

Freedom or Slavery - External - Terrie Lambert 23-11-19

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9jr_GQU8lgE&t=9s

Turn in your Bibles to Luke chapter 19. This will be as a Sabbath School lesson so I invite contributions and answers. Luke chapter 19 and we'll start in verse 37. And when Jesus was come nigh, even now at the descent of the Mount of Olives, the whole multitude of the disciples began to rejoice and praise God with a loud voice for all the mighty works that they had seen saying, Blessed be the king that cometh in the name of the Lord : peace in heaven, and glory in the highest. And some of the Pharisees from among the multitude said unto Him, Master rebuked Thy disciples, And he answered and said unto them, I tell you that, if these should hold their peace, the stones would immediately cry out. When we're looking at the line of Christ, where are we in this particular incident? What's occurring? What's the context of this story? It is the triumphal entry. What are the disciples doing? Particularly in verse 37 what are they literally doing? Praising with a loud voice, a loud cry, and we can call that a midnight cry. So they're crying out. There are other voices, what are the other voices saying? Their saying don't cry. And God says, Jesus says, if they don't cry who's going to cry? The stones. So what do we understand those stones to be?

Go to Matthew 3:7. "And when he, [this is John the Baptist], saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees come to his baptism, he said unto them, O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance: And think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our Father: for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham". So what can God do to a stone? So the children of Abraham they're not stones are they? They don't come from stones. What do we like liken them to? If Gentiles are stones, what is it about a stone? It's dead, it's as dead as dead, you can't get any deader than a stone. So obviously if you're from Abraham you're not dead. so what are you? you have life. I want you to compare a stone with something else. If He be Christ, then you are what? Your seed! So you are either a stone or a seed. If you're a stone you're dead as one, or you are a seed, and you have life within itself.

So God says I don't care if your seed or your stone, I can bring something to life from something that's dead. And so if you go back to Luke chapter 19 Jesus says, if these disciples of mine, these people that have raised to give a message don't give the message, then I'm going to raise something that's dead and they're going to give a message. So he's going to use something that's dead. So the stones are still dead, he hasn't turned them into seed, so they haven't gotten life, but what have they got? They've got a voice, their voice because they're going to cry, they're going to give a message. So stones can speak. what else are stones used for? Punishment, because what do you do with a stone? You stone somebody with them, so they bring punishment. They've got voices and they're the means for judgment. So they're are some principles that we can draw from stones. And if you're stoned what have you been doing? Sinning, and sinning is the breaking of the law. So a stone it can speak, but it can also speak to condemn somebody who's breaking the law.

In Bible prophecy is a little aside, but in Bible prophecy can you think of something else that speaks and brings judgment at the end of the world from the book of Revelation. I'm thinking of Revelation chapter 13. You want to turn there Revelation chapter 13. What does the beast do? It speaks. So if we look at verse 11 Revelation 13:11, "And I beheld another beast coming out of the earth; and he had two horns like a lamb, and he spake as a dragon". So this beast speaks. In the Great Controversy what does sister White say this speaking of the lamb represents? The act of its judicial and legislative power. So what's it speaking according to? The Law and judgment. So it speaks judicial and legislative. And if we drop down to verse 15 we see that this power, this beast has power to give life unto the image of the Beast. So the image of the Beast can do what? Speak. So again we've got this image that can speak and can cause judgment. So if we can just keep that thought as we move on that this image of the beast speaks and causes that as many would not worship the image of the Beast should be killed.

So speaking, is it a good thing or a bad thing? It really depends, it depends on if it's a good law or if it's a bad law. So here we've got an example of a speaking and a judgment that is based on a bad law. So stones speak, and

stones deliver judgment. The most powerful stone in the world today is who? Would anybody like to guess who the most powerful stone would be. Did God raise Trump to give a message? No, Are we stones, no we're seed. So we're looking for what kind of person, are you looking for Jew? You're looking for a Gentile. So we're looking for a Gentile. The most powerful stone in the world, you need to know how to pronounce her name, Nancy Pelosi. Why am I saying Nancy Pelosi, what is she, she's a speaker. She's not just any speaker, she is second in succession to the presidency. If something happens to Donald Trump who takes his place? Vice president Mike Pence. If something happens to Mike Pence who takes his place, the Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi. On the evening of September 24 2019 Pelosi announced that six Committees of the House of Representatives would undertake a formal impeachment inquiry into President Trump. Pelosi accused Trump of betraying his oath of office, US national security, and the integrity of the country's election. So she was the one that spoke. She announced the impeachment inquiry of Donald Trump on the evening of 20 September 24 2019. She is the first woman to have served in the office of speaker of the of the House of Representatives. As Speaker she is second in the presidential line of succession. On September 24 she spoke, she spoke and she announced an inquiry into the impeachment and investigation. On November 1 she gave an interview ,and she spoke, and I want to share portions of her interview with you. She said that the impeachment inquiry was important for the American people, they need to understand that nobody is above the law, not the President of the United States, nobody is above the law .

She said in the earliest days of our revolution, Thomas Paine wrote, “ **the times have found us**”, meaning here we are, and these are our circumstances. Here they were, they declared independence, they fought a war, they established a country, they wrote a constitution that was to free them from a monarchy and to establish a democracy a republic. And then she noticed that when on September 17 1787 it was the day when the Constitution was adopted. The Constitution was adopted and on that day when Benjamin Franklin walked out of Independence Hall, they asked him what do we have Mr. Franklin, a monarchy, or a republic ,he said a republic if we can keep it. She goes on to say that the genius of that Constitution is three co-equal branches of government, a check and balance on each other, a separation of powers, not a monarchy but a republic . On that very day September 17 this year was the day the news broke about that telephone call, and that went right to the heart of our Constitution. She said that on September 17 1787, that was the day the Constitution was adopted, and that the people did not want a monarchy they wanted a republic. But what happened on September 17 this year she said when a law that was broken went right to the heart of the Constitution.

So how do we understand the Constitution of the United States? Wikipedia says that the Constitution of the United States is the **supreme law** of the United States. So the Constitution is what? **Supreme law**. It has seven articles, and they delineate or describe the frame of government that the United States has. The first three articles describe the separation of powers. The first article is congress. What's the important checks and balances with Congress. It has two parts, the Senate, and the House of representatives, with Nancy Pelosi as speaker. A person is voted in, so that's your first article. Your second article is the executive branch, and who's that? Trump the president . So who's this Pelosi, we know that it's not her alone any more than Trump is the executive branch alone. The third is the judicial branch, the Supreme Court. These are the first three of seven articles .We won't go into the rest of the articles. The first article said there's there's two chambers, a house and the Senate. It is regarded as the oldest written and codified National Constitution enforce since the Constitution came into force in 1789. It has been amended 27 times, including one amendment that repealed a previous one in order to meet the needs of a nation that has profoundly changed since the 18th century.

So why does the Constitution get changed or amended? To meet the needs of a changing nation. The first ten amendments what's the name of the first ten amendments? The Bill of Rights. They offer specific protections of individual liberty, justice, and places restrictions on the powers of government. So what do the first ten do? They ensure the rights of the people, they protect the people's Liberty, and it also restricts the government's power. The majority of the seventeen later amendments expand individual civil rights protections. So what do those amendments do? They expand the protection. Do they take away the protections? No, they expand them. What an amendment does, it expands on the original, it corrects, it clarifies. According to the United States Senate the Constitution's first three words, We the people, affirm that the government of the United States exists to serve its

citizens. Why does the government exist? To serve. You need to remember this word exists to what? To serve. For over two centuries the Constitution has remained in force because its framers wisely separated, and balanced governmental powers to safeguard the interests of majority rule, and minority rights of liberty and equality, and the federal and state governments. So the reason why it's hung around so long is because they wisely framed it to balance government, they separated the powers and that has ensured that you have majority rule, and minority rights. Any questions on the Constitution?

So let's go back to Nancy Speaker Pelosi. She said in one conversation he Donald Trump undermined our national security by withholding military assistance that had been voted on by the Congress of the U.S. to the benefit of the Russians. So there had been military assistance, that had been voted on by who? Article 1, by Congress, they had voted they had put it into law that this is what we're going to do we're going to give the Ukraine military assistance, so that we can protect them and to protect us from who? The Russians. But he undermined national security, by saying he would withhold it. At the same time he jeopardized the integrity of our elections, the heart of our democracy, and in doing so in my view, he possibly violated his oath of office to protect, defend, and conserve the Constitution of the United States. So he takes an oath that he's going to defend the Constitution, and what is he doing? Undermining it.

She went on to say, she talked about the genius of the Constitution, about it's three separate co-equal branches of government, the legislative, the executive, and the judicial. But what she said is that what Donald Trump is saying about this second article, is that Trump is saying that he can do what he wants, " I'm executive". He's not realizing that he is actually second article, not first article. So he says " I can do what I want". She said that if he only read the Constitution, and the Federalist Papers they did not want a monarchy, they did not want a unitary government where one person called all the shots. He overturned an action of Congress, overturned military assistance to a country. She said this is all about the Constitution, we are defending our democracy. In that interview she made it very clear when it comes to impeachment that this is not about his character, his morality, or his behavior, not even about his policies. What this impeachment is about, is about the Constitution. She just repeated that over and over again, that it was about the Constitution, and whether he abused his power to advance his own personal interests by undermining the constitution. So what was he doing? Using his power as the executive power to advance his own personal interests. Why is he there? To serve. And whos he going to serve? Himself, he's not serving his country, He abused his power to advance his own personal interests, and that's what undermines the Constitution, and the Constitution is what? **The supreme law.**

She went on to say, they were asking her about the impeachment, and it because everything's about the impeachment and it's like it sucked the oxygen out of whatever else is happening, and she said the House of Representatives has sent scores of bills to the Senate, but all the oxygen is being sucked up by the impeachment inquiry, and she listed a few. She said scores of Bills. How much is a score? 20. So she said we've sent scores of bills to the Senate. The leader of the Senate, Mitch McConnell has said that I'm the Grim Reaper. What's the Grim Reaper do? It kills. So every time a bill goes to the Senate, what is he there to do? To kill it. What kind of bills have they sent to the Senate? She lists them, gun violence protection climate action now, for the young people, we want climate action right now, for women she said ending violence against women, equal pay for equal work, raising the minimum wage where two-thirds of people getting a raise will be women, because they're not getting equal pay. She said protecting the dreamers, who are the dreamers? They're the young immigrants, give them a chance, let them have an education, visas, and then give them the opportunity to maybe to get full citizenship. We need to protect the dreamers. So she listed all these things, gun violence, climate action, equal rights for women, immigration, and the Equality Act which would end discrimination against LGBT community. She said just a few of the bills that the house has sent to the Senate.

While all the timeless impeachment hearings are going on, what is the Senate doing? Shutting down the expansion of the Constitution, and then she made this profound statement ; She said thank God that they, and by they she meant the founding fathers that made it, and by it she means the Constitution, thank God that the founding fathers made the Constitution what? Amenable. Why is it made amenable? So that it could expand freedom over

time. What did the founding fathers do? They said this Constitution can be amended. What does it mean to amend something? We're going to correct it, but we're going to correct it by expanding it. And what is the idea of expanding the Constitution? To expand freedom over time. This is showing that they recognized the progressiveness of the Constitution. While it's set in stone to a certain degree it can be expanded on so that issues related to freedom can be clarified and enlarged. And when a president takes an oath to take his office, he takes that oath so that he can strengthen the Constitution which he serves.

The reason there's amendments is so that there can be more freedom and this takes time. Were they always free? When did they get freedom? If we can picture ourselves as John the Revelator in Revelation 13, where are we standing? We're on the beach, and if we look one way, what are we going to see? The sea, and what's in that sea? A dirty great big beast, with teeth that can chew you up, and feet that can tread you down. And who's doing that to the people that live in the old world? That beast has what? Horns with crowns, so it's kingly powers over there in the old world that are going to tread you down, that will take away your freedom. As he looks over into the earth what does he see? A lamb like Beast which has two horns, are the crowns on it? No, and they represent what? The separation of powers. He's on the beach; so there's this transformation between a kingly power, and freedom. There was no freedom in the old world, they had to move to the new world. When they arrived in the new world, did they have freedom? No, Why didn't they have freedom? They're still connected to the old, and the old was who? one of those horns had a crown that's the English government, and they were still chained to that horn. And over time those restrictions in the new world increased too much, and so what did they decide to do? Revolt, they had to break away, they had to fight a war of independence to get independent of that horn with the crown on it, and then it could announce that it was independent or free. In order to guarantee Liberty, to ensure and protect freedom, it needs a government that works within a framework of law. So now that it's free what does it need to have to make sure it stays free, it still has to have law.

Let's go back, we've looked at the Constitution, they've had their War of Independence, or they're in their war of independence, they're rejecting the kingly authority of the old world, and they're going to announce that they're free. They're going to break those chains. What do they declare? They make the Declaration of Independence, they say we're free they make a declaration. The Declaration of Independence was the solemn declaration of the Congress of the United States of America on 1776, what date? You all know it, the 4th of July. On July 4 of 1766 they formally renounced their subjection to the government of Great Britain. So now they're free. The Declaration of Independence officially broke all political ties between the American colonies and Great Britain. It set forth the ideas and principles behind a just and fair government, and the Constitution outlined how this government would function. The Declaration of Independence says we're free, the Constitution says, this is what is going to look like to be free. What does it look like to be free? It looks like to have laws. Can you have freedom without law? No, you're still going to have laws because one of those laws going to do? Protect that freedom, and when they don't if they fall short of protecting that freedom, what are you going to do? You're going to amend them over time, they're going to expand.

Let's talk a little bit about the Declaration of Independence. Let's read the first paragraph, "The unanimous declaration of the thirteen United States of America when in the course of human events it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, so when it becomes necessary that we break our ties with England, and to assume among the powers of the earth the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them, and so when now we can create our own government like everybody else around the world can, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation" What we now owe everybody is an explanation of why we're separated, so when the time comes that you've got to separate from a kingly power. and we can create our own government then we need to be able to explain to you why, and that's when it says, " We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" So it's going to announce truth. What are these truths? Truths are what? Self-evident. What does it mean when something self-evident? It means no explanation, no proof. What needs no proof according to the Declaration of Independence? All men are equal, and because they're

equal they are endowed with unalienable rights. What does it mean when a right is unalienable? Can't be taken away, you can't give it away, nobody can take it away, it's innate, it belongs to you, so unalienable rights. and these unalienable rights among them are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. So you have the right to live, you have a right to be free, and you have a right to pursue happiness whatever that happiness looks like. We'll talk about that more in a minute.

To secure these rights, governments are instituted among men. So what do you need to be able to have life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness? You have to have a government. Governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. So any type of government? Is a monarchy a government? Does the monarchy have the consent of the governed? No they don't have that consent. Then whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form as it shall seem most likely to effect their safety and Happiness. So if a government is not doing this for us what do we have the right to do? Get rid of that government, bring in another government that's going to ensure that all men are equal, that their unalienable rights are protected?

So who wrote this Declaration of Independence? The first draft was written by Thomas Jefferson, and then it went to a committee of five, who in his words butchered it or mangled it was his words, but they fixed it up, and then it went to the second Congress. So it went through a process to formulate this document. When Jefferson submitted his original draft those opening paragraphs that we just read, they didn't change it, maybe inalienable was changed to unalienable are something like that, but largely they left those opening paragraphs alone. So that was the introduction, what followed after that was 20 reasons why they left Britain, and they got stuck into the king they got stuck into the British people for allowing the Parliament to do what they did, and then the last part of that was announcing that they were free. So they made some small changes to improve its clarity and accuracy. They took 25% out of Jefferson's list, but they've left 20 in there. Thomas Jefferson wrote those famous words. Where did he get them from?

Let's go back in history because this Declaration of Independence other than the list against against Britain, it was largely plagiarized, and it was plagiarized from the works of a man called John Locke, and who was John Locke? We're going to go back in history. If you were to ask Thomas Jefferson who the three greatest men were in history, he was asked once, he enlisted three, he said Francis Bacon, he said Isaac Newton and he said John Locke. The men that wrote this Constitution, that started or formed the government, the founding fathers were largely influenced by certain philosophers from the Enlightenment period. One was John Locke, another was a baron Montesquieu. So who influenced the writing of this concept of this Declaration of Independence? An Englishman and a Frenchman. It was Baron de Montesquieu that came up in the 1500s with the idea that government would be best served if there were three co-equal branches. so that wasn't new to the United States, he said you know we can keep it if we separate the powers, if we separate the judiciary from the executive, and from the legislative then we will be able to preserve rights. They had read those papers and they gleaned all these principles from writers before. What John Locke did was all those opening paragraphs were pretty much a plagiarism of a book that he wrote in 1689, and it's called "The two Treaties of Government".

And so let's go back to that history just to give it a little overview. What was going on at that time? So a little bit of English history, you all have what kind of a Bible?, King James, King James the first. James the first lived from 1603 to 1625. He was the grand nephew of Henry the eighth. So he was a Protestant, but he was also a strong Monica stay. So we'll see that come out in his son Charles the first. Charles the first ruled from 1625 to 1649, and he was a Catholic. And Charles the first believed in the Divine Right of Kings, he believed in absolute monarchism. He gave no concession to Parliament. He ruled with an iron fist, and so what did Parliament do to Charles the first? They chucked him out and they beheaded him, he was executed. Who took his place? Ever heard of Oliver Cromwell, not a king, he ruled from 1653 to 1658, and how did he rule? He was a Puritan, and he enforced his Puritan beliefs. So dancing halls were shut down, any place playing music was shut down, he banned Christmas, **he was a dictator**. Oliver Cromwell died and his son took his place but not for long, his son was very weak. Parliament took over and

they reinstated a king, they brought back Charles II. Charles II ruled from 1660 to 1685. He was known as the merry monarch because he brought back all the music and the dancing halls. He did a lot of bad things but he was a happy monarch. And he was actually the one who passed what's called the Test Act, and the Test Act was banning Catholics from Parliament.

So we've got James, Charles, Cromwell the **dictator**, now we've got Charles and who do you think comes next? James the Second, and James the Second ruled from 1685 to 1688. James the second was a Catholic and he believed in absolute monarchism. He believed in the Divine Right of Kings. And it's during this time because of those two made a lot of mistakes, they wasted money on Wars, they wouldn't support the Parliament. It's actually during this time period here that Britain became a Commonwealth. So what happened was what's called the Glorious Revolution. The Glorious Revolution was a bloodless revolution that brought down this king, nobody died. What they did was James had a daughter called Mary, Mary was a Protestant and Mary had married William of Orange, and they said to William come over and be our King. So they ousted James the second and they put in William the third. He's known as William of Orange because he was Dutch, and Mary the Second. What do we have? We have a joint monarchy. They ruled together until Mary died. Then William ruled alone until he died.

It's during this time period here that the works of John Locke are under test, and others are being used because, what you've got is you've got a split in the British people. There's those that want representation, they don't mind having a monarch, they don't mind having a head of government as long as he listens to the voice of the people through the Parliament. And you've got others. So the other group are known as Patriarchs, but they believed a political belief called patriarchalism, and basically patriarchalism is the Divine Right of Kings. There was a man called Robert Filmer, he died in 1650 but he had written a book called The Divine Right of Kings. What they wanted to do was reinstate James the second, he hadn't died, they wanted to bring him back, put him on the throne. So you've have this split, and what James Robert Filmer did was he traced supposedly James right back to Adam, and said the very first king was Adam. The very first King was a man, he was a patriarch, and then he gave all these reasons why God instituted a monarchy through Adam, and then he followed through all the Millenniums and that's why we should have James the second reinstated. When William the third and Mary the second were Co- ruling, most of their time was spent fighting these monarchists and that was largely the Jacobins. So they didn't have a fun time of it. So this glorious revolution, it overthrew the catholic king, replaced William of Orange and Mary.

So John Locke, he's written this book Two Treatises of Government, and what he did was he took Filmer's book and he just pulled it to pieces, because what they were using what Filmer was using was biblical what they thought would be biblical proof. And so Locke went into that and just showed how I mean some of it was just was just silly you know. Actually if we go down to Genesis one, I'll show you what they did. Go to Genesis 1 verse 26; And God said, "Let Us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let **them** have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air", etc. So what he would do is he would replace the plant pronouns, and he would say that **them** is Adam. So all John Locke had to do is go in and say well **them** has to be Adam and Eve and they both had what? Dominion; They ruled jointly. And then he would go to Genesis chapter 3 and the curse on Eve, and show that the man was put over the woman. She was subject, so John Locke just refuted that and said that God made Adam king in one day and a day laborer in the same breath, because he got cursed as well. So it's just argument after argument that gets refuted. But what's interesting is that in this book that John Locke wrote, "There is truth that are self-evident that all men are equal, and they have unalienable rights of life, liberty" but he didn't write the pursuit of happiness, he wrote "property"- the acquisition and possession of property. And all that Jefferson did was change that into the pursuit of happiness. But essentially, they're the same thing. Now when John Locke wrote of this property he meant it in a narrow and a broad way. So in a narrow way he meant your own land you can own stuff, but in a broadway he meant, you can have aspirations, education you know you're free to pursue your happiness wherever that takes you as long as you respect life and liberty, not just for yourself but also for others. You can't have life and liberty for yourself, and then not expect that on other people. So we allow the pursuit of happiness. We could sum that up with the right to buy or sell.

In 1689 Locke argued in his Two Treatises of Government, the political society existed for the sake of protecting property which he defined as a person's life, liberty, and estate. In a letter concerning toleration, he wrote that the magistrate's power was limited to preserving person's civil interest, which he described as life, liberty, health, and indolence of body, and the possession about wood things. He said that the highest perfection of intellectual nature lies in a careful and constant pursuit of true and solid happiness. Whereas the patriarchal system, defended the concept of absolute power for the monarchy. The book that Filmer wrote was called Patriarca where he used genealogy to legitimize kingship. So property it's a wide range of human interests. It's not just things that you possess, it can be material goods, but it can also be aspirations.

Let's back up so you've got men that have moved to the new world, they are not free, but they overthrow the government that is keeping them in servitude, and they become free, and they declare themselves free through that declaration. Now they have to preserve that freedom. How they're going to preserve it? Through the Constitution. What's the relationship between the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution? The Declaration of Independence, this is called natural law, natural law is self-evident, it needs no proof. Natural law consists of fundamental principles of justice and right. The fundamental characteristics, are people who have equal dignity before God. And the government is erected primarily to protect people's rights. Now what's the difference between this natural law and the Constitution? The Constitution is called positive law. Positive law is man-made, it aspires to the ideal of natural law. But it doesn't always meet, positive law doesn't always match up with natural law. But the purpose of government is to bring them as close together as possible, and that's why the Constitution is amendable. It expands freedom over time. They want to bring this positive law as close to the ideal.

When the Constitution was written, these truths were self-evident. When that was written were they all men? No, so what's the problem with that statement? If you're living in 1776 why isn't that put into practice in 1776? What are you going to enforce? In 1776 they write this: By 1789 they've got their constitution, 1791 they've got their Bill of Rights; Are all men equal in 1798? No, they're not equal. So what's the problem? What constitutes a man? Who are men? If you're a man, you're equal, if you're not man what are you? You're property. So am I a man? Terre asked, yes, but back then I wasn't a man. So you become property. Was a heathen a man? No, so then they became property; therefore they have no rights, are not in control of their life or their liberty, and they cannot pursue happiness. So what has to happen to the law over time, for all men to have freedom? We have to have amendments. Those amendments are just clarifying. Who wrote the constitution? We say Thomas Jefferson, but he didn't, he plagiarized it, he even admitted it. Even James Madison said, we didn't want to come up with anything new, we just wanted to use what was out there. I'm paraphrasing. And they did. That wasn't their intention they just were using the thoughts of the age. Did Thomas Jefferson like slavery? No, but did he have slaves? yes. It became a problem back then.

You know how I said he wrote 20 things against Britain? He wrote more than that, they took out 25% of what he wrote. He was not a happy man. One of the articles that was removed was slavery. He was charging Britain with slavery. They took that out. Their concern was they needed nine states to ratify that document. And if they didn't get it ratified it wasn't going to go through. So expediency was the issue. They said, let's leave that out we don't want Civil War now, let's just get this through. So it makes you wonder what would have happened if they had actually took that stand and said "No slaves". They thought that they would be in a mess and that was probably what would have happened. They understood that all men were equal, but they couldn't implement it. So it was what it was, and they eventually did get civil war. So rightly or wrongly sometimes out of expediency, people write things that need to be amended in due course.

When the Constitution was originally written by John Locke, you had the Carolinas, you had southern states that needed to help ratify this document. John Locke certainly believed all men are equal, was against slavery, and was for women's rights back in 1689. This was the Age of Enlightenment. These were philosophers that were bringing light to the world. We kind of, you know, roll our eyes with philosophy, but there was a lot of truths that were being expounded. So, are purpose in going back to him is saying that these thoughts aren't new, that they were generated from the old world, that the new world were well-read educated people who chose the the ideas that they knew

were needed to start fresh. We know what monarchy looks like, we don't want that here, so we're going to have to go back to these writings, to these men, and you know these are the words that are fueling their desire for freedom. The point is what kind of freedom is it? Is it unrestricted freedom? What's restricting them? Laws, the Constitution. So the Constitution is there to protect, to put equality in practice, and to protect it. The founders believe that in a perfect world positive law would be the same as natural law. In an imperfect world that's impossible, but they tried to make positive law approximate natural law as close as possible.

So this Declaration of Independence has served several purposes. It stated a natural law, the natural laws we hold these truths to be self-evident, that's a natural law you can't argue against it needs no proofs needs no explanation. Second, it showed how British legal practice varied from this idea. He lists twenty reasons why they have to separate, because the British practice wasn't all men are equal. Why aren't all men equal? Because who was King? We've got to skip quite a few years, but it was King George the Second during this period of independence. Thirdly, it explained that the variation between what they wanted and what the British government were forcing on them was so great that they had to separate. After independence, the declaration remained as a statement of America's natural law ideals. So the Declaration of Independence is a statement of what they would ideally like America to be like, and that is we're all equal, we all have a right to live, all have a right to be free, we all have a right to pursue happiness, or to buy and sell property, or to get a wedding cake, you know we have that right.

The Constitution does this in at least two principal ways: rules, and procedures that are designed to produce better results. So what does that mean? What the Constitution is there for is to not only provide the parameters to keep that possible but also to improve it. The founders could not produce a constitution that approximated natural law in every way, for example, most founders recognized that slavery was against natural law, but given the constraints of the time, tolerating slavery was the better of two bad choices. If the Constitution had banned slavery, it would not have met the nine state threshold necessary for ratification, it would have been a fragmented country. It would have led to civil war that would have lasted a lot longer than the one they had. So the way to conform the Constitution more closely to natural law, is not to pretend it means what it does not mean. The way to conform the Constitution more closely to natural law is to juley amend it. What it's saying is that we don't bend the Constitution, we amend the Constitution. We don't try and read into the Constitution what we think they're trying to say. What we try to do is, we amend it and make it say what it's meant to say

. So what have we learnt so far? At the time of the midnight cry or the loud cry, God raises up what? Stones, these stones give a message, and they are a means of delivering judgment. And we looked at one example of a stone, Nancy Pelosi, the Speaker of the House of Representatives. She announced the formal investigation into the impeachment of the President of the United States. The reason for the impeachment inquiry, was what Trump was doing. Misusing his power for personal gain which undermined the Constitution. He was violating his oath of office, it has to be proven, but he's kind of proved it himself. What is the purpose of government? To serve. And what did he do? He served himself. Again this is the problem when you go back to all these Kings, what were they doing? Serving themselves, and particularly if you go look into the excesses that they had, the taxes that they wanted raised for their own personal benefit is the reason for this glorious revolution with kingly power.

We looked at the Constitution and we've compared it to the Declaration of Independence. The Declaration of Independence is what kind of law? Natural law. The Constitution is positive law. So it's natural that all men are created equal, and are endowed with inalienable rights. The Constitution gives the framework for the laws that will ensure that freedom and equality. So it is amenable, it expands freedom over time. In expanding the Constitution what we want to recognize is that everything is there in the Constitution. It just needs to be expanded or clarified, and put those thoughts into into law so that there is **no doubt**.