

Why Contract Ideology Will Always Be Part of Man's Law

(A Critique of the Sovereignty Movement)

By Jana Esp. (<https://janaesp.com/contract-ideology>)



In the sovereignty movement, many will get sidetracked from pursuing the occult understanding of Natural Law because they will fail to fully deconstruct man's law—the body of laws including corporate, commercial, civil, monetary, cannon, and ecclesiastical laws of one integrated system. Their minds and hearts are entangled in the matrix they seek to transcend and I'm going to explore why that is the case.

Some, like Kenneth Scott (aka Ken Cousens) of Gemstone University, fall into contract ideology, which becomes a substitute for Natural Law. Scott is able to articulate man's law eloquently and accurately through historical accounts and comprehensive reasoning; as an educational resource, much of his material is good. The works of Jordan Maxwell have also exposed the deeper meanings behind the Ancient Archonic system that we are still enslaved in that controls, engineers, and devolves the human species under the dark religion (solar, lunar, and stellar cults) of priest-like rulership going back to ancient Babylon, Egypt, Greece, and Rome.

However, when it comes to solutions and philosophical understanding, Scott and others supporters of contract ideology fall short as they give more merit to the fictional realm of man's law than they should, assigning intrinsic value to any and all contracts made between parties, seeing our signature as a bond and oath. So, we must endeavor to understand the nature of contracts and their relationship to real Law. What bearing do contracts really have? If they are voluntary are they as binding as Law? Or can this only be true under man's law?

Let's first clarify Scott's position. To him and others in the sovereignty movement, it is our agreed-upon contract with our rulers that perpetuates the control system.

From *An Overview of the World System of Bondage and Separation from Life* by Kenneth Scott:

"...as creator beings when we agree to something contractually, we are bound to it. We have agreed to be bound to commercial paper known as negotiable instruments, which are securities that bind our life force and beings as the surety, guarantor and debt servicer...

The key is the power of contract; it is the most powerful force in this matter, because as a creator being, the paramount capacity we have is our ability to enter contract with another being. Thus, the law of contract was and is paramount. Everything that is in the world system is contractual and clearly defined. The essence of a contract is its choice of where it binds itself by mutual agreement of the parties to jurisdiction. Underlying the word "jurisdiction" is the definition "word of the law", but it is also the Word (Sound) of my Bond (Oath), "Juris" in Latin is both

“law” and “oath”. This is how we bring forward the essence of our being to bind ourselves to the artificial construct of legal fictions, to become bonded sureties for illusions of money and debt, and therefore are “lost at sea” and presumed dead.” (p.13)

https://www.academia.edu/7959281/Overview_of_the_World_System_of_Bondage_and_Separation_from_Life

Video: The Esoteric Approach to Exit the Matrix with Kenneth Scott
<https://youtu.be/qlMknuckvuw>

Video: Amanda Vollmer Interviews Ken Cousens of Gemstone University and Discusses Status Correction <https://youtu.be/i7SOYVidi5Q>

In truth, however, our *social contract* to be ruled by the King (monarchy, Crown Corporation) and the Priest (Vatican and commercial/cannon law, the Holy See/Sea) holds no weight in objective reality. Just because we were given a birth certificate, social security card, and legal fiction as our ticket to interact with the slavery system doesn't mean any of these documents hold any value in the objective sense. I can write gibberish on a piece of paper and say you are bound to that, but does that make it true?

What is real in objective reality? This is the philosophical question we should be asking.

Even if we adopt contract ideology and make the argument Scott and others make, no one has consciously agreed to the *social contract* that Hobbes and Rousseau so greatly cherished during the “Enlightenment” Era, as champions of the Collective State. But the social contract (to be ruled) is not and can never be a voluntary contract.

If our mother is somewhat responsible for the birth certificate, she cannot sign on behalf of the child. Furthermore, we are never given full transparency to all stipulations in the social contract and what it actually entails as to know what we are agreeing to, which is to be employees of the corporate state, monetized debt-slaves, and chattel property of the Crown from birth to death. Even if individuals desire to be these things, there is still an element of mind-control present as to have us view the contract in a false way. Where there is deception, there cannot be informed consent.

Besides being a contract of deception, which would void the contract even in contract ideology, it is not the actual contract that binds us, but the coercion and duress that it is backed by. Licensed doctors are required to submit a birth certificate for every birth under the threat of losing their license, and even if we have children without medical help, denying them a social security number will keep them dependent on others as they will not be able to drive, travel, work, deal with money, or own vehicles and homes. Living off-grid is no longer an option as the matrix has too much control, thus not having a birth certificate is more trouble than it's worth.

Behind coercion and duress is the monopoly of violence owned by the Global State and this is the manpower that backs all commercial and legal contracts through systematic force. We comply with the system as an act of self-defense, otherwise, we are fined, dragged through the courts, and imprisoned. We are under military conquest being subject to the jurisdiction of the occupying forces. Man's law is simply the language that justifies that oppression.

Therefore, it is false to believe that the control system has its power over us through the legitimacy of the social contract. It is only the power of militarized violence that immorally imposes its will that grants this power. There is no legitimacy in this even though it can be done.

What stands above contract ideology is real Law and the objective difference between right and wrong. Right and wrong transcends contracts. But contract believers claim that consent equates to validity, making all voluntary contracts valid.

However, even if a victimized party agrees to an immoral contract, that contract remains immoral. Consent can never transform something immoral into something moral, for such consent is only from ignorance. Choice does not supersede morality.

Even if I knew that I was signing my life away as a slave, and even if there was no monopoly behind it forcing me to do so, I could never make myself a slave by nature. I could never turn untruth into truth. You can never sign away your sovereignty because it is *what is*. You are an eternally sovereign being whether the state recognizes it or not.

We cannot bind ourselves to an evil system by way of our signatures, regardless of whether it was done under coercion or not. No amount of paperwork and legal jargon can eradicate objective truth and the true essence of ourselves and the world.

Also, the belief that our social contract has merit after death is rubbish. Scott alludes to a “soul harvest” performed by our dark overlords upon our death based on these contracts which brings us back here, trapping us in this plane. However, what binds us here is our level of consciousness, not man’s law as man’s law is not Natural Law and does not travel with us through reincarnation.

Man’s law is not about evolution but a materialistic religion designed to prevent evolution. Those who try to make its false axioms part of the larger evolutionary scheme of things are materialists too. Sorry, but you can’t take your materialist religion into the next life, or any other falsehood for that matter.

Some in the sovereignty movement take the idea of bonds and debts too literally, fooled by the illusions of materialism. We are bound to the system under the threat of violence and because of our belief systems, not because bonds and securities to our name have any validity.

People who try to elevate social contracts as having spiritual implications often have ulterior motives. They may position themselves as being able to help you rescind those contracts, as if it were some occulted magical information, turning it into a business or fostering some type of dependency.

All ties that bind must be removed; so ultimately rescinding those contractual agreements within the law of the contract is essential to be free. We leave the sea of the dead and walk onto the land of the living, where we have standing, status and capacity, where we are a king or queen as both sovereign and solvent. (From *Overview of World System*)

The truth of the matter is that you do not have to go through any process to void the social contract. No agreement makes it real, it is simply a delusion that some men have authority over you. All you need to know is the difference between truth and falsity and what a person has a right to do and what a person doesn’t have the right to do. And no person has the right to enslave another person. That is Natural Law.

Thus, to say that Natural Law binds us to contracts is false. This belief is built on the idea that sovereignty is simply free will choice, seeing law as based on free will. But Natural Law regards right choice not just any choice. If we make bad choices, we are NEVER bound to them, no matter our initial agreement.

When we make agreements with others, the virtues of integrity, honor, and being of our word exist, but that agreement has to be moral (and fair) in the first place. Just because you agree to something, doesn’t mean it is right to honor that agreement.

Any contract in which one party upholds a position of power over the other is not a fair contract, making it meaningless from the get-go. All contracts processed through man’s law will always be unfair, biased to serve the aristocracy.



Yet, even moral contracts cannot be turned into a rock-solid principle of morality. Even if a contract is just, the question of whether it is immoral or moral to break such a contract depends on the context of the situation. There can be legitimate circumstances for one party to lose his capacity to fulfill an agreement like a family member getting ill making him unable to pay back a loan. Sometimes we need to be compassionate and see our loss in an agreement as an act of charity, as helping another relinquish an obligation that is stifling him.

There will be cases when a person will break his word when he does have the capacity to fulfill his agreement. This could potentially harm the other person involved in some way. Even though the injured party may want retribution, revenge, and punishment towards those who break their word, all agreements have to be upheld with free will. This doesn't right the wrong action, it just doesn't give the injured party the right to seek compensation through the act of violence.

Ultimately, we cannot use violence to make people do the right thing. Thus, we have to try to find reasonable resolutions with others by adapting to new conditions, and this includes accepting injury for good or ill reasons.

A function of the legal system is to enforce justice in our contracts with others. The problem is that the instant you want to enforce contracts through the legal system is the instant you are asking for the legitimization of violence at a highly organized scale. That violence must be a monopoly, structured as a dominator-hierarchy, as without a unified force behind the legal system there could be no well functioning system.

People think the legal system protects rights, property, and business contracts because it does so in a very small way, so small it could almost be considered negligible to the entire output. The system plays the authority to end our disputes biased towards the wealthy party and those in positions of power while receiving money and soul-draining energy from all parties.

If you are wealthy and powerful enough to be able to sue people then you may get some justice, but at a high cost as you will be put through a demeaning process that could last many years and you empower the system of oppression in the process. In many cases, it isn't worth it and people are willing to pay hundreds of thousands of dollars to get out of the legal grind as it is so toxic for the soul. It is antithesis to the life force.

The legal system never stops people from harming others, it only profits from the aftermath.

An artificial system of justice can only become injustice.

The moment we construct a third party to settle our disputes is the moment we institutionalize authority. That authority can only become more corrupt over time, as it accrues vast amounts of power over the lives of every Earth inhabitant.

Just look at history; we have seen the "legalized" world take-over by the ecclesiastical papacy and its sanctums in the 1300s to rule the earth and own everyone (the Papal Bull), and then in the 1600s the Corporate (monopolized) State emerged (the Crown Corporation) in the City of London with the British East India Company colonizing the world in which the United States corporation became an extension of, as the base for international military power (Washington D.C.). This is why the US is always fighting foreign wars to get countries to comply with the United Nations. Then the US corporation became bankrupt in 1933 to further enforce admiralty "law" and make us dependent on our creditors, the Federal Reserve, IMF, and the World Bank.

This is what the seeming innocent desire for a third party to end our disputes can become: a mega-mono-lithic oligarchy of corrupt power with its tentacles in every industry and almost every aspect of our existence.

For this reason, it is very important to see how contract ideology, and the belief that contracts are necessary and binding as a law in themselves, feed into all this. Not only does it legitimize a satanic system, but it believes that we must have this system and that there is no other way. They hold onto the matrix in fear of the alternative to having our contracts enforced by an external authority, which is taking on risk in our interaction with others.

This is why the sovereignty movement is largely about reforming man's law. Take for example how Scott talks about status correction and becoming an estate with solvency to exit the sea (commercial law) and claim one's living body on the land (common law).

According to him, he has successfully become a living person in the House of Cousens, his ancestral genetic lineage, no longer bound to commercial law. He claims the FBI, Federal Reserve, SEC, and other high-profile government agencies have investigated his business and have not given

him any problems. This contrasts with his sovereignty friends who keep getting thrown in jail for not breaking the **legal** code.

What Scott and others don't realize is that, at any time, government institutions can turn against them for any reason. A relative system operates on the commands of the authority, superseding the upholding of contracts. The laws of contracts are altered and changed to fit the interests of the elites. That's why new sections, codes, and statutes can be made.

What makes Scott believe that those who have created our immoral contract at birth (eradicating our sovereignty) will suddenly act morally just because right now what he is doing with his paperwork is not threatening to them. The matrix likes to co-opt the half-enlightened by allowing them to pursue their projects freely until they become a threat. But most in the sovereignty movement ideologically serve the system and so pose no threat. Moreover, the system likes to gather all data on anomalies of the matrix (including bright pioneering individuals like Scott) for predictive programming and the Artificial Intelligence system. So, Scott isn't being unharmed by the authorities out of any ethical obligation towards contract law but for other purposes.

Contracts do not replace ethics and the authority of the system is not subject to any ethical conduct. Man's law means that some men create laws, but those men are ALWAYS excluded from the laws they create. There is no third party insurance without this double standard and power differential.

The individuals behind the curtain can make any changes to contractual agreements for any reason. Their authority is the substitute for reason.

Ultimately, the attempt to prove man's life within man's law is futile, even if some loopholes are found. If man's law can suppress the truth of man's sovereign nature and metaphorically remove him from our sacred life force through its proxy court rituals and legal constructs, then its ability to free man from this is moot. By virtue of the fact that man's law has the capacity to be evil, should be enough to de-legitimize it, let alone its reign of terror throughout millennia.



People adhere to contract ideology because they would rather have the security of the future than freedom in the moment. They would rather have insurance than no insurance at the expense of their freedom. We have to look at what we are getting from the system to become free from it.

We have to understand that the system is not only about money, property, and enslavement but an insurance system. We want contracts (whether that be business or property) because we want to ensure the people we deal with will follow through on their agreements and that our property won't be taken from us.

When we leave our property, we want some insurance and some type of recourse against theft and squatting. We want the police force to help us get justice when we have been wronged by another and the legal system to enforce our rights to our property.

Yet, this third party insurance system can only become a control system managed through bureaucracy and accounting. The police force that we think can help us achieve justice ends up enabling the crimes of the state that lead to collective poverty and genocide. All governments turn on their people. So no matter what little justices were gained from the system, the cost of collective evils is never worth it.

We can't have our cake and eat it too. We can't live in a world of free will and then also enforce contracts with authoritarianism. The only way to enforce contracts is through violence to the claims of jurisdiction, and under any empire, the jurisdiction we eventually fall under becomes that of the global police state. (The nature of empire is to become global.)

We have to start to understand security and morality in a larger context and in a more holistic way. The tradeoff of protections granted by the state for freedom is never worth it.

The two main reasons even free-minded people still support man's law is to deal with very offensive crimes and to manage the risk in our contracts with others. Putting the former aside for another time as there are ways to deal with criminals without the matrix, people lack the ability to embrace risk.

How many people in the freedom movement claim they are ready to be anarchists and would embrace the risk of not having titles and insurances on anything or legal backing to business contracts?

Can we assume the risk for the agreements we make with others or the risks of unintentional harm from others rather than siphon the risk to a third party?

We have to understand that money is a contract as well. Every dollar in circulation is a contract to pay back a loan since money is created as debt. While we think that banks exist to assume the risk for their loans, in reality money comes from nothing and is ensured by the state. The government guarantees the value of money since intrinsically it is nothing (no longer the paper it is written on). There cannot be a monetary system without government backing as money is a contract of value (in reality debt) and not actual value. In this way, money can be seen as a government contract.

One may claim that car insurance in a free world could exist without government, but car insurance operates through the contracts of property and money. Even though no one truly owns property and is just a "trustee" (registered user), he still is offered some protection for it. The insurance company guarantees the value of the car with money, which is a contract with the state.

This means that in order to transcend man's law we have to deconstruct our ideas about money and property rights to see them in a whole new way. While that is not the scope of this article, it is part of coming into a Natural Law worldview.

We have to understand that this is an interconnected system, or it doesn't work. It is its integration that makes it so poisonous to humanity. (In some ways, the control system can be seen as the negative form of holistic, being so unified. This is why most people cannot see it because they don't have holistic consciousness.)



People talk about sovereignty, but they don't know what it means to be truly sovereign. This means that we cannot have mommy and daddy government resolve our disputes with others and that in some cases, we have to accept injustice when we can't work things out.

How would we perceive agreements without contractual ideology? We would understand that agreements aren't end all be all and that Natural Law transcends them. We would seek to apply common sense as to discover and choose what is right to do.

As human beings, we are not meant to be constrained to written documents detailing all of our arrangements with others coming from the fear of risk. If that even feels necessary, it is most likely not a relationship to get involved with. This should simply be clear and open communication with others in the spirit of self-evident reason and morality.

It is better to have very few or no long-term commitments or agreements with people, and in such a circumstance to be highly selective. The one long-term commitment that should be preserved is marriage, which shouldn't be seen as a business contract but as a daily oath to the living love that is present. Yet, under certain circumstances it may be necessary to get a divorce. We should not use our commitments to trap us into situations that are unhealthy even though we should give our best effort to make things work. People change, life conditions change, and so to will agreements change.

It is this living reality that contract law attempts to destroy by turning the constantly changing world into a static rigid structure (the black box) where we seek security and protection. Seeing our agreements as contracts is already coming from the wrong angle as it removes the true living value of the living connection by seeing humans as static machine-like constructs.

When you go to work, you are making the agreement to be there but not indefinitely and maybe not tomorrow as you could quit. As human beings, we require the freedom to change course.

While being honorable and of our word is a virtue and we should attempt to only make agreements we can keep, it still doesn't make upholding up agreements always right as certain circumstances permit. To hold on to your word when it is no longer right is to be self-destructively stubborn. You may embark on a business venture with someone who turns out to be raging mad.

Understand that by making agreements you are assuming the risk that the other may not be able

to uphold his end of the deal. While you are not responsible for another's actions, you are responsible for the risk you take when working with them. Don't lend money that you can't afford to lose. Accept your losses from the start to prepare yourself for that outcome.

Sometimes one will break an agreement for a good reason and sometimes not. Right and wrong exist in our interrelations, but morality isn't contingent on the contract itself.

When others do us harm, that's on them, even though we may pay for it. Could that not be our karma playing out? Sometimes losses reveal to us that our ideas and/or intentions weren't right in the first place and that some inner corrections need to take place, regarding the ego and shadow. Or maybe such a loss is just a valuable lesson for us to learn something about ourselves and the world?

We may feel owed, but life will always balance itself out. We may find an unfair situation leads us to greater things. We should not see hardships and losses in life as simply negative, as there can be a deeper purpose behind them. Sometimes loss prepares us for the new and with hindsight, it can all make sense. With the law of rhythm, the lows we sail will be met with the highs; nothing remains static.

Knowledge and wisdom is the value we can extract from negative situations with others.

Be discerning about whom you make agreements with. Sometimes we get screwed over because we lack social discernment and were blind to the dark side of others. Sovereignty is about learning self-defense from the dark side of others. While we can never protect ourselves fully, we can become more discerning in who and what we get involved with.

While we can reflect on how our own karma intersected a negative situation, but we cannot always understand cause-and-effect in the microcosm. This is because the larger picture of individuals involves many lifetimes; there are too many levels of cause and effect within people and between people, and we are not omniscient. We have to accept that our finite minds cannot make rational sense out of everything that happens, while simultaneously understanding that all happens according to Law.

We cannot see the future and reason for all things, but by accepting the results of our interactions with others, not condoning wrongs done to us, we can start to evolve out of contractual ideology that holds back the human species.

Ultimately, we must have trust in cosmic justice and even see injustices in that context. Certain injustices like that of a serial killer require physical restraint and containment, but many of the smaller harms we discuss here (breaking agreements) do not warrant physical combat.

It is the understanding that all acts will be karmically balanced in the bigger picture that can allow us to move forward without being the enforcer of justice. Even if a serial killer gets away, he cannot escape his fate.



What is really toxic to the contracts of man's law is how they bind us to artificial time with the dates of bureaucracy that lower our vibration to even think about.

The contracts of man's law attempt to capture life, organic movement, and spontaneous growth through reductionistic symbols to structure it in a way that does not follow natural time, destroying the novelty of emergence. The experience of life should be through holistic time and the flexible, expansive of consciousness. Part of natural law living is getting in touch with right timing that has to do with consciousness and correct perception of reality, more than dates on a calendar. But the control system wants to structure time and energy in an artificial and robotic way that goes against evolution.

This desire to over-plan and control many aspects of life and our interactions with others is an attempt to organize what cannot be organized. We see this in the business paradigm as the manifestation of fear and control. With this wrong approach, however, we end up enslaving ourselves! We remove the beauty and serendipitous aspects of reality.

Now... it would not be possible to start tomorrow a world without legal insurances because the consciousness of the world is too low. It is actually too risky as most people's morality is tied to man's law and 99% of the population are moral relativists. The control system is the corresponding collective manifestation of the immoral consciousness of the individual in the aggregate. In other words, where immoral consciousness in the aggregate exists there will be a control system as a function of Natural Law. (Man's law exists in the context of Natural Law.)

This is why government could never be removed in a day, it has to be evolved out of. The human species has to get to a level where most individuals understand objective morality (as directly perceived and as a principle), understand the illusion and immorality of authority and dogmas, and accept risk in exchange for freedom, as well as transcend their fear of death and chaos.

Only an evolved species can live in sovereignty under Natural Law. This is how we would be able to take on the risks with each other because morality would be commonly known by the aggregate.

Until then, all we can do in the meantime is educate people as no action in the matrix can end the matrix.

In closing, you can never be understood as sovereign under man's law and legal fiction. Even if you play by their rules, at any time those rules can change as they are the arbitrations of the highest (unethical) authority, those behind the British monarchy and Roman Catholic Church. Any validation of man's law validates the authority behind it.

Going all the way with truth means understanding that even the contract aspect of man's law is in fact fiction. We make agreements with other people, but those agreements only exist between the individuals involved and the morality of the agreements depends on context. We cannot have a third party insure those agreements without giving up our freedom to a system that will, eventually and incrementally, turn against us.

In short: contract ideology is a belief system that binds us to the matrix in mind and spirit. Transcending the matrix means transcending the old religion of man's law. Freedom cannot be found in man's law. Our consciousness must become free from the matrix before we can ever be physically free. The military forces that hold us under duress would have no power if most of the people in the world understood Natural Law.

Being sovereign means we must become adults and accept consequences for our actions and the risks we take on with others (which is our choice), rather than believing a contract can remove risk and provide insurance. We aren't entitled to have an external organization handle our disputes.

Our belief in such entitlement has left us only with empty titles and no real ownership anyways—as we don't even own our bodies under man's law. Man's law is about enslaving our bodies, stealing our property, and then giving us the privilege to use it as long as we labor on the plantation. In the end, private property must be backed by nothing other than morality, understanding rights, human needs, and common sense... and there is a lot of evolution that needs to take place before that can happen.

Evolution in consciousness is the only answer. But this answer won't bring in much income to those who try to sell it. This is why we have to look into the agendas of those in the sovereignty movement who act as if they found the keys to exit the matrix and claim they can beat the machine with the machine's own codes. While those like Kenneth Scott can provide excellent education, what is joining their community really about? Where does it really lead?

There is nothing wrong with the goal of friendship in these communities, but the participants need to accept that when they start to crack the code of their leader's cul-de-sac and share it with others, they most likely will not be welcomed. To see the truth, one will no longer stand under the mission statement that man's law is the key to enlightenment. That philosophical difference is a deal-breaker for those on the path of truth.

To Initiates, those who lack philosophical understanding of the nature of reality can never have the right intention or agenda. In the world of business, spiritual cul-de-sacs are profitable, whereas the Great Work is not. Communities are usually erected to bring in resources to those who steer them while acting as if they contain egalitarian value. Their activities don't lead to any real freedom, but ultimately empower the financial and social standing of its leaders. Followers in such communities may find themselves on an endless treasure hunt to find that legal construct that will level the playing field. But no such treasure exists because a rigged game can never be made fair. Justice, morality, and fairness require us to stop playing the game (first in our minds).

Be an educator, but don't sell false promises and cul-de-sacs. Don't be an opportunist looking to exploit other people's ignorance and fear for your own selfish gain.

One last thing on the topic of spiritual debts... What are debts in the spiritual sense, but simply the movement of individual evolution. Natural Laws apply to the Individual: mentalism, correspondence, polarity, vibration, rhythm, causality, and gender.

There is polarity to every thought, feeling, and action and there is consequence. Right-mind, right-intention, and right action lead to evolution, while their opposites do not. We reap what we sow; what we give, we receive. If we are unjust to someone, it will come back to us. The universe can be a reflection.

Through the evolutionary journey, the imbalances in our hearts and minds must be balanced. Lower vibration must become higher vibration. Our past trauma must be healed. Our dark side and shadow must be confronted and transmuted.

While we can never know when and how karma will unfold, we know that the universe is always

moving towards equilibrium—but this is greater than simply settling debts as it involves miraculous transformations into greater levels of spiritual being.

Our errors, sins, and wrongdoings should not be seen as “debt” in the materialistic sense but as lessons that make way for evolution. While we should feel bad for our sins enough to change, we shouldn’t punish ourselves unnecessarily.

The debt-based control system is about making man loath himself as to identify with his sin as a static and permanent state. As long as he sees his life as a debt to pay off, he will accept his slavery. The control system is about getting us to believe we have obligations we really don’t have. We have no obligation to the state or its systems of money and commerce, we comply because we are being held under duress.

The mind-control is all about making us feel indebted as to put us in lower vibration of shame and guilt, but we don’t owe the system anything, and to heal we must recognize that we come from love, that our Origin is the Infinite.

It is important to see how Roman law and Catholicism are some of the roots of this mind-control. By seeing man as indebted to God, as a sinful creature that can only find salvation through obedience, requiring punishment for disobedience, we then see ourselves as lowly creatures indebted to the state that appears to us almost as powerful as God. We obey the state as if it were God and believe that obedience is enough to make us feel better about ourselves. Our self-worth gets entangled in how well we obey the rules and avoid being punished. We want to reform man’s law because we are still obedient to it, we are still enslaved by it, disconnected from the All. We want a piece of paper to validate our sovereignty because we are still punishing ourselves unnecessarily.

So powerful is the state in fact, that even bright individuals who see its diabolical nature continue to empower it through their beliefs in its legitimacy. Church and State can never really be separated as statism is a religion. This is why the spiritual end for contract ideology is to carry the lie that we are indebted to the social contract into the afterlife. It is a poisoned worldview that has accepted the indoctrination of the elites as Spiritual Truth.

We must rise above the social conditioning to see our true nature and the true nature of the world. Spiritual Truth exposes man’s law for what it is. And the path to freedom is first freeing our minds from its falsehoods. Upon this achievement in the aggregate, the control system would lose its physical dominance.

Natural Law	Man’s law
Based Upon Principles & Truth (Inherent To Creation)	Based Upon Dogmatic Beliefs (Constructs Of Mind)
Harmonized with, due to Knowledge & Understanding	Complied with, due to Fear of Punishment
Universal; exists and applies anywhere in the Universe regardless of location	Differs with location based upon the whim of legislators (Moral Relativism)
Eternal and Immutable; exists and applies for as long as the Universe exists, and cannot be changed	Changes with time based upon the whim of legislators (Moral Relativism)

Image courtesy of <https://whatonearthishappening.com>

