

Bolshevism Done American Style And The Law Becomes An Ass

While watching tennis player Serena Williams temper tantrum after losing 6-2, 6-2 to a 20 year old tennis player Japanese Naomi Osaka reminded me of Hillary Clinton's loss for the presidency. Serena blamed the referee, Hillary blamed the Electoral College. Naomi, whose childhood idol was Williams, tearfully accepted her well-deserved trophy while the crowd booed.

Then we have had since Sept. 1, 2016 former NFL quarterback for the San Francisco 49ers, Colin Kaepernick who first knelt during the National anthem after Trump referred to them as SOB's. [\[Link\]](#) President Trump, as usual, only said what so many others have felt about these well paid players as compared to others much brighter and accomplished.

And we are reminded at how quickly ABC cancelled Roseanna Barr claiming the comedienne's insult against Valerie Jarret was racist because she wrote that the former Obama administration official looked like the "muslim brotherhood and planet of the apes had a baby." Yes, indeed, we do have a [double standard](#) in America because the Left gets away with such insults of conservatives.

But then there is President Trump himself being treated disrespectfully by the Deep State crowd which proves all Americans are equal, but some Americans are more equal than others as explained in Fay Voshell's article below, "Law Defined," which came first from the 5/11/2018 *AMERICAN THINKER* and later published in the July 2018 *THE SCHWARZ REPORT*.

All this reminds me of Rev. 13:15..."And he had power to give life unto the image of the beast, that the image of the beast

should both speak, and cause as many as would not worship the image of the beast to be killed.” Today people “worship” and give undue respect and honor to those whose “image” comes over the television or movie screen appearing to be real, live images which feed our imaginations. Turning on your television could very well become a computer chip or a magnetic “tattoo” in your hand (or forehead) so they could know who listened and who didn’t. [[YouTube Video](#)]

ARBITRARY LAW BECOMES AN ASS

Whatever objections may be leveled at Ayn Rand’s objectivist philosophy, she certainly knew what arbitrary law looked like. Her father’s business was seized during the Bolshevik Revolution, and she herself was purged from Petrograd State University because she was considered a member of the bourgeoisie.

When arbitrary law is established, the law becomes an ass. In other words, the law as created by legislatures and administered by [the courts cannot be relied upon to reflect common sense or to be fair](#).

As Rand later wrote: “The threat of sudden destruction, of unpredictable retaliation for unnamed offense, is a much more potent means of enslavement than explicit dictatorial laws. It demands more and mere obedience; it leaves men no policy save one: to please the authorities; to please- blindly, uncritically, without standards or principles; to please- in any issue, matter or circumstances, for fear of an unknowable, unprovable vengeance.”

AMERICA ACCEDING TO ARBITRARY LAWS

America is gradually acceding to the arbitrary law Rand knew so well. Be it unwitting transgressions against the latest permutation of leftist ideology or ignorance of sheer bureaucratic complexity, any American peaceably sitting in the family living room can be accused of breaking the law. Under

capricious law, the citizen cannot know when he or she will be charged with some offense against the powers that be. The result of chronic uncertainty is perpetual anxiety leading to ulcers of the spirit.

Two recent examples of these transgressions is the pastor who was arrested in MN for speaking to Muslims about why he converted from Islam to Christianity and the other about a retired Lutheran pastor in a Virginia senior community evicted for holding Bible study.

The result of the Bolshevism that Rand rejected was, Alexander Solzhenitsyn remarked, the knock in the middle of the night. One never knew when to expect "The sharp night-time ring or the rude knock at the door. The insolent entrance of the unwiped jackboots of the unsleeping State Security operatives."

[Why is Western law inviting collapse into Soviet style mere caprice?](#)

Speaking generally, the justificatory bases for Western law can be divided into two categories, one basis being the Judeo-Christian law as summarized by the Ten Commandments and undergirded by the realities of natural law. The other, especially in the last century or so, is arbitrary decided by a political party's ideology. ([This upcoming mid-term election could be our last.](#))

American law has increasingly followed the Bolshevik model as the progressive Left has sought to enshrine its political ideology into law while eliminating through persecutory and, arbitrary procedures certain classes of people who are the equivalent of the bourgeoisie represented by the kulaks.

As Lenin put it, certain classes of people are "insects" worthy of eradication. As Solzhenitsyn noted, categories of "insects" proliferated like vermin. Anyone opposing communist ideology was an insect:

The people in the local zemstvo self-governing bodies in the provinces were, of course, insects. People in the cooperative movement were also insects, as were all owners of their own homes. There were not a few insects among the teachers in the gymnasiums. The church parish councils were made up almost exclusively of insects, and it was insects, of course, who sang in the church choirs. All priests were insects- and monks and nuns even more so.

One “insect” among many in the teeming American Christian anthill is Jack Phillips, the baker whose case will be ruled on before the Supreme Court. An insect like him dared to act according to his conscience, angering a same-sex couple who believed that ant Phillips must be crushed underfoot and his business destroyed. Phillips was basically presented with a choice: Convert his thinking to conform with LGBT ideology or effectively perish as a functioning member of society. II
Thes. 2:11

JACK BEING SET UP

It should be noted the Jack Phillips case had not yet gone before the Supreme Court when this article was first published; however, the Supreme Court has since ruled in his favor 7-2 upholding his religious freedom but on the very day the Supreme Court decided to hear Jack’s case in June 2017, an attorney called Jack’s bakery asking for a custom cake. He wanted a cake that would be blue on the outside and pink on the inside in order to celebrate his transition from male to female. Although it seemed obvious that Jack was being targeted and set up, he treated the lawyer the same way he would have treated any other customer in that situation. Jack politely declined to create a custom cake expressing a message that conflicted with his faith. Once again, Jack acted based on his conscience, then the attorney filed a claim with the same Colorado agency that prosecuted Jack and the harassment continues forcing him into bankruptcy like [Oregon Judge Vance Day](#).

ONLY MARRIAGE BETWEEN ONE MAN AND ONE WOMAN

Also of importance, Oregon voters in November 2, 2004 by a vote of 1,028,546 to 787,556 voted to amend the Constitution that only marriage between one man and one woman is valid or legally recognized as a marriage but the scallywags in the 2007 Democrat-controlled legislature got the Oregon Equality Act passed which protects the rights of gays, lesbians, bisexuals and transgendered Oregonians in employment, housing and public places. Business owners once could say to customers, "No shoes, no shirts, no service" but that all changed after the Equality Act when once again the Bureau of Labor penalized a bar \$400,000 for banning cross dressers.

And then along came Aaron and Melissa Klein who refused to bake a cake for a lesbian couple's wedding and one Pecksniffian (Pompous Twit) alone in the state's Bureau of Labor and Industries made the decision that their First Amendment rights no longer existed and initially wanted to fine them \$200,000 but ended up being fined \$135,000. The Klein's were forced to close their business and left leaning judges and bureaucrats continued shutting down business entities that didn't cater to homosexual wishes but stood on the First Amendment like Jack Phillips. [[Link](#)]

Now continuing with Fay's story about BOLSHEVISM DONE AMERICAN STYLE:

Thought crimes such as Phillips was accused of creating a category of capricious law that has been and are particularly useful for what is essentially retooled **BOLSHEVISM** done American style. There is no end to legal arbitrariness if thoughts are crimes, for thought crimes make a mockery of the rule of law. Actual guilt or innocence are completely unmoored from the law, which traditionally is supposed to assign guilt to actual transgressions. Anyone can be charged as guilty if he or she will not speak the Newspeak, now characterized by gender-neutral terminology.

Now one can, by attributing a wrong thought or word, make a man out to be guilty, as [Canadian Professor Jordan Peterson found out when he refused to use gender neutral pronouns on demand](#). The idea was that Peterson must employ the language utilized in transgender liturgy or be declared heretic and worthy of excommunication from academia.

For the left, thought crimes as evidence by “wrong” speech are revelatory of wrongfully privileged class status; therefore, certain classes such as the conservatively or religiously inclined who speak about moral and observable verities must be suppressed, banned or even eliminated. Arbitrary law becomes a useful tool through revolutionaries accomplish the destruction of whole categories of enemies such “privileged” white males like Peterson.

A few contemporary observers are able to sum up the essence, problems, and consequences of arbitrary law. Dmitry Dubrovsky is one of them. In an essay published in *Eurasianet*, “[The Bolsheviks and the Law: The Legacy of Arbitrary Justice](#),” he writes arbitrary law is the essence of revolutions, which are meant to overhaul existing orders.

“The Bolsheviks did not see the law as a means to adjudicate civil and business disputes, or to dispense justice blindly; they viewed it as a mechanism to implement their social and political agenda...The law, for the Bolsheviks, was the means toward that end, an instrument of persecution, not dispensing justice...The law, along with the system’s functionaries, was expected to serve the interests of...the party running the state.

“(The law)...codified inequality, elevating a certain class, the proletariat, to preferred status. At the same time, it limited the right of others, namely anyone deemed to be a member of the bourgeoisie class. It created conditions in which it will be impossible for the bourgeoisie to exist, or for a new bourgeoisie to arise.

Scarcely any clearer description of the goals of the American left concerning the law could be found. What rational observer cannot observe the unyielding assault on the rule of law as the left inexorably and relentlessly seeks to eliminate any [distinction between the law and the left's will?](#)

Who cannot see that as the law is increasingly detached from its traditional Western mooring, it has increasingly become a mere manipulative tool to persecute and oppress political and religious opposition, all the while seeking to undermine every institution that still has even a tenuous alliance with the Judeo-Christian concept of law as having its genesis in a transcendent order?

Dubrovsky continues: Even during the late Soviet period...Soviet law remained arbitrary, in that Kremlin leaders...continued to manipulate the law, using it as an instrument of repression. Political factors, not legal precedents, determined judicial decisions.

Dubrovsky concludes that inequality was codified so a certain class might be elevated to preferred status.

Again, what objective observer cannot see that the left in America is attempting to duplicate the Bolshevist society described by Dubrovsky, seeking to establish a radically different class system – one that is replacing the permeability of classes that has so long been the mark of American society and the basis of the American dream? Who cannot see that some categories of people are now more equal than others? [Link]

At the heart of the changes in the rule of law is the revolutionary desire to eradicate any opposing world view, particularly one that believes in actual concepts of guilt and innocence. As Solzhenitsyn notes, for the left “A convenient world outlook gives rise to a convenient juridical term: social prophylaxis in order an ideological world view is

cleansed of opposition – the intellectual rot of Christianity being among the intellectual diseases that need cleaning... In addition, how many kinds of cursed intellectuals there were – restless students and a variety of eccentrics, truth-seekers, and holy fools...who are always a hindrance to a well-ordered, strict regime.”

Solzhenitsyn concluded that political guilt replaced actual guilt. One party rules today, and another rules tomorrow – with a different set of rules. Power alone reigns, enabling repression of the most malevolent sort to flourish:

The proofs of guilt were relative, approximate, and the interrogator could find them, even when there was no evidence and no witness, without leaving his office, basing his conclusions only on his own intellect...Thus it was that the conclusions of advanced Soviet jurisprudence, proceeding in a spiral, returned to barbaric or medieval standards. Like medieval torturers, our interrogators, prosecutors, and judges agreed to accept the confession of the accused as the chief proof of guilt.

The confession as proof of guilt is one reason why we now witness a constant parade of confessions and retractions by leading figures left and right. Confession establishes guilt and retraction removes it. The whole process is circular and endless self-justification and self-exoneration. One is one's own prosecutor and defender; judge and jury, sentence and parole officers.

The result? The law becomes an ass and the future of [America becomes an Avalanche of Socialism](#).

SOLUTION- RETURN TO THE RULE OF LAW

The solution? Return to the rule of law based on Law that transcends the individual and is applicable to every man and woman, namely, the Judeo-Christian ethic based on the Ten Commandments and natural law.

“the master plan is all but a *fait accompli*. People should remember these words by Ayn Rand: “We are fast approaching the stage of the ultimate inversion: the state where the government is free to do anything it pleases, while the citizens may act only by permission – which is the stage of the darkest periods of human history, the state of rule by brute force.”

© 2018 Betty Freauf – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Betty Freauf: bettyfreauf@gmail.com