

26+ Reasons to Not Trust the Police

By Rev. Goodwill, revised 2023.v2.3

The police aren't making too many friends these days. It seems like there isn't a day that goes by where some tragic and outrageous story comes out involving the cops and somehow violating somebody's rights, or even killing them. But, no matter how much we see this behavior, no matter how frequent it becomes, there seems to be an army of ignorant, dependent, terrified people who will jump in to defend the police from any criticism, because, you know, they are heroes.... Next time you encounter somebody like that, show them this article, and if they still dismiss it, just move on, there are plenty of people with eyes to see and ears to hear if you aren't wasting your time with the willfully apathetic.

But first off, I want to give a shout out to all of the alternative media outlets that tirelessly cover issues of police abuse, and show us just how common these violations are:

[Filming Cops](#)
[Cop Block](#)
[The Anti-Media](#)
[RICO Busters](#)



Now, just why should we be skeptical of the police? Well where does even one begin....

1. The Police Have No Duty To Protect You

It's plastered right on the side of many police cruisers: "To Protect And to Serve", but this serves as little more than a PR slogan for the public to feel more comfortable and trusting of the police. In 2005 the Supreme Court ruled in a case titled [Warren Vs the District of Columbia](#) it was ruled that police do not have a constitutional duty to protect, all the way to and including against a women who has a protection from abuse order from a husband and is being attacked by said husband. Being stalked? No duty to protect. Locked away somewhere by an attacker. No duty to protect. Being raped? Well, you get the point, unfortunately. The court went as far as to say "[t]he duty to provide public services is owed to the public at large, and, absent a special relationship between the police and an individual, no specific legal duty exists." Supporters of this verdict will tell you that it is because individuals are expected to protect themselves and their loved ones, which is true, but many states such as New York, and New Jersey get in the way of that with their draconian gun laws, effectively making them reliant on police, who then have no duty to oblige. *To Serve and Protect* has [no legal support](#) and is nothing more than a company motto.

2. Private Prisons Have "Lockup Quotas"

In 2011, [Management & Training Corp threatened to sue the state of Arizona](#) over a line in the contract between the two that required that the prison remain 97% full. The lawsuit threat was spurred after 3 murder convicts escaped from the prison, and the state found the prison to be "dysfunctional" and thus stopped sending inmates to the facility. The state caved and paid 3 Million dollars in tax payer dollars to a prison that let 3 murderers escape from their facility to cover the losses created by the diverted prisoner population. This notion of "lockup quotas" or "guaranteed occupancy rates" has actually found to be a [common practice](#) after analyzing over 60 contracts between states and prisons, with some Arizona prisons having an expectation of 100% occupancy!

This could help to explain why even though [crime is consistently falling over the past 20 years](#), the U.S continues to remain in the [Top 10](#) countries (There are 195 countries in the world as of 2023.) for imprisoning citizens (nearly double that of Russia) as lawmakers look to write laws to appease prison contracts instead of serving the people. There are [more prisons than schools](#) in this country. Think about that for a second.



The for-profit prison industry/Institutions in the United States is growing at a time when the inmate population is declining. Critics argue that corporate-run prisons pose more safety problems than public ones, saying the companies hire fewer guards and cut costs to make money. Lawsuits by inmates and civil rights groups allege that cost-cutting is leading to dangerous prison conditions and poor medical care. But the industry and its supporters say private prisons are as safe as government-run facilities and that privatization helps governments avoid overcrowding and save money. The Obama administration in 2016 began phasing out private federal prisons, but President Trump reversed course a year later. Meanwhile, companies are playing a greater role in the detention of undocumented immigrants, drawing criticism from civil rights groups and some communities where private detention facilities are located. Immigrant-rights groups say the prison industry is encouraging the Trump administration's crackdown on illegal immigration — a charge the companies deny. All of this, no matter the side, is carried out by the Police.



3. Police Profit From Enforcing the War On Drugs

Did you know that when the police arrest somebody for a drug charge, even marijuana, they actually earn money? Yup, for any low level arrest, a department can make **\$153 per arrest in federal grants, called Byrne Grants**. This totally changes the incentives for what police work is. When you combine this, with the fact that drugs are widely available, hugely demanded, very profitable, and in some states, marijuana is becoming legal, the fact that there are lockup quotas, this makes the average citizen a fish to be baited into the system for profit, more than a master that is to be served, as all government is supposed to be. Then there is asset forfeiture, another **very profitable revenue stream**. This is where alleged drug dealers have their property stolen under the suspicion that they got that property from nasty drug money. It's literally legal theft. It's such an unsustainable method of revenue generation that many departments have a blanket opposition to legalized marijuana, despite its **overwhelming medical potential** in addition to the moral hazard of assuming what control over what people can do with their own bodies, that departments **have even expressed** that the stability of their budgets is dependent on this insane practice.

4. SWAT Teams Are Corporations, And Are Used VERY Commonly

In a [2014 report](#) on police militarization, the ACLU was effectively told by SWAT agencies, that they are private corporations, and thus are not subject to open records requests, and generally not obligated to answer to the public. The report went on to find that SWAT is overseen by LECs or Law Enforcement Councils made up of police chiefs in the surrounding area, and funded by these same departments. Somehow, even though it's a police agency made up of police departments and police officers, these LECs were able to incorporate into 501(c)(3) status, granting them corporate privacy. In Massachusetts alone 240 of the existing 351 departments belong to these LECs, effectively creating a blanket of secrecy over SWAT and its operations. Similar problems exist with [informants](#).

This is met with a [dramatic rise](#) in the use of SWAT teams over the past 25 years. It is commonly thought that SWAT is used for hostage crises and other extreme situations, but more often than not, they are used for suspected drug raids. And as we have seen, they often [get it tragically wrong](#). The methods used for a lot of these drug raids are [overwhelmingly forceful](#) using no knock, forced entry, flash grenades, and other excessive shows of force, even for [\\$2 worth of marijuana](#). Some studies have shown that SWAT teams are called out as much as [40,000 Times a year](#).

5. Police Can, And Do, Lie To The Public

The [police can legally lie](#) to you and they receive training to lie! Many people think that as “authority figures” that police have an obligation to be honest, but [that is untrue](#). The most common example of this is undercover police telling suspects that they are not undercover. But this extends quite a bit. Police commonly use [intimidation tactics](#) in order to scare or trick you into giving up your rights to privacy and not to incriminate yourself. They can tell you that a witness has seen you that hasn't, that a confession was made that never was, that you are legally obligated to do things that you aren't, like submit to searches. The most effective defense is knowledge, courage, and a camera. Additionally, police are [trained to commit perjury](#) (lying on the stand in court while under oath).



The [C.A.T.O. Institute](#) reports over 75% of police interviewed admitted that they lie, and the law-enforcement community itself has embraced deceit as a legitimate investigative tool.



The [Jack Rice law firm](#) specializes in going after these lying criminals pretending to be law enforcement.

6. The Police Kill Far More People Then Commonly Thought

The FBI reports that in 2013 police killed 431 people, with an average of about 400 people killed per year since 2008. As of 2023, those numbers have [skyrocketed](#) (in part due to increased police corruption and in part due to more of that corruption being reported).

It has been found that the FBI reports are inaccurate. First of all, these numbers are based on what are considered to be “justified homicides”. That's right; the FBI is not interested in telling you about police *murders*, just police *homicides*. If that wasn't bad enough, the data given to the FBI is turned in on a voluntary basis. In other words, if a police department like, oh I don't know, the [Albuquerque police department](#) decides that such disclosure is bad for business, then they can keep the information to themselves. On the flip side of this, several independent efforts, such as [Fatal Encounters](#), [Deadspin](#), and my personal favorite because of its simplicity, [Statista](#) have taken a crack at getting the real number, and with legitimate sourcing, have come up with over 1000 people killed annually since 2013.

To put this in perspective, you are [8 times more likely to be killed by police than by terrorists](#), with police having [killed more Americans than the war on terror](#).

7. Police Officers Are Not In The Top 10 Most Dangerous Jobs

Many people will claim that the police are selfless heroes who put their life on the line on a regular basis for your safety. Much like the PR slogan of “protect and serve”, this is another inaccurate factoid that serves to suppress criticism of police officers. [Data from the bureau of labor statistics](#) shows that being a construction worker, roofer, or truck driver are much more dangerous than being police officers. In fact, you are statistically [safer as a cop](#) than as a civilian. This is in stark contrast to the perilous dangers that firefighters encounter every day. Firefighters are nearly [300% more likely to die](#) in the line of duty and they don't whine about it like police do.

8. Police Kill A Lot of People's Pets

While it is unclear exactly how often it happens due to a lack of data, through the use of cell phone video's and the alternative reporting, we are getting a glimpse of how often police kill man's best friend. The [USDOJ Bureau of Statistics](#) has released an updated 2018 report on police killing pets. This government report claims that police kill more than 10,000 dogs alone annually.

9. Police Will Share Private Photographs With Each Other For Amusement

Officer Sean Harrington of the California Highway Patrol was arrested after DUI suspect that he had arrested alleged that he had [gone through her phone without her permission](#), and then proceeded to send himself nude photos of her. After a search warrant was served, it was found that Harrington was not alone in this behavior, and several other officers were identified who not only admitted to doing this multiple times, but called it part of “a game”. Later evidence showed several police commenting on the photos with each other. Harrington, an Dublin, CA officer, claimed to have learned this “game” from LA, and that it was a common thing among police officers. It's anybody's guess how many police officers can figure out they can victimize women like this across the country.

In Sheboygan, WI, no less than [10 cops were found guilty](#) of sexually harassing a woman in 2023. She too was a police officer!

10. Police Can Enforce Laws They Don't Know

2015 Started off with another blow to freedom, as the Supreme Court, in [Heien Vs. North Carolina](#) ruled [A police officer can stop a car based on a mistaken understanding of the law without violating the Fourth Amendment](#). This arose after a man was found with cocaine in his car following a search, based on a stop where the suspect had a tail light out. Only problem is, no law exists making that a crime, or a reason to get a search. The officer was mistaken, which lead to the defendant motioning to dismiss the cocaine as evidence as it was the result of an illegal search. The Supreme Court sided with the officer. This creates a double standard in the application of law. If you or I are guilty of a crime that we legitimately did not know we have committed, ignorance of the law is no excuse and we have our lives torn apart. A police officer does it, and it's “valid” and your life is still ripped apart.

11. Police Have Technology That Greatly Infringes Our Right To Privacy

Everybody knows that the TSA has been data mining us through our phones, and our computers for years now. But it's not just the TSA that is collecting data, but maybe even your own local police department. Many police departments are making use of devices such as, [Range-R](#), [Stingray](#), [Fog facial recognition](#) and more, without a warrant to track people's cell phones for anything that might lead to a drug bust. LAPD has even used the technology on non-suspected neighbors of suspects in search of info! And of course, this has all been found to somehow be constitutional according to the Supreme Court of Arizona. In 2018, that decision was [overturned](#) as a 4th Amendment violation. Still, that means for nearly 6 years these acts of treason were permitted and carried out by so-called officers of the law

Some Police Departments, such as NYPD have taken to use TSA like [Naked body scanner technology](#) to scan people and their cars in search of guns in New York, where guns are unconstitutionally illegal. Not only do these scanners present a serious threat to every person's right to privacy, but also [a serious health threat](#).

In addition to this, [A RAND Corporation](#) study has found that 70% of police departments use license plate scanners. These are scanners that scan your license plate information, allowing full access to it for the officer, usually without knowledge, consent, warrant, or even a traffic violation.

Many of these departments work hand in hand with fusion centers, with the federal government via the Department Of Homeland Security being able to take over local departments, so any information that a police department has is liable to end up in the hands of the federal government as well.

12. Police Will Potentially Kill For Even The Most Minute Laws

All police encounters are potentially deadly. As the national news has shown to the whole country, the police will escalate any situation to maintain control and dominance. If it came down to it, they would [kill you for a seatbelt violation](#) if you don't comply with them how they want you to. Any law, ordinance, or statute is essentially a death threat to disobedience. If you get a ticket, they demand money at gun point, you don't pay, you get a warrant and they will come to put you in a cage, you resist the cage and they will hurt or kill you. That is how it works. ALL laws are enforced at gun point, and there are [so many laws](#) that you can be put in the cross hairs at any given moment and not even know it.

13. Police Unions Keep Violent Police On The Street

It doesn't happen often, but sometimes you see a story where a cop is overtly abusive, obviously in the wrong, and definitely undeserving of a badge, and that cop is fired. And to many people, justice is served and that is the end, but in many cases, it isn't. The Atlantic has [compiled a list of examples](#) of how police unions will go to bat for people who have been investigated by internal affairs and fired, and get them their job back or get their punishment reduced. This list is just the tip of the iceberg. Unions are known for protecting and shielding police from criticism, no matter how outrageous they behave.

14. The Police Have Their Own Secret Society Called The Fraternal Order of Police

Like its name suggests, the FOP is a fraternal organization that has hundreds of thousands of members who meet up only with each other, in private, in thousands of lodges across the country. It's cops meeting with other cops to figure out how to push forward their interests. The FOP [lobbies a good bit of money](#) to their friends who then cover their backs in the police unions. The FOP gets involved in a lot of reactionary measures, such as [Security](#) and [fundraising](#) for Darren Wilson, even as the case publicly became little more than a sad joke to usher in the inevitable judgment. Now they are [Calling for 'Waze' to be disabled](#), even though the app and the technology are an extension of free speech.

15. They Can Discriminate Against New Hires On The Basis of Too High Of An IQ

In September of 2000, The 2nd U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals upheld a decision that was being contested by Robert Jordan, an aspiring NYPD officer. He scored 33 points on his police exam, which corresponds to an IQ of about 125, but NYPD was only interested in hiring people that scored around the 22 point area, corresponding to about a 104 IQ. That's right, NYPD is NOT interested in hiring the best man for the job. They claimed that this score mean that Robert would get bored with the job. The Police have refused to hire [smart people](#) and the superior courts [continue](#) to uphold this practice.

But let's be honest here, this has little to do with Robert "being bored". The court even admitted that it was an unwise procedure. No this is more about making sure that free thinking people, people who might question orders, who might morally oppose enforcing certain laws, people who might expose corruption, or blow the whistle on police abuse, or any other crossing of the thin blue line, are kept out of police work.

16. Even Small, Local Police Departments Have Received Military Equipment

It is no secret that police departments across the country have received a [frightening amount of military equipment](#). Fully automatic rifles, anti-mine tanks, grenade launchers, you name it, many police departments have it. What is not quite as well known is just how wide spread this has become. Very, very small police departments [all over the country](#).

17. Cops Are Going Out Of Their Way To Hire Returning Veterans

Now this can get touchy, as it is well known that veterans have a [high unemployment rate](#). That being said, I think the argument can be made that in many cases the role of a combat veteran is only appropriate for police work if the police have become seriously militarized, and that the role of the police has switched from protect to serve to something more closely resembling that of a military platoon. [Posse Comitatus](#) strictly forbids the military from being used as a police force (but of course, it has [been violated](#)). The reason for this is that having a standing army in your own country enforcing laws with the kind of firepower that the military has is by definition a military occupation, which I would argue the police have become. NYPD has already proclaimed to be able to [shoot down a plane](#), for example.

The Justice Department is [offering "COPS grants"](#) to police departments that hire veterans, and where incentives are, people follow.

Another troubling aspect of this is that many veterans suffer from PTSD, (which, by the way, the federal government [could massively reduce](#) by repealing federal drug laws.). It is hard to know just how many of them actually have PTSD. Many have chosen to hide their symptoms from the VA because in a lot of cases PTSD is being used to [take away the gun rights of veterans](#). On top of that, police are required to do [extra psych evaluations](#) to tackle PTSD if there is a history of it in the applicant, but if the applicant has never reported it, there is "nothing to worry about" from the hiring department's point of view. Between the grants incentivizing veterans towards police work, the number of homeless vets there are, and how many who are more in need of help than a new war zone on the homeland, and it's not hard to imagine that there are at least some combat veteran police officers who should not be in that job.

18. Police Have Little To No Real Accountability

Who arrests the cops? Other cops, after an internal investigation turns up wrong doing first, of course. So, after the police investigate themselves, guess how often they find themselves to be in the wrong? Not very often at all. Grand Juries vote to indict the defendants [almost every time](#). But if the defendant is a police officer, it magically becomes [very difficult](#) to indict them.

In the event that cops do have body cameras, they simply can [Turn them off](#). As we saw with Eric Garner, and I know from [personal experience](#), that cops will lie under oath, conveniently "lose" evidence, fabricate charges, lose their footage and the list goes on and on of all the tricks they can and will pull to keep you down. In 2 cases, both for summary offense violations, I had 2 separate lawyers tell me, essentially that I am innocent, and I have a great case, but that its the police and there just isn't hope. Cops word is automatically taken as truth in court, putting the defendant in a position where they must prove their innocence, turning the justice system on its head.

19. Police Officers have High Rates Of Alcohol/Drug Abuse and Domestic Violence

Some studies show that -

- [A quarter of all police officers are active alcoholics](#);
- [Another 20-25% are actively abusing drugs](#) (That is double the national average!);
- Another disturbing statistic is that [nearly 50% of officers have abused their wives!](#)
- Without knowing how those statistics cross, [we have to assume](#) that it's close to a certainty that when you are pulled over you are dealing with somebody who is **not mentally balanced**.

20. Many Police Departments Have A Culture Of Racism

This is something that the black community has, for good reason, been screaming about for decades. The subject reached a bit of a head last year with Michael Brown, Tamir Rice, and Eric Garner all morally unjustifiably being killed by the police. Statistics show that [you are more likely to get arrested](#) as a black drug dealer than a white one, even though there are more white drug dealers. They are more likely to be arrested for Marijuana Related Charges, they are for more likely to be subject to [Stop and frisk](#), which are essentially random, and warrantless searches. With 25% of black males entering the justice system, they are way more likely to be arrested by police. Former police officers have [gotten on the record](#) about just how racist and sexist many of their coworkers were.

21. Cops Have No Mercy For The Homeless

The country is in economic doldrums that the government would like to have you believe have been on an upswing, but sadly [it's getting worse](#). There are [over 600,000](#) homeless at any given moment, and economic trends ensure that that will probably rise. Starting with the Occupy raids in 2011, there has been a trend of police raiding homeless encampments and displacing already displaced people. [In Some cases](#) they run blanket background checks on all of the residents of a homeless shelter. [Other times](#) they just force the people out, or even [shoot them](#). Such murdering of the homeless has been occurring for years and continues as of this revision in 2023. [Many places](#), 48 States as of 2023, have gone back to enforcing [vagrancy laws](#).

22. Some Police Departments Do Weapons Training With Targets Depicting Pregnant Woman, Children, And The Elderly

It's truly chilling, and bizarre, but [it's true](#). The targets were made by a company called ["Law Enforcement Targets Inc"](#), all targets include whoever imaged, whether it be a pregnant woman, or a child, with a gun pointing back at them. This line of targets is called the "Zero Hesitation" series, what hesitation is looking to be eliminated, I'm sure you can figure out just by looking at the images. With over [\\$5.5 million](#) worth of targets sold, at 99 cents apiece, it's safe to say they have been spread to police shooting ranges all over the country. Although recent years have seen less money awarded, the Police still have all they purchased with those millions. Too, they do not have to be concerned with such investors with traitors such as [Joe Biden giving the Police \\$35 Billion](#).

23. They Will Plant Evidence On People

The [Walter Scott video](#) served as a major wake up call to people all over the country to the corruption of the police force. Not only was Michael Slager found to be lying when he said that he "feared for his life" from the fleeing Walter Scott, who he shot in the back, but the video also showed Slager planting a taser in order to "prove" that there was a threat when there wasn't. To make matters worse, the senior officers assured him that he would have days before he would be asked any questions about the shooting, assuring him that he could come up with any story he needed to. The department also backed his story that Scott had fought with him and brought the shooting on himself, before the video came out and put egg on the entire department's face.

Unfortunately, this does not appear to be an isolated incident of an officer planting evidence and framing his victim to take the fall. On [a segment](#) on "Fox and Friends", for District Attorney Arthur Aidala, who has been on Fox news many times as an expert analyst on legal matters, said in no uncertain terms that over the course of 30 years that **planting evidence on somebody that was killed by police was a common occurrence**, saying:

*When I was in the DA's office in the 80s and 90s, that was **standard operating procedure**. Police officers — I hate to say this — would keep a second gun that nobody knew about on their ankle, so if they ever killed someone they shouldn't have they would take that gun out.*

I'm talking about dirty cops in the 70s and 80s.

As a DA, he must have sided with such cops many, many times over the course of his career to have this information.

It doesn't stop at the 90's though. A former Philadelphia cop, Jeffrey Walker, who was on trial for a year's worth of embezzlement, false arrest's, false charges, and corruption, had testified against his fellow officer's in order to avoid a life sentence. Yes, a cop on trial for life and it wasn't murder, the level of corruption was THAT bad and sustained for THAT long. He went on to detail how they would target "White males, college boys, wearing khaki pants, easy to intimidate", sometimes even holding victims over balconies, to extort money and drugs from them. He once carried a safe full of drug money down 17 flights of steps to avoid the cameras on the elevator. He was just one member of an inner circle Mafioso within the Philadelphia Police Department.

Also, [another video](#) surfaced of a police officer planting drugs inside a man's car after that man had been brutally beaten and choked. His "crime" was running a stop sign.

A simple [YouTube](#) search yields a frightening number of results.

24. They Have Ready Made Stories Designed To Clear Them Of Wrong Doing

This is another area where the [Walter Scott case](#) destroyed the facade of the police as honest and trustworthy. In the time immediately after, the police backed Michael Slager's story without question. It wasn't until the video surfaced that the entire situation was found to be full of holes and lies.

Peter Keane, a former San Francisco Police commissioner, in an article for the San Francisco Chronicle, titled [Why Cops Lie](#), wrote:

"Police officer perjury in court to justify illegal dope searches is commonplace. One of the dirty little not-so-secret secrets of the criminal justice system are undercover narcotics officers intentionally lying under oath. It is a perversion of the American justice system that strikes directly at the rule of law. Yet it is the routine way of doing business in courtrooms everywhere in America."

He goes on tie the culture of lying within police departments with the war on drugs, because narcotics officers have incentives, as outlined above, to make as many drug related arrests as possible at all costs. The result is persecution of poor and minority communities who are unable to defend themselves.

Because police have set themselves up as the arbiters of the law, average people on the jury are quick to take their side in a case where its a "their word against mine" type of scenario, basing judgment solely on police testimony, even if there is a total lack of any other type of evidence. This gives police officers a "too big to fail" type of safety when it comes to honesty in the courtroom. More often than not, the cops have what they would call a "working relationship" with judges, prosecutors and even defense lawyers. To everybody else it much more closely resembles a "conflict of interest". Judges have an incentive to lock people up to fulfill the aforementioned prison occupancy quotas, prosecutors want to have a good record, and defense lawyers want a play to get the most money for the least amount of work. Not to mention, infamously, arrest quotas from the police.

Another great article on this issue can be found [here](#) at Filming Cops.

25. If Things Get Bad In Your Area, They Will Simply Stop Responding To “Lesser Crime”

To Protect And To Serve..... unless you aren't important enough of a victim to be worth our time. That's right, in areas all over the country; the police have announced that they simply will not respond to certain crimes like vehicular theft or burglary. Granted, these areas are some of the most violent in the whole country, and the cops claim they are doing this so they are more able to respond to shootings and other violent crimes, but I think I speak for most everybody when I say that we would prefer that they would then just not enforce frivolous laws such as those for drug possession, but of course that is noticeably absent from the list of crimes that these departments have said they will no longer be responding to. Areas that have followed this policy include, though are not limited to:

[Chicago](#), [Oakland](#), [Detroit](#), [Las Vegas](#), [10 other reasons](#).

26. They Would Rather Go After Drug Users Than Violent Criminals

When examining violent crime [clearance rates](#), that is the percentage of cases that are closed due to arrest, or “exceptional means”, we find that Cops are horribly inefficient at making arrests having to do with violent crime, as well as property crime. The highest clearance rate, according to the FBI is murder at 60%. That means that only slightly more than half of all murders have an arrest made to close the case. But the focus comes when you look at the sheer numbers. The most recent numbers I could find were from 2012. In that year over 1.5 Million people were arrested on drug charges, with just over 500,000 were arrested for violent crime. Obviously, with such low clearance rates and such high number of drug arrests, there is a huge missed opportunity by the police to actually administer justice for people that are victims of actual crime.

In addition to the original 26 Reasons, several new articles were sent to me that deserve notice.

A.) Police [destroy records](#) of their own criminal actions. And not just the police, [courts](#) too!

B.) Overlapping immunity doctrines insulate officials from the consequences of their action's, no matter how egregious, seditious, tyrannical, terrorist, or treasonous.



Oklahoma resident Donald Logsdon was fixing his neighbor's generator in March 2020 when three deputy United States Marshals snuck up behind him, kicked him in the head and took turns stomping on his body while he was unconscious. The excessive force was a clear-cut constitutional violation, but when Logsdon tried to vindicate his rights in court, a federal judge decided he had no business being there.

Logsdon's situation isn't an anomaly. Due to myriad different, often overlapping immunity doctrines, government officials are overwhelmingly insulated from the consequences of their actions, no matter how egregious. What was the result? People are left with virtually no recourse when their rights are violated, and the Constitution becomes little more than an empty promise.

As Chief Justice John Marshall observed over 200 years ago, the "very essence of civil liberty certainly consists in the right of every individual to claim the protection of the laws, whenever he receives an injury," and a government cannot be called a "government of laws, and not of men ... if the laws furnish no remedy for the violation of a vested legal right."

Yet far too often, people find themselves in that exact position. Logsdon had a warrant for his arrest on the day federal agents attacked him — though that doesn't excuse their behavior. But [James King](#), an innocent college student from Michigan, did nothing except walk on a public sidewalk in broad daylight when members of a law enforcement task force misidentified and brutally beat him. Both Logsdon and King ended up hospitalized.

- Want to sue the agency responsible for a constitutional violation? Sorry, the government gets [sovereign immunity](#).
- How about the officer that actually committed the violation? [Qualified immunity](#).
- Did a self-interested prosecutor slap you with a baseless charge? [Prosecutorial immunity](#).
- Did a corrupt judge violate your right to due process — perhaps by initiating an impromptu [raid](#) on your home and ordering the theft of your possessions? [Judicial immunity](#).
- Would you like to bring a constitutional lawsuit against a federal official (often referred to as a *Bivens* suit)? [De facto absolute immunity](#).

Even where Congress has explicitly authorized constitutional claims, like it did for suits against [municipalities](#), badly decided court cases have made it nearly impossible for people to actually exercise those rights. In one particularly devastating example, New York prosecutors brought [bogus patient endangerment charges](#) against a group of innocent, immigrant nurses who had been subject to indentured servitude, threatening their livelihoods, all without consequence.

From [unjustified traffic stops](#) and warrantless [mail seizures](#) to [retaliatory arrests](#) and the [actual destruction of people's homes](#), government officials consistently try to get away with appalling human rights violations. Most of the time, they succeed.

The trouble is, the courts have created a problem that builds upon itself. Because of doctrines like qualified immunity, law enforcement officers can only be held accountable if there is a prior case with facts directly on point that clearly establish a constitutional violation. So how similar do the facts need to be?

Well, in 2019, the Sixth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals [ruled](#) that an officer who sicced a dog on suspect who had already surrendered should be granted qualified immunity because in the previous case, the suspect surrendered by lying “on the ground with his hands out to his side” rather than by raising his hands. “[T]he fit is not perfect,” the judges held. In another case, the Fifth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals [held](#) that a prison guard who pepper-sprayed an incarcerated person “[for no reason](#)” should be granted immunity because a guard in a previous case who had been granted immunity used a Taser rather than pepper spray. Thus, the constitutional violation with specific regard to pepper spray hadn’t been “clearly established.”

Because courts tend to decide whether immunity applies before weighing in on the constitutional violation — thus never actually reaching the merits of the claim — we don’t get the buildup of decisions necessary to establish future liability. Instead, we get a merry-go-round of constitutional violations and lack of accountability without any way to get off the ride.

The end of all of this is a system where citizens spend years in court trying to vindicate their rights only to have their cases thrown out because apparently “ignorance of the law” is only an excuse for those charged with enforcing it. In such a system, the Bill of Rights and Constitutional guarantees becomes little more than words on a piece of paper. That is not the system our Founders created, and it is not the system we should be dealing with today.

Yet, in 2023, the State of California found out that the law isn't the law, and that these criminal's usurping positions of law enforcement/government have in fact been [using a corrupted version of the statutes](#) so that they can intentionally commit crimes with seemingly no consequences.

So, what can be done? Don't trust the police is a given, but it doesn't address the problem. Start a revolution – appropriate but dangerous. Throw off the shackles of corrupt government – easier said than done. Establish an Exodus 18 form of government? The concept may be unknown to most, yet it is older than Christianity itself and is the method of governing used by the Greek's who created Democracy and the Magna Carta, the bases of America's form of government. However, it has been corrupted and one must be able to see that corruption for what it is before one can decide if it is the solution for you.

David Barton is considered to be one of the national leaders in the Exodus 18 governmental reforms, yet he is in fact one of the worst things that could have happened to the movement.

Exodus 18:21

An examination of David Barton, proponent for an Exodus form of government, as he **adds** to history and the Bible at the same time.



This is a [clip of David Barton](#) claiming that the Founders based our republican form of government on Exodus 18:21. He added that some Founders actually referred to the Exodus passage as the basis for electing people to various offices at the local, state and federal levels.

Barton claims that “God set out elections at the very beginning.” He added that Israel was a monarchy later but before that “God established elections.”

However, that is **not** what happened according to Exodus 18. To get the context, I cite here Exodus 18:13-26. In this passage, Moses is lamenting to his father-in-law, Jethro, that he has to judge disputes of the people all day long. His father-in-law responded to Moses’ complaint with some good advice.

¹³ The next day Moses took his seat to serve as judge for the people, and they stood around him from morning till evening.¹⁴ When his father-in-law saw all that Moses was doing for the people, he said, “What is this you are doing for the people? Why do you alone sit as judge, while all these people stand around you from morning till evening?”

¹⁵ Moses answered him, “Because the people come to me to seek God’s will. ¹⁶ Whenever they have a dispute, it is brought to me, and I decide between the parties and inform them of God’s decrees and instructions.”

¹⁷ Moses’ father-in-law replied, “What you are doing is not good. ¹⁸ You and these people who come to you will only wear yourselves out. The work is too heavy for you; you cannot handle it alone. ¹⁹ Listen now to me and I will give you some advice, and may God be with you. You must be the people’s representative before God and bring their disputes to him. ²⁰ Teach them his decrees and instructions, and show them the way they are to live and how they are to behave. ²¹ But select capable men from all the people—men who fear God, trustworthy men who hate dishonest gain—and appoint them as officials over thousands, hundreds, fifties and tens. ²² Have them serve as judges for the people at all times, but have them bring every difficult case to you; the simple cases they can decide themselves. That will make your load lighter, because they will share it with you. ²³ If you do this and God so commands, you will be able to stand the strain, and all these people will go home satisfied.”

²⁴ Moses listened to his father-in-law and did everything he said. ²⁵ He chose capable men from all Israel and made them leaders of the people, officials over thousands, hundreds, fifties and tens. ²⁶ They served as judges for the people at all times. The difficult cases they brought to Moses, but the simple ones they decided themselves.

Moses did not put the matter to the people in an election. He simply chose able people who could serve as judges over the people. It is remarkable to me that Barton would claim that this passage is the basis for popular elections when the Bible is clear that Moses did the choosing and appointing.

Barton then insists that the Founders referred to Exodus 18:21 as the basis for [Article IV, Section 4](#) of the Constitution. That section states:

The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a [Republican](#) Form of Government, and shall protect each of them against Invasion; and on Application of the Legislature, or of the Executive (when the Legislature cannot be convened) against domestic Violence.

In the short clip, Barton does not give any names; he just says “the Founding Fathers who wrote that cited Exodus 18:31 as the basis.” I have studied this but an initial search for confirmation has come up empty.

On Barton’s Wallbuilder’s website, Barton links the verse to early writers but he actually adds the reference to their writing. For instance, consider this reference to Noah Webster. Barton [quotes Noah Webster](#) and adds the reference to Exodus 18:21.

Founding Father Noah Webster delivered a similar admonition:

Let it be impressed on your mind that God commands you to choose for rulers just men who will rule in the fear of God [Exodus 18:21]. . . . [I]f the citizens neglect their duty and place unprincipled men in office, the government will soon be corrupted . . . If [our] government fails to secure public prosperity and happiness, it must be because the citizens neglect the Divine commands, and elect bad men to make and administer the laws.

However, in Webster’s book, the reference is not there:

49. When you become entitled to exercise the right of voting for public officers, let it be impressed in your mind that God commands you to choose for rulers, just men who will rule in the fear of God. The preservation of a republican government depends on the faithful discharge of this duty; if the citizens neglect their duty and place unprincipled men in office, the government will soon be corrupted; laws will be made, not for the public good, so much as for selfish or local purposes; corrupt or in-

Webster did not cite Exodus 18:21 as a basis for favoring elections as Barton implies on his website. Barton leaves a false impression that [James Otis](#) referred to the Exodus passage when, in fact, [he did not](#). Elsewhere, [he claims that Exo. 18:21](#) supports the Republican form of government but does not cite anyone who wrote the Constitution.

Even if a Framers did refer to the Exodus passage, that would not mean that Framers was correct in asserting that God established elections via the advice from Jethro. Many Framers believed that leaders should fear God (a perversion of the Bible rewritten by King James I where the original Greek text uses 'revere the creator') and be honest. However, this does not mean they took the concept of representative government from Exodus.

Clearly Jethro's advice was enlightened. Moses needed help and delegating authority was a wise approach. However, Jethro did not advise Moses to nominate some good people and then let the people vote.

So, where does that leave us with establishing an Exodus form of government? Some Presbyterian, Jehovah's Witnesses, and other Christian denominations follow Barton without question. While that may be "faith", it is not honest.

The Declaration of Independence established a decent framework of government using biblical concepts without establishing religion, as that would violate Article 1 to the Bill of Rights and establish theocracy, the worst crime ever committed in human history.

Consider six biblical principles embodied in the *United States of America Declaration of Independence*.

1. Innate Human Dignity. From the beginning, the Bible asserts that all human beings are created Imago Dei, in the image and likeness of God (Gen 1:27). The Declaration of Independence builds upon this foundational truth, declaring it is "self-evident" that [every person] is created equally with "certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness."

2. Natural Human Rights. The Declaration asserts that human rights are not granted by governments, but are inherent in human existence. Psalm 139:13-14 reflects that from the moments of human conception, when "you knit me together in my mother's womb," human life is "fearfully and wonderfully made." The biblical passage highlights the intrinsic value of human life and implies its legal rights. The Declaration builds upon the biblical idea that individuals have rights to life and freedom first given by Nature's God (not to be mistaken for the Christian God).

Nature's God is one - a deity that operates entirely through laws - natural laws - that are explicable. And we have to approach this god through the study of nature and also evidence and experience. So it's a dramatically different kind of deity from that you find in most revealed religions. It is not the God of Moses who literally gave the law, you know, from on high - revealed in that way. And it also turns out to have a very different genealogy, if I may say so. Nature's God really descends from an ancient Greek tradition (those people who ushered in a thousand years of enlightenment and created the Magna Carta upon which much of the Bill of Rights is founded) that was passed along to the early modern philosophers. And these were quite radical thinkers who were really challenging the ways of thinking of their time and the established religion. Many of them ran into trouble, but it was from them that America's revolutionary philosophers picked up their ideas and, in particular, the idea of nature's God.

3. Government by Consent. The Declaration maintains that governments can only derive their power “from the consent of the governed.” The Bible teaches that leaders are responsible for serving and protecting their constituents and be held accountable for governing righteously. Romans 13:1 states, “Let everyone be subject to the governing authorities, for there is no authority except that which God has established. The authorities that exist have been established by God.” Although this verse addresses submission to a governmental authority, it implies that the power of government derives from God’s ordination and the governed’s consent.

4. Right to Self-Governance. The Declaration states that “it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish” government and to “institute new Government,” free from oppressive rule. This idea reflects biblical themes of freedom, self-determination, and the idea that God’s people are to have a role in shaping their society.

We see an example of participatory self-rule in Exodus 18:21; “But select capable men from all the people—men who fear God, trustworthy men who hate dishonest gain—and appoint them as officials over thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens.” This passage illustrates the principle of the people selecting their leaders and participating in self-governance.

A New Testament example is found in Acts 6, when the apostles charged the members of the church to select delegated leaders to serve some specific needs of the constituency, “So, brothers, select from among you seven men of **good reputation**, full of the Spirit and wisdom, whom we will put in charge of this need ... and the statement pleased the whole group...” (Acts 6: 3 and 5).

5. Right to Seek Redress. The Declaration establishes that people have a right to challenge their government for grievances and to seek redress when their rights are violated. Redress is a biblical principle. The Bible advocates justice for the vulnerable and upholds the rights of the marginalized. Proverbs 31:8-9 admonishes, “Speak up for those who cannot speak for themselves, for the rights of all who are destitute. Speak up and judge fairly; defend the rights of the poor and needy.”

6. Revolutionary Spirit. The Declaration of Independence, while not explicitly biblical, is built upon the values and principles contained within the biblical ideals of human dignity, freedom, justice, and accountable governance.

The Bible contains narratives of individuals and communities taking a stand against injustice, oppression, and tyranny.

One example is the story of the Israelites’ liberation from Egyptian bondage in Exodus 3:7-10. God calls Moses to lead the Israelites from slavery in Egypt, highlighting the principle of standing against oppression and seeking liberation. God’s purpose was for his people to be free to worship him (Ex 7:16). Freedom of religion was another founding principle of the American Revolution.

We see another example of standing against unjust and oppressive systems in Acts 5:29. When the governing authorities commanded the apostles to no longer teach in the name of Jesus, their reply was, “We must obey God rather than human beings!”

Conclusion

The values and principles reflected in the U.S. Declaration of Independence resonate with the biblical (and far older) ideas of innate human dignity, natural human rights, government by consent, self-governance, seeking redress, and a revolutionary spirit. At the same time it wisely disregards any form of actual religious establishment; otherwise it would simply quote Christian Biblical passages.

Can a revival of one of the oldest and most successful forms of government work to eliminate police/government corruption? In my opinion, (and not just because I'm Greek), I say, **YES**.

In order to establish a modern Exodus 18 form of government, basic biblical concepts, like those used in the Declaration, should be (re)established, yet religion must be kept out, less it create conflict in each and every individual's belief. Ironically, the Greeks saw and understood all of this, thousands of years ago.

For a modern example of a successful governmental reform and to learn how to hold corrupt officials accountable for their crimes you can check out:

<https://OCCR2021.com>

And

<https://Odysee.com/@SupremeCourtOfLaw:9?view=content>

Rev. Goodwill