

Natural Rights from a Philosophical and Biblical Perspective

Hyung Jin Moon

January 20, 2018

Conference on Arms for Defense in Lausanne, Switzerland

European Sovereign Citizens Alliance



Hyung Jin Moon was born in New York State, USA, and has a Bachelor of Liberal Arts degree and a Master of Theology degree from Harvard University. Pastor Hyung Jin Moon founded World Peace and Unification Sanctuary, known as Sanctuary Church, and conducts his ministry through Sunday services and daily Kings Reports, giving a commentary on current affairs from a religious perspective.

He has a brown belt in Brazilian Jiu-jitsu, teaches martial arts and self-defense, and gives peace militia training.

He is the heir and successor of Reverend Sun Myung Moon of Korea, and 2nd King of Cheon IL Guk. He published the Constitution of the United States of Cheon IL Guk in 2015. He lives in Pennsylvania with his wife and five children.

At the conference, he speaks on "Natural Rights from a Philosophical and Biblical Perspective."

Good morning everyone. So beautiful to be here on this stunning lake and of course this historical site! Today I would like to speak about natural rights from both philosophical and biblical perspectives.

When we look at natural rights or our rights as sovereign citizens, our rights in my view cannot be grounded in anything but theistic Judeo-Christian values. If our rights are determined by groups or coalitions, boards or bureaucracy, they are not really rights. They are only privileges that are given to a lesser population.

Our rights have to be rooted in something that's transcendental, that's beyond any human institution, and/or board, government, etc... They must be rooted in God. For our rights to be human they must be intrinsic to the nature of human being, that is to say, they must be held as soon as that person is conceived, and they must be inextricable- not being able to be separated –from that person with any outside power.

That is why some of the greatest philosophers have always evoked not only the idea but the truth about God, in order to discuss human rights and discuss universal values. In the modern day it's very common to see different philosophies such as relativism, moral relativism, philosophical relativism, being heavily pushed in universities and institutions of higher learning.

Unfortunately with this kind of doctrine comes the weakness of human beings in being able to decide what is right, what is morally objectively true, and what is not. Now of course Europe has seen the repercussions of such a philosophical position in the person of Hitler who believed he could create his own determination of good and evil. What that does to history is recorded in textbooks around the world.

My journey is very interesting because we grew up in New York, a very liberal state in the United States, but my father and our family have always been into firearms. As you may know one of the first businesses that my father Rev Sun Myung Moon created was a firearms business in South Korea. After he fled from North Korea being there in prison for preaching the Gospel, he went to South Korea, where he was persecuted as well, but eventually he was able to work with the South Korean government to develop the arms industry, eventually producing such weapon as the Vulcan cannon for the Korean military.

So, our father pioneered this area, but on the ecclesiastical or the church side we did not see it as vividly as people who were with him in the early days. That's why we now reside in Pennsylvania with the True Mother of our tradition who was also part of that original business, and who was awarded the prize of being the best seller in the early rifles business.

You may also know that one of Rev. Moon's sons, Mr. Kook Jin Moon is also one of the top firearm inventors and manufacturers in the United States running companies such as Kahr Arms, Tommy gun and Thompson magnum research etc... So this has been quite a big part of our family's past stemming all the way from East Asia. It has always been my father's desire to have all peoples experience sovereignty, experience authority in their lives, and be able to freely seek God whether or not in a free society, but obviously his prayer and his compelling was always to seek God, for our rights and our human value are determined in our relationship with Him.

There is no honest discussion about natural rights and human rights without the idea of a personal God. If you know and are familiar with some of the works of preeminent scholars like Dr. William Craig, Alvin Plantinga, etc... - who have really solidified and strengthened the Christian apologetic position, debating some of the top atheist minds in the world including Dawkins, Hitchens, Harris and alike - you will see their positions outlined very clearly in the idea that it is most likely that we are in a universe that is created by a designer.

When we look for example at the great fine-tuning of the universe, it is so precisely done that any modification of any of the constants and conditions including the mass of the electron, proton, with the weak force of the gravitational pull, etc... will result in the complete collapse of the universe.

These arguments are developed in these intellectuals' works, so I will not delve into them deeply here, but it is clear that there is a great fine-tuning in the universe and that all these constants and conditions must balance and work together in order for it to function, less they collapse into what some prominent scientists called a reverse implosion or a complete annihilation of life.

We also need to look at the question of whether there is real good or evil in the world, for example if the act of rape is evil or if it is simply a cultural taboo. Then we have to get into the whole discussion of moral objective truth, and of course of a moral objective truth giver, or a standard upon which we can decipher whether something is good or something is evil.

Intrinsically we all know from our conscience that there is really evil in the world. No one can stand and see millions of children being massacred and say, "Oh that's just taboo!" Nor can anyone stand to see women assaulted in the European crisis and say, "Oh that's just cultural taboo! It's not evil or wicked!" Instinctually, as human persons, we know that there is a good and there is an evil. This position of course is developed and worked out through the moral objective truth arguments.

These are just brief summations of some of the most compelling arguments for the reasons for a God and a personal. When we look at even the most modern science which points to the creation of the universe, referred to as the big bang, we see that the nature of the universe in its inception, all matter and all time, began at a certain point where previously it did not exist. It is of course main stream scientific theory.

If there is a beginning to time, then it is most plausible that there is an agent or someone that has personality, that has an element of choice, that can chose to bring in the universe at our dimensions of time and space, from nothing to something. Many of these arguments are written in very large philosophical treaties and intellectual works, and I highly recommend the work of Dr. William Lane Craig, Mr. Plantinga for the ontological argument etc... very well worked out thorough arguments that we simply don't have time to cover today.

Getting back to the topic of natural rights, I think from my perspective as a pastor, we have to go to the word of God. And I briefly create the summation of the plausibility of God's existence because in the end without God we are simply animals. The process of evolution dating back according to theories, millions and millions of years, that we are floating on a large asteroid rock in outer space, with no particular meaning and no particular purpose.

These types of philosophies or positions lead to morally a hedonistic position but of course philosophically a nihilistic position which is the idea that there is no real purpose to life and our life is in

the end meaningless. These of course are untenable positions from the Christian worldview, because our image and nature is made in the image of our Creator, so as a pastor I have to go into Scripture to delve into the idea of natural rights and human rights. So that's what I'd like to do in a most focused way this morning.

In the Judeo-Christian worldview and framework, when we look at Scripture our natural rights begin in Genesis 1:26, where God says, "Let us make man[a] in our image, after our likeness. And let them have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the heavens and over the livestock and over all the earth and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth."



He also says in Genesis 9:6 "Whoever sheds the blood of man, by man shall his blood be shed, for God made man in his own image."

These are two essential Scriptures talking about the nature of man, and as unique creation a human being is different from an orangutan or a chimpanzee or an armadillo or whatever you have in Switzerland. It is a different ontological being that has a different connection to the Creator.

So the idea of human rights, at least scripturally, begins with human beings made in the image of God. This has to be contextualized and framed, because God is not just another person. He is the great creator of all things; He is the great architect of the universe, the mathematician of all constants and conditions that we find, that sustain the universe. He is the great mind and the great intellect behind all things.

So when we say, "Human beings are made in the image of God" that's quite a remarkable statement; that's quite a powerful statement! To say that there is nothing greater than God, and of course that among all living things human beings hold a special place in the universe, that we are not just another species, or that we are not just another form of animal! We hold a very special unique place in the universe which of course seems very large and vast.

In Jeremiah 31:33 God speaks to his people about the Covenant that He will make with the House of Israel in those days. He declares, "I will put my law within them, and I will write it on their hearts and they shall be My people."

Also in Romans 2:14: "When Gentiles, who do not have the law, by nature do what the law requires, they are a law themselves, even though they do not have the law."

From a Judeo-Christian framework all human beings, all men and women, have what is commonly called a conscience, or what the Bible calls, "the law of God that is written on our hearts", that we know intrinsically, we know the difference between good and evil, we know when people are being oppressed or exploited or if there are cases of assault or rape, we know these are bad things. Intrinsically human persons know that these things are wrong, and the Bible delves into that, shedding light on the fact that our Creator writes these things on our heart and our heart becomes a conscientious decision maker that allows us to discern between good and evil.

It's very interesting, when we think about moving onto the topic of self-defense, that all these things are determining the value of the person, of the human being, that life itself is valuable and that it is purposeful, or that it is important or even worthwhile to defend. If our life had no value it would not be

worthwhile to defend, especially at the risk of your own life.

The whole idea of defense comes from the notion that life and in particular human life is valuable, and human life must be protected, especially the life of those who cannot protect themselves and are vulnerable. I believe every human person has this intrinsic nature in their own heart that when they see other people being oppressed the natural tendency is to want to defend them and/or protect them. That comes from an idea and a perspective on the value of human life, which is of course the reason why any modern, post-modern, and /or nihilistic framework cannot lead to an adequate explanation of why a human person is valuable in the first place.

All nihilists and moral objectivists can get to, is an idea of universal preferred behavior but that has nothing to say whether something is good or evil, and of course that has nothing to say against the dictator principle. It is the theoretical concept and historical reality that if a dictator takes over a nation by force, annihilates or eradicates his opposition, and himself becomes the majority with his new power, then of course the morally preferential and morally universally preferred values, now change - if the dictator is able to win and destroy, in many cases committing genocide against his opposition.

So any philosophical exercise or exploration into the idea of human rights and natural rights cannot be separated from our divine nature which is given to us by God. Cannot be separated!

Then again with the universally preferred behavior we run into the same issue, with a new majority which is violent, a new majority which has no problem using force to take what they want, and "might equals right", a new majority that will determine what will be morally preferential. Unfortunately this has been the course of history, time and time again in various cycles, in what from the Judeo-Christian framework we would call the fallen state or the fallen history.

In the Bible we can also see God speaking to His people, in Exodus 22:2. This is under the Mosaic Law: "If a thief is caught in the act of breaking into a house and is killed, the one who killed him is not guilty." God says.

So if someone in the night is breaking into one's house and that intruder is killed in self-defense, even a thief, it's not a murderer or a rapist, but in this case a thief, then in terms of Judeo-Christian law the person who killed him would not be guilty.

Of course the next verse goes on to say that in the morning if the person could be visible then he should be given a warning, so that person would be held culpable if that person was killed and he had the ability to chase him away.

In Nehemiah 4:14 God also says, "Do not be afraid of them. Remember the Lord, who is great and awesome, and fight for your brothers, your sons, your daughters, your wives, and your homes."

This is another reference where God calls his people to stand up for those who are vulnerable, and stand up for their own kinsmen and people.

In Proverbs 31:8-9 God says, "Open your mouth for the mute, for the rights of all who are destitute. 9 Open your mouth, judge righteously, defend the rights of the poor and needy."

You will see this constant compelling from Christ to defend the poor and the needy. There are many biblical Scriptures, in the New Testament, referring to these things such as the Gospels where Christ says, "And whoever shall cause to stumble one of these of the little ones believing in Me, it is better for him that a heavy millstone should be hung around his neck, and he be sunk in the depth of the sea" and in the Beatitudes also, Christ says, "Blessed are the poor" or "those who are humble in heart for they will inherit the Kingdom of God."

Many references again to standing up to defend the rights of other people- a central Christian and biblical principle!

Also in Psalm 82: 3 we see in the Scripture God says, "Give justice to the weak and the fatherless; maintain the right of the afflicted and the destitute. Again calling upon believers and humanity to stand for those who are weak, for those who are afflicted and destitute! These are of course central Judeo-Christian values that are rooted in the human person as a creation made in the image of God, again not simply another species of animal, but a being that has special place and value in the universe.

In Luke 22, Jesus is talking to his disciples; this is a very famous episode in Scripture unfortunately not taught in most Christian churches, parishes, Catholic churches, etc... because it is such a clear reference to the fact that believers in Christ must not only defend themselves but must be armed as well.

In Luke 22:35 -37

"Jesus said unto them, When I sent you without purse, and scrip, and shoes, lacked ye anything? And they said nothing. 36 Then said he unto them, but now, he that hath a purse, let him take it, and likewise his scrip: and he that hath no sword, let him sell his garment, and buy one. 37 For I say unto you, that this that is written must yet be accomplished in me, and he was reckoned among the transgressors: for the things concerning me have an end. 38 And they said, Lord, behold, here are two swords. And he said unto them, it is enough."

Here we see Jesus - contrary to how many on the left try to position Jesus excluding these very clear statements about his believers having to defend themselves and/or Jesus entering the Temple a different religious establishment and flipping over tables and chasing out the money changers etc... very radical behaviors for those who want to package Christ as a peace activist or a Dalai Lama type figure!



We can see a much more radical view of Christ but of course one who ultimately is protecting and is destined to save human life.

In the episode with Luke 22, we see that Christ implores his disciples to sell their accoutrements, some of the most important things in the ancient world being garments, to protect oneself against the elements, but also even as a status symbol. Even in the modern days, as you know, garments are status symbols. And selling of one's garments would be a very large thing to give up, especially given the fact that they did not have the modern accoutrements that we have and we enjoy today.

Christ says very clearly that they are supposed to sell these things for the possession of a sword, obviously not for offense. But in the times in which the disciples would be confronted and/or their lives would be in danger, to have a sword with a specific purpose and that sword, as a firearm in the modern day, does not have any other purpose than a lethal purpose for the defense of human life. Obviously a sword in that period is not used for agriculture or for culinary purposes, but a sword is used for combat.

So the idea of having a sword to defend oneself is of course really very strong in the Old Testament, but very clear in the New Testament as well. I am very surprised when I meet pastors and /or Christians who have never heard Luke 22.



From a Biblical perspective, also from a Judeo-Christian perspective, from which most of our ideas of natural rights, natural law and human rights are derived, and especially on the conservative side, we have

the idea of Christ as King. That is an essential characteristic to a Christian's relationship to the universe, and/or institutions of power as he or she moves through his or her life, that is apportioned to them on this planet.

In Mathew 6:9 Jesus commands his disciples to pray, "Our Father who art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven." And of course many will know the rest of that prayer commonly called, 'The Lord's Prayer'.

He implores us to, in our prayer, anticipate and look forward to the day when God's kingdom comes to this earth. This is a very important Christian principle that God's kingdom will come to the earth, that it is not just a celestial kingdom, and a kingdom that we meet after we perish, but a kingdom that believers will be able to encounter when Christ establishes his kingdom on earth.

It is a very important concept because it compels those who are believers and who are in the Judeo-Christian framework to look forward to the day when God will be King. The end of suffering, tyranny, and oppression will come and it is incumbent to position our moral compass and our faith life in fidelity and in trust with God and Christ, and in his Kingdom that he promises to bring.

In Mathew 6: 33 Jesus also says, "Seek Ye first the Kingdom of God and his righteousness and all these things shall be added unto you." He also implores us: the first thing that a believer in Christ needs to do is to seek the kingdom of God. In Greek the word is *basileia* coming from *basileus* which of course is the word for king.

In Mathew 10:7 Jesus says, "As you go, preach, saying 'The kingdom of heaven is at hand.

In Luke 4:43 he also says, In these key Scripture, we see that Christ says that he is sent for the purpose of preaching the kingdom of God. What we know historically is that wherever the kingdom of God was preached, Christ and /or his disciples came under tremendous persecution from the local and the federal authorities which they lived under- the Roman authorities at that time.

It was such a radical doctrine that he was not only gaining in followers, but that he was an existential threat to the centralized powers- what we refer to as the archangelic powers of the day.

In Mathew 4:23 "And Jesus went about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing all manner of sickness and all manner of disease among the people."

Again we see that the Bible clearly represents the gospel of Christ, the Gospel of the kingdom of God.

In Mark 1:14-15 "Now after that John was put in prison, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God, And saying, The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe the gospel."

Wherever Jesus would preach the Gospel of the kingdom of God, there would be healing, there would be repentance, but also there would be political upheaval.

This of course is often not even emphasized in the theological world, in the Christian scholarly world, the nature of Christ' message being so politically charged, and his message being so politically powerful, that even the most powerful civilization on earth at the time, felt an existential threat from this very obscure figure.

In Mathew 9:35 "And Jesus went about all the cities and villages, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing every sickness and every disease among the people."

Matthew 24:14 says, "And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come."

In Matthew 25:34 "Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world."

We see, from a Judeo-Christian perspective, both New and Old Testament, the idea of the value of a human person, made in the image of God, and eventual co-heir with Christ in his kingdom. The Christian views society in a different framework because the Christian is to have a kingdom gospel mindset, pointed towards God's kingdom that will eventually be on this earth. In that God says also that the believers and those who are faithful will be co-heirs with Him.

In the modern day, with the spread of democracy throughout the world, many in the West have a very negative view of monarchy, which of course is for a very good reason that is to say that most monarchies have been highly centralized and have created a master and slave or serf system; nevertheless what

modern political speculators call neo- feudalism, or a type of feudalism is what they, especially the left- want to re-invent.

This, of course, from the perspective of God is antithesis to what He intended for human beings made in His image, given the blessings of sovereignty, to be fruitful, multiply and have dominion over the earth. The rights of private property for example are rooted in Scripture, in the idea that a human person is not only valuable but has a right to sovereignty i.e. a right to hold private property, which of course under communist doctrine or in communist nations is impossible.



Our most cherished beliefs in the West that come from these historical, biblical principles are often overlooked and are taken for granted. The idea that one can own property and defend that property is such a common place concept in the West that we forget where this comes from and how radical a statement that can be.

We know that many on the left absolutely abhor the idea that people can own property or they can own a piece of the earth depending on their own different theological or political positions. But these principles which we take for granted in the West are not from the secular tradition. They don't appear from morally preferential behavior that is agreed upon by the majority of people; they come from a certain place and that place historically has been the Scripture.

It is a great tragedy for the modern western persons to be so dominated by post- modernist culture that we are separated from our religious past and our framework from Scripture which allows us the structure and experience in this short time we have on earth together.

It's my conviction and I assume it has always been any serious believer's faith that no human rights and/or natural rights can be granted by anything else than a transcendental architect and designer of the universe who is powerful, who knows much more than we can ever know, that is greater than all matter, that is beyond all time, for both time and matter have been created, and that has the conscious ability to decide when to create something from nothing which would of course point to personhood.

It is in this creator's image that we are created and which our human rights stem from. In the end human rights cannot be a product of human minds. They must be the product of a transcendental creator that gives us sovereignty, that gives us value, that gives us purpose, that gives us salvation from our own ego- hood or selfishness or sin as in the Christian world it would be referred to, or evil or wickedness as humanity calls it, and allows us to strive to become more like the good God that has created us.

From a biblical perspective the idea of human rights, the idea of the value of a person is of course exemplified in Christ, in the Gospel of his kingdom, and of all the Scriptures that we have seen, but how will his kingdom be ruled is another question for the Christian mind. How will the kingdom of God be ruled in a way that is consistent with God's nature, his intellect, his personhood and his laws which are extensions of his nature?

God is not a thief, so an extension of that would be 'Do not steal.' God is not a murderer so an extension of that would be 'do not murder.' God is not a liar, so an extension of that would be 'Do not lie or bear false witness.' So any of God's laws are also extensions of his nature! And of course the reason why that is critical for the Christian and Judeo-Christian understanding of human rights and also the future Kingdom

of God is that all wonder how God's kingdom will be ruled?

When we look at the past kings and monarchies of the past we see centralization of power, which led to more stratification within the population, which led to a super class that ruled over the majority of people, and one can hardly say this was the much anticipated model for Christ's kingdom when he returns.

This I believe is a critical conundrum in the minds of believers, in the modern day, who stand up for sovereignty because of certain Scriptures that seem to intimate that when Christ comes he will come and rule with great judgment, with great wrath and with tremendous –what people would see as – tyranny. So how is the believer to juggle this with what one knows about Christ through Scripture and personal experience that he is a God of love, as the Bible says God is love?

As we see in the picture of Eden, God also gives his children Adam and Eve, freedom and sovereignty to act and behave, even to choose to reject Him and his commandment. The Bible also says that God is eternal, that He is unchanging, and that He is the same today, yesterday and forever.

So how is the modern Christian and/or thinker in the Judeo-Christian framework to think about God's eventual reign on earth, yet at the same time having to contemplate on the goodness of God and his nature which does not change, even when his Kingdom shall come?

I am going to draw your attention to some Scriptures here that give a picture of God's Kingdom:

In Psalm 2:8 he said: "Ask of Me, and I will give You The nations for Your inheritance, And the ends of the earth for Your possession. 9 You shall break them with a rod of iron; You shall dash them to pieces like a potter's vessel"

Again, these Scriptures are not intended for the Christians to receive and recite in hubris, but for the Christians to understand that sovereignty is a God-given promise and a God-given right.

In Revelation 2:27 "He shall rule them with a rod of iron; they shall be dashed to pieces like the potter's vessels as I also have received from My Father"

Again, another reference to Christ as he returns to earth as Christians believe, and that he will rule with the rod of iron. The imagery is very powerful; it's a very violent imagery as the vessels of the potter are broken to pieces. Again, another forceful, a very violent imagery that the nations who are against him that will be shattered!

Again, can Christians frame this seemingly very violent, almost despotic Scriptures, of the rod of iron with Christ's own nature which is love?

Rev. 12:5 "And she brought forth a man child, who was to rule all nations with a rod of iron: and her child was caught up unto God, and to his throne."

Again God's rule will be with the rod of iron in the Judeo-Christian framework.

Revelation 19:15 "From his mouth comes a sharp sword with which to strike down the nations, and he will rule them with a rod of iron. He will tread the winepress of the fury of the wrath of God the Almighty."

Again the Christian or a believer or someone who is looking at Scripture, even someone who does not believe, would be hard-pressed saying that this type of rule would not be fearful. The Bible seems to say that when Christ comes back and rules with the rod of iron, it will be a very fearful rule, almost what people would see as a despotic type of rule.

How is the modern thinker to negotiate that with God and his nature and with Christ and his nature as a God of love?

When we look at criminality, when we look at different social ills that plague our civilization, for example if we look at America, we can see that some of the most radical left-leaning cities are run by people leaning to the left, or what my father would call communists or political satanists, because it provides safe haven for actual Satanism to exist and to flourish; it creates the political framework for protection of those who are on the business of murdering children through abortion clinics, etc... that most left-leaning politicians and/or leaders will support.

Also strong on the leftist agenda is gun control, the controlling of firearms, and the fact that citizens are not able to own and protect themselves with the use of technology, the greatest of which would be a firearm in the self-defense world at this point in history.

When we look at America in the position of one of the few nations of the world where citizen armament is quite common, and the ownership of firearms exceeds over 100 million households, we can observe that some of the most liberal-leaning areas which do not allow for possession of firearms to defend one's family and/or life, have some of the highest per capita homicide rates in the country. Whereas, on the other hand, in areas that are more conservative and allow for citizens to be armed and to defend themselves, the per capita homicide rate drops dramatically.



The problem of homicide is based on firearms according to those on the left, whose theories will of course eventually lead to communism and/or socialism. Kim Jung Un for examples is on the left, dictators like Maduro are on the left. So in Western societies when people say they are on the left, it should bring concern to people who have experience with such regimes and/or whose families have been killed such as our family, many of whom have been killed by the North Korean regime.

In a brief survey of the US statistics, there are 90 guns per 100 households, for arms that I have effectively referred as the rod of iron; 90 per 100 households. If the leftist position was correct and the problem of homicide was based on firearms, then the US by far, should have the highest homicide rate in the world, with almost double the amount of gun ownership compared to the next countries such as Switzerland etc...

When one does even a cursory analysis of that, one sees that the US does not even fall in the top 10 in terms of homicide rates, does not even fall in the top 20 nations of the world, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70, 80. Currently the US is close to the top 90.

If one excludes the liberal controlled cities such as Detroit, Baltimore, St Louis, etc... one has now a nation with one of the lowest of the 200 – maybe not even on the top 200 countries- in terms of homicide. Most people in the world have been educated by their governments and their institutions of learning that a firearm is a dangerous thing and creates crime.

This could not be further from the truth when it is in the hands of the right people. When it is in the hands of the law-abiding citizen we see statistically that society becomes safer and that homicide rates will plummet. Of course we will hear from those precise statistics from our speakers today.

It is my view and it has been my father's view that all peoples find their value and their worth in their relationship with God. Whether we as peoples and individuals decide to believe in a God or not is one of personal volition, but does not separate us from the reality that our lives are meaningful, that our lives are valuable, that we intrinsically know the difference between right and wrong and good and evil, that we want to see those who are oppressed be free, that we want to see people being able to defend themselves against violent intrusion and violent individuals who seek to exploit the peacefulness of normal individuals for their profit.

I believe all these desires that we have naturally come from 'Our Father who Art in Heaven' in whose image we are created. So our natural urge for compassion, and urge to love God and love our neighbor - as Christ condensed the commandments of God into those two simple things – I believe these things are encapsulated in those who seek to protect people through responsible ownership of arms.

It is the only way to be able to negotiate God's eventual rule of the world with the rod of iron and his

actual nature which is constant over time and does not change of being a God of justice, a God of love, a God who is kind to those who are in destitution, a God who grieves as seeing calamities in this world, but a God who also respects the gift of free will which He has given to his creation, mainly humankind.

If we understand that our rights and natural law, that our natural rights come from our transcendental Creator, who is in his own nature love and in his own nature is good and just, then we too must have faith in his creation, namely humanity to hold responsibility over the powers that are usually just given to governments and to bureaucracies.

It is when the normal citizens can see the sovereignty that is bestowed upon them by their Creator who is the King of Kings and the Lord of Lords, that they can stand with Him as co-heirs, essentially kings and queens with Him in his kingdom, and rule the nations with the rod of iron, not for subjugation and/or conquest but for peace and stability, so that humanity can move forward without predators, without the fear of violent interruption, and/or violent intrusion into their lives.

The Scripture says, "The Kingdom suffered violence for the violent take it by force." It is essential that citizens of all nations, races and creeds have the power and have the human right to be able to defend themselves against tyrants, dictators, and powers, enemies - foreign and domestic as we say in the US- against those who seek to do harm and to exploit by force. Citizens are the greatest and most important protection for our common defense.

It's on that note that I wish to conclude my more academic remarks, but I would like to implore everyone to reflect on those things.

Thank you very much.

