

Tyler Sena Alberta Canada Presentation 9

What I want to do in this presentation is rap up everything we have done. Restate it and review it all and bind it off so we can sort of have some resolution on some thoughts. Before we do that my sister asked if I could explain the electoral college because sister Tess was talking about it in the last presentation. I will take a couple minutes and do that quickly.

The Electoral system in the US is broken up into two votes like Tess was saying. You have the states votes and you have the electoral college. The way the states work is exactly the way it works everywhere else. Everyone goes into the voting booth and they all vote. The state either goes red or blue. You are either voting for the democrats or republicans or even independents, whatever it may be. However the majority of the people in that state vote is the way that state goes.

What happens now is that the people here in the states are not actually voting for the President of their candidate. They are not actually voting for the candidate. What they are voting for is what their electoral votes are going to go to.

So if we talk about Trump and Hilary in 2016 election. They are voting to see where their electoral votes are going to go to one of these people. There are different rules, depending on the state, about how the electoral votes are broken up exactly. The constitution gives you one thing about the number of the votes. We actually read part of this the other days.

Article 2 section 1 Claus 2

Each State shall appoint, in such Manner as the Legislature thereof may direct, a Number of Electors, equal to the whole Number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress: but no Senator or Representative, or Person holding an Office of Trust or Profit under the United States, shall be appointed an Elector.

Quiz: How many representatives does every state have in the senate?

2

Every state has equal representation In the Senate but when you come to the house it is a different story. It is actually based on population at that point. Based on the amount of population you have, you get more votes or less votes. It's the combined total of the two. This means everyone is always going to have representation because you are going to have at least two senators and some amount of population. Everyone is going to have some amount of representation in the electoral college. That is how you determine the number. What happens is everyone votes and will either vote for the electoral votes to go to Trump or Clinton. Then the delegates are going to come together and they are going to have another vote. But there is one more problem. The problem is, depending on the state rules, these electoral delegates can be broken up differently. What this means is this, some states have a winner take all policy. Let's say in Texas they vote for Trump. This means all the delegates will go to Trump if it was winner take all. They can also do it by proportion and say that the majority went for Trump so he is going to get this amount of the delegates, but Clinton won this amount of the vote so we are going to give her her equal portion of delegates as well. This is splitting the delegates with the one who gets the majority of the vote getting the majority of the delegates.

So each states has different rules about and they can change a winner take or a proportionate kind of vote. Then you come to the electoral college and the day where they are going to vote here. They all come together and say that based on what their states said the state said they have to vote for Hilary or my state said I have to vote for Trump. You are basically voting for someone to vote. These delegates aren't necessarily bound to vote the way

their states says they have to vote. The state says we voted for Trump. Let's say it's winner takes all and let's say it's Texas with about 36 delegates. Let's say half of them can say "You know what I disagree. I don't agree with the way my state wanted me to vote and im going to vote for Hilary". So half of them vote against what their state says. Now there are different laws about that. In certain states they are bound and in certain states they are not bound to vote in a certain way. This is a really interesting concept. Again I'm not sure that it's ever happened that they have broken the way they are supposed to vote.

Someone says they have. It is not often that his happens.

Faithless Electors

1948

Preston Parks of Tennessee was chosen as an elector for the Democratic Party, which was pledged to incumbent Harry S. Truman. Before the election, some Democrats opposed to Truman's support of civil rights and racial integration split off and formed the States' Rights Democratic Party, also known as the Dixiecrats. Parks actively campaigned for Dixiecrat candidate Strom Thurmond and [said in advance](#) of the election that he would not vote for Truman under any circumstances, instead voting for Thurmond.

1956

W.F. Turner, a Democratic elector from Alabama, voted for a local circuit judge, Walter B. Jones, for president instead of the Democratic nominee, Adlai Stevenson. Jones, an avowed white supremacist who in 1960 presided over *New York Times Co. vs. Sullivan*, which later became a landmark Supreme Court case that defined the standard for journalistic libel, was not on the popular ballot. Fellow electors at the time [told Turner](#) he was under an "obligation" to vote for Stevenson because the electors had signed a party loyalty oath. Turner replied: "I have fulfilled my obligations to the people of Alabama. I'm talking about the white people."

1960

Henry D. Irwin, a Republican from Oklahoma, telegraphed all of his fellow Republican electors in the country asking if they would consider supporting a Barry Goldwater-Harry Byrd ticket over Richard Nixon-Henry Cabot Lodge. Irwin received approximately 40 replies, some favorable, but when it came time to cast their votes, Irwin was the only one who defected. According to an account in the book "Why the Electoral College is Bad for America," by George C. Edwards III, Irwin told the Senate Judiciary Committee in a subsequent hearing about possibly changing the presidential election procedures that he had worked to get electors to abandon John F. Kennedy and Nixon in favor of a strongly conservative candidate. He said he voted the way he did because he "feared the immediate future of our government under the control of the socialist-labor leadership."

1968

Lloyd Bailey, a Republican from North Carolina, voted for George Wallace of the American Independence Party over Nixon, the Republican candidate. Bailey was a member of the ultraconservative John Birch Society and, according to Edwards' book, disliked what he considered to be Nixon's "leftist" appointments of Henry Kissinger and Daniel Patrick Moynihan to advisory positions, as well as his request to Chief Justice Earl Warren to remain on for an additional six months.

1972

Roger MacBride, a Republican elector from Virginia, deserted Nixon to vote for the candidate of the nascent Libertarian Party, John Hospers, a philosophy professor at USC. MacBride was a political disciple of Rose Lane, according to his obituary in the *New York Times*. Lane was the daughter of author Laura Ingalls Wilder and an adherent to Ayn Rand's philosophy of objectivism. After Lane died, MacBride became the guardian of the "Little House on the Prairie" series and produced a television version of it. He went on to become the Libertarian presidential candidate in 1976, but received no electoral college votes.

1976

Mike Padden, a Republican from Washington state, cast his vote for Ronald Reagan (who had lost in the Republican primary) over Gerald Ford, having decided that Ford was not definitively clear in his opposition to abortion. Edwards notes in his book that the 1976 election between Ford and Jimmy Carter was exceptionally close, and had Ford garnered slightly more support, Padden's faithless vote would have essentially resulted in a tie, throwing the election to the House of Representatives.

1988

Democratic elector Margarett Leach, a nurse and former member of the West Virginia Legislature, voted for vice presidential nominee Lloyd Bentsen as president and presidential nominee Michael Dukakis as vice president. "I wanted to make a statement about the electoral college," [Leach told the New York Times](#). "We've outgrown it. And I wanted to point up what I perceive as a weakness in the system — that 270 people can get together in this country and elect a president, whether he's on the ballot or not."

2000

Barbara Lett-Simmons, a Democratic elector from the District of Columbia, left her ballot blank to protest what she called the district's "colonial status," or its lack of congressional representation. Lett-Simmons later said she would have voted for Democratic nominee Al Gore if she thought he had a chance of winning. The presidential election that year, between incumbent Vice President Gore and Texas Gov. George W. Bush, was the closest in U.S. history, with 537 votes separating the two candidates in the deciding state of Florida. The narrow margin required a recount and ultimately necessitated a Supreme Court decision. In the end, Bush received 271 electoral votes and Gore 266.

2004

One Minnesota elector voted for vice presidential candidate John Edwards (actually spelled "Ewards" on the ballot) instead of presidential candidate John F. Kerry. That elector also voted for Edwards for vice president. It is not known who it was, since none of the state's 10 electors identified himself or herself as having cast a protest vote or having made a mistake.

2016

Christopher Suprun, a paramedic and former firefighter who was one of the first responders on Sept. 11, wrote in a [New York Times op-ed](#) in the run-up to the electoral college vote that Trump is "someone who shows daily he is not qualified for the office." Suprun said he had a legal right and constitutional duty to vote his conscience and planned to do so. On Monday, he cast his vote for Ohio Gov. John Kasich.

Another Republican elector from Texas, William Greene, cast his vote for former Texas Rep. Ron Paul, according to the [Austin American-Statesman](#).

(A third Texan, Art Sisneros, had also opposed Trump and resigned from the electoral college ahead of the vote. He was replaced by an alternate.)

In Washington, where voting for a person not nominated by the party carries a \$1,000 fine, four electors defected from Clinton, who won the state's popular vote.

Esther John, who voted for former Secretary of State Colin Powell, [told local media](#) she did so "in the hopes that Democrats and Republicans could reconcile."

Peter B. Chiafalo, a co-founder of the group Hamilton Electors, which seeks to change the electoral process, also voted for Powell. So did Levi Guerra, who, together with Powell, had previously attempted to challenge Washington's faithless elector law in court.

Robert Satiacum, an environmental activist, voted for Faith Spotted Eagle, a Yankton Sioux elder who has protested against the Keystone XL and Dakota Access pipelines.

In Hawaii, where Clinton won 62% of the vote, elector David Mulinix voted for Vermont Sen. Bernie Sanders because he thought Sanders was the “most qualified” candidate.

From <<https://www.latimes.com/nation/la-na-faithless-electors-2016-story.html>>

That's how that part of the system works. You vote and then the delegates go to the electoral college and they actually vote for who the president is. You might ask why is this system in place? That's the obvious question because that is a really weird system we have going on. The idea was that, you wanted to be able to have equal representation in the U.S. or equal voting power in the U.S. The way they are going to do this is through the electoral college. Let me explain that more. If you think about the history in which the electoral college is made, you are looking at 1787 with the constitutional convention and then 1789 when it is actually going to get ratified. In that time though, there were some big cities, big industrial areas, and then there was the rural country. In an effort to equalize the vote of the rural places and the vote of the cities, they gave the rural areas more voting power through this electoral system. Because what ends up happening is, it ends up equalizing to some extent. I know there are some problems with it and we won't go over all of them, but some of the powers are that it gives them disproportionate power. So you can have a small state with three to four times the voting power compared to someone like California which has millions of people in it compared to this small little state. At the time the way they were dealing with it was to make sure that it wasn't disproportionately voting because what they saw was that you can have places like New York, LA, San Diego, San Francisco, Chicago, some of these major cities in the U.S. If they all voted one way it wouldn't even matter if you were in Wyoming and you showed up to the poll that day. It just doesn't matter, your vote doesn't really count because those major cities voted and there's millions of people in them and they are all, to some extent homogeneous, and they all voted the same way. This was a way to equalize that problem. There are debates going on right now as to whether or not the electoral college is fit for purpose anymore. That's a whole other argument. That is generally how it works.

Like I said I want to try to recap what we have been doing and just sort of bind off where we are right now.

How did we begin? What was our first premise that we laid out?

The constitution is good.

How did we do that though?

We started in the year 1798. In 1798 what verse if being fulfilled in Revelation 13:11. You have the beast that is coming up out of the earth. Sister White comments that the word "coming up" means spring up like a plant. What we saw was that you can pull the agricultural system out of this verse since it's implicit with that in this verse, and it is bringing you to somewhere in that agricultural cycle, which we know to be where the plant is springing up at 9/11. So it is bringing you to that way mark. That time after you have a ploughed field but before you have a plant and growth process taking place. You are right there at that middle point. From this point we said that if you have this history here at 9/11 where the seed is growing, what must you have before it? You have to have a time where the field is being ploughed.

So we said we had this ploughed field but what did we say was the problem with this field before it is ploughed?

It's full of weeds, it's full of problems. So we said there must have been a time before hand with all these weeds and all these problems in it and somehow the U.S. is going to go through this process from a Fallow field to a ploughed field. The first thing that we have to identify is what is the problem that the U.S. is solving.

What did we say?

How It's going to govern?

What did sister white say. What are two problems that she raises?

She says there is royal oppression and priestly intolerance. She says that's the history that is taking place here during the 1260 years. It is the darkness that they are steeped in.

In order for that to be rectified, what has to come? What does the U.S. need to solve the problem of Priestly intolerance and royal oppression?

It needs knowledge, it needs a message.

What message is going to arrive, what did we day?

The DOI the message of freedom in 1776.

1776 you have the DOI and the DOI is going to say, it's time for a change of things.

What did A.T. Jones call the American Revolution? No how about this what does the great seal of the U.S. say on it?

A new order of things.

The American Revolution is this time where new order of things is going to take place. That new order of things is the idea of changing what we have done in the past. What sister White identifies is Priestly intolerance and Royal oppression. A civil problem and a religious problem, so what we need now is religious freedom and civil freedom. The way she is going to describe this in the nice phrases and in the nice way the chart describes it is, Republicanism and Protestantism. It needs those two things to solve the problem of the past. We identified Republicanism as the idea of the rights of the individual. It is the rights of the individual over the state. You have the rights of the individual over the states.

What is Protestantism?

Back to the Reformation?

When sister White and the pioneers are talking about Protestantism what are they talking about?

The German Princes who protested Rome.

What was Rome doing to the Princes?

Rome was forcing the Princes to do whatever Rome wanted. So these civil Princes come together and say no they are not going to do it anymore. They are not going to take Rome bossing them around and telling them how to run their countries so what they are going to do is they are going to protest Rome and they are going to say enough is enough. They come together and sort of rebel at that point. This is how Protestantism is borne. Protestantism in this constant isn't the idea of religious Protestantism but the idea of protesting Rome ad protesting Church and State.

Republicanism represents the individual over the state and Protestantism represents Church and State being separate. We identified that the principles of Republicanism and Protestantism find root in the DOI. This is when they are first given voice to.

Who were the founders who wrote the DOI writing it to?

Great Britain is impeding their freedom at this point and so they give GB a list of grievances. The founders say that they have rights that GB can't take away. Not only can they not take away these rights but I couldn't even give you these rights if I wanted to and GB is trampling all over those rights. They lay out this argument that they are justified now to break away from GB and to start their own government and do their own thing because GB has not been respecting them as a people. GB wanted to tax them and dictate to them without representation. One of the key places where we saw this illustrated was 10 years before in 1766 with the declaratory act.

What did the act say?

That the U.S. was subject to Britain. At this time what was happening is the U.S. was coming up with their own laws. They had something called the continental congress and they were coming up their own laws and Britain was saying that they are not allowed to do that. They said U.S. is under their subjugation and under parliament. Parliament is going to tell you what you can and can't do. They are not only saying that they have to do what parliament says but also that they have no voice in parliament.

If I tell you what to do without your say in it, what is that?

It's dictatorship and it's tyranny.

So they see this Tyranny here and they're horrified by it. There is going to be this space of time and they come to this breaking point where U.S. says enough is enough. They make their list of grievances with the DOI.

Then we said that the Idea of the DOI are just ideas and they are not formalized yet. They are going to increase and they are going to try to do the articles of confederation but that doesn't work. They are wrestling with how to make this work. They come to 1789 where they are going to found the constitution. The constitution is the formalized message of the DOI. Same principles and now it's going to just establish the Nation. From this point it's going to go further. Then the U.S. is here established in 1798.

We saw that we can take this line all the way to the SL.

Is the SL technically the end of the U.S.?

The constitution. What does the constitution represent?

It's the end of the Republic. From 1798 to SL is the history of the American Republic.

What starts at the SL? First what is a Republic?

It's the right of the individual over the state.

What comes at the SL?

A dictatorship. It's the American Empire.

What does an empire have?

An Emperor. This is going to take you to the close of probation. This is the history of the U.S. as the 6th kingdom of bible prophecy up until SL. And after is the history of the U.S. as the 7th kingdom of Bible prophecy. They are still going to have the right to vote. The problem is that somehow through events that are going to take place, they are no longer going to be protecting individual rights.

And we said that the constitution guarantees what things?

Freedom of Religion
Civil Freedom
Sovereignty of the people
Rights of the People

These are the things that go away when you come to the SL. Now they are already going away presently. It is a progressive fall. These are the things that are fully and completely destroyed by the time you get to the SL. This is what makes the U.S. a Republic.

When you remove those things where and in what history do you end up?

You end up in Rome but when is Rome?

You end up in the 1260. You end up back to the 1260 years of Papal persecution. What is this beast of the U.S. going to do at the SL?

It's going to persecute but what is it going to according to Rev 13?

It is going to speak like the dragon. It is going to force the people to make an image to the beast at this point. It itself is also going to make an image to the beast. So it's going to make the whole world make an image to the beast and it's going to have an image to the beast itself. What that is, is it's bringing the world and the U.S. to the 1260 years over again. We know that this is the history of the beast that it's trying to copy.

So you have the 1260 years. It is the 4th kingdom. We will call this the beast.

What is the beast? How do we describe the beast in this history? I don't mean in terms of the spiritual language but what it actually looked like.

The Church dictates to the state. But who were the players in that history?

You had the kings of Europe and the Papacy sitting on top of the kings of Europe. The Papacy was dictating to them saying this is what you have to do. Just like what we saw with the protest of the princes and the diet of Spires. They are going to say that they don't want Rome to dictate to them anymore and don't want to be under that yoke anymore.

The idea is that the kings of Europe are going to be subjugated to the beast. Then it is going to receive it's deadly wound.

Them who rises up?

The U.S.

You have the U.S. and what is so great about the U.S. at this point? What kind of government is it?

It's a Republic.

Then what is going to happen to that Republic? It is going to come to an end is now going to be an Empire.

What did we say the U.S. is going to do here? What does it make itself?

An image to the beast.

What is the image of the beast? What is an image?

It's a replica. Basically what I am asking when I say we are going to make a statue or image of sister Tess, we would make a little replica.

Is that Replica Tess?

No it's different from Tess but it looks like. It's a copy. So an Image is a copy. It is a copy of the beast.

Where is the beast?

No the beast isn't in the background waiting. The beast is dead. The beast is fully killed in 1798. The Papacy is still alive but the papacy is not the beast. The problem with calling the papacy the beast is that the papacy did not end in 1798. The Papacy has been around always. It never ceased to be the Papacy?

Cambridge Analytica Ltd (CA) was a British [political consulting](#) firm which combined [data mining](#), [data brokerage](#), and [data analysis](#) with [strategic communication](#) during the electoral processes.^{[5][6]} It was started in 2013 as an offshoot of the [SCL Group](#).^[7] The company closed operations in 2018 in the course of the [Facebook–Cambridge Analytica data scandal](#), although related firms still exist.^[8]

The company was partly owned by the family of [Robert Mercer](#), an American [hedge-fund](#) manager who supports many politically conservative causes.^{[2][9]} The firm maintained offices in London, New York City, and Washington, DC.^[10] CEO [Alexander Nix](#) has said CA was involved in 44 US political races in 2014.^[11] In 2015, CA performed data analysis services for [Ted Cruz's presidential campaign](#).^[9] In 2016, CA worked for [Donald Trump's presidential campaign](#)^[12] as well as for [Leave.EU](#) (one of the organisations campaigning in the United Kingdom's [referendum on European Union membership](#)). CA's role in those campaigns has been controversial and is the subject of ongoing criminal investigations in both countries.^{[13][14][15]} Political scientists question CA's claims about the effectiveness of its methods of targeting voters.^{[16][17]}

From <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cambridge_Analytica>

The Mercers

<https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2017/01/no-one-knows-what-the-powerful-mercers-really-want/514529/>

Project Blitz

<https://www.au.org/church-state/november-2018-church-state/cover-story/bracing-for-the-blitz-the-religious-right-has-a>

cod·i·fy

/ˈkɑːdəˌfiː, ˈkoʊdəˌfiː/

[Learn to pronounce](#)

verb

verb: **codify**; 3rd person present: **codifies**; past tense: **codified**; past participle: **codified**; gerund or present participle: **codifying**

1. arrange (laws or rules) into a systematic code.

synonym systematize, systemize, organize, arrange, order, marshal, set
ms: out, chart, structure, tabulate, catalog, list, sort, dispose, index, classify, class, categorize, compile, group, range, file, log, grade, rate, assort
"the bill codified these standards for the first time"

- arrange according to a plan or system.
"Verdi helped codify an international operatic culture"

What did we describe the beast as here during the 1260? Church and state. You need to have both together. You need to have a civil power and a religious power coming together to do a work of persecution. The Church has to be on top of the relationship. So we come down here and we they are going to make an image to the beast.

So what are we saying the image is?

It's a copy of the beast. So whatever the situation looked like here, that is what the situation is going to look like here. This is the copy of the beast.

Catholic church in the dark ages

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Church_and_state_in_medieval_Europe

What did we say that they need?

The Religious power and the Civil power.

What is the Civil power?

It is the muscle. It is the power that forces everyone to do what the church wants them to. The church by themselves has no power. It can't do anything. It has to use the civil power. To keep Sunday or to persecute or whatever the thing may be.

Who is the muscle here in 1260?

The seven kings.

Who is the muscle here in 7th kingdom?

The ten kings in Revelation 17.

Who is in charge of the ten kings?

Trump, the U.S. The U.S. is in charge of the ten kings. It's the U.S. that become the muscle for the Religious power here in this history. What we wanted to identify is that it is the end of the Republic and the beginning of the time of the Empire at this point. This marks the end of these things here.

Freedom of Religion

Civil Freedom

Sovereignty of the people

Rights of the People

All those things now are gone. If you want to know what makes the constitution good then you have to look at the problem that it solves. You have to juxtapose them. That is what we did.

What history did we look at to see the problem that was solved?

We looked at the 1260. It was the Papacy / beast that created the problem. We traced the history of the papacy at the beginning of the 1260. We used the agricultural model there when we looked at the papacy.

What did we say was the history from 508 to 538? What is this history?

If we look at the field what is happening to the field here?

It is being ploughed and it is being prepared. Prepared for what?

Prepared for the work that the field needs to do. What work does the field need to do?

It needs to grow the plant. The field isn't ready yet. It has to be prepared. This is a time period of preparation from 508 - 538.

What work does the Papacy need to do? What is their job function?

Persecute. He wants them to persecute people

The history of the beast is 538 to 1798. The field needs to be prepared. The situation needs to be prepared to get them to this point.

What gets them here in 538?

It is the beginning of the captivity for Gods people and the beginning of what for Babylon?

They are going to rule supremely. There is no competition for them.

What is the U.S. doing from 1798 to SL?

It is ruling supremely. No one is standing in it's way. People are trying in both histories to challenge them but no one is able to take them down. You can see here that this time period 538 - 1798 is the supremacy of the Beast and 1798- SL is the supremacy of the U.S. This means the history before that point is the predatory period and we said that that's 508-638.

Now what happens, if you can remember, ten years before 508? In 498?

What are the characteristics of this pope?

He is the first one to be called the Vicegerent of God. He is the first one to be called the judge of God. He is also the first one to start excommunicating empowers. Uriah Smith Talks about this. His name was Symmachus. This is Symmachus. What was he before? He was a pagan. He is a Pegan converted to Catholicism, which is important to the idea of conversion from Paganism to Catholicism.

What is standing in the way of the U.S. here in 1776 here in terms of its growth? What does the U.S. need to do?

It needs to be the American Republic. What is stopping it from being the Republic?

Britain. So what begins here?

They remove themselves from Britain.

What is happening here in 508? What is removed that is standing in the way of the Papacy?

Paganism.

So in every case something gets removed that is standing in the way. The thing that is always standing in the way is always the thing that was standing here before hand. If we made a long history and brought it back, this is the history of Pegan Rome. Pegan Rome is going to get removed here and now Papal Rome is going to get raised up.

Great Britain, being a symbol of the European powers, was ruling and now it's going to get taken out of the way but U.S. cutting the tie. Now the U.S. has the ability to rise.

What are the principles of the Papacy?

How would we know what their principles are?

Without saying anything specific how would we know what the principles of the Papacy are?

Using parables and what we have on the board how would we know?

Contrast it with the American Principles.

Freedom of Religion
Civil Freedom
Sovereignty of the people
Rights of the People

Opposite of this.

So those principles come in when Symmachus comes in and starts using his rights. The idea of church and state coming together really come in here in 498. this is when those principles are being seen. Church and state combo with religion on top. When did these ideas get formalized of the Papacy. 533 in Justinian's decree. He codifies them and puts those principles into law. Doi is ideas and constitution is put into law.

Who is the master of the Papacy in this history in 1260?

Satan.

He is the one where the message comes from. This message arrives for them and they will accept. In terms of what Satan's agenda is, is that message perfect? It's a masterpiece of deception. It is perfect and it gets codified. He has no complaints about it. Using the understanding of the, is the message of the freedoms that arrive here, are they perfect? Yes. That means constitution in 1789 is a perfect message.

We look at that idea of perfection in the Constitution. That is difficult for some people. Some say that there is slavery in the constitution. This is the idea we have to pull on. It lead us to the history of slavery in the U.S.

We started reading about it and saw that slavery is not explicitly in the constitution and it was left out in such way as to allow a correct reading of the constitution to show that slavery is wrong. We said that there is a problem here though. The problem is the states. The constitution allows the states to figure out their own business. If you have anything against the constitution it should be that it allowed states to have slavery.

Then we that we have two states. They will either use the constitution to say there is slavery or not. Then we saw that the idea of property in man is not in the constitution. We looked at Abraham Lincoln, Fredrick Douglas, and Charles Sumner, they all show there is no property in mand in the constitution. So you have good states and bad states arguing about this until 1861 where there is a point of separation.

What we saw was that this perfect document was being used to uphold these to opposite agendas. We overlaid our line on top of this and we saw similarities.

You have Time of end and increase of knowledge and formalization then later on a point of separation.

How did we make Raphia a point of separation?

The wheat and the tares are separated. There is a harvest there. We said that the government of the U.S. illustrates the same dynamics as our line. You have a message that comes down at the time of the end then that message gets formalized in the constitution.

What does the time of the end magazine produce for us? It produces a movement. I don't think it is an accident that in 1996 Future for America comes into being and gets its name. Even the ministry gets formalized at that point. What did the constitution create? A nation. This movement and this nation get established. 9/11 establishes us as a movement and 1798 establishes this country.

What happens no?

What does the parable of the agricultural model tell us we have?

Two groups wheat and tares. The wheat and the tares are going to grow together. We now they are opposites and we know they are going to fight each other. You have the good states being the wheat and the bad states being the tares. What made a good state and a bad state? Slavery. Based upon slavery we saw one was good and one was bad. We see here in our line that it is a prophetic doctrinal issue that is going on.

When we bring these together we can compare and contrast them what do we see inside of the states? Are states just homogeneous groups of people? No. You have people in the state that like slavery and people that don't. The states allow us to see the internal battle that is going inside the state. The state represent the individual and we know there is a battle going on inside the individual. The moment you decide if you are pro or anti-slavery you take a position and then eventually it comes to a separation.

What interesting is the idea of the harvest. Who is bundled first in the harvest? Who leaves in the history of the U.S.? The confederacy. They leave and the U.S. is trying to get them to stop but they just walk away. It is interesting because it was the same dynamic in the time of Christ. Christ didn't walk away from Judas. Judas got up and walked away. It is always the tare that walks away. John 6:66, everyone is standing there. There are good disciples and there are bad disciples. Christ is standing there and says you have to eat my flesh and drink your blood. The good disciples say amen we will do this. The others say you are a cannibal. They hear the same message and come to different conclusion. Then the ones that read incorrectly they stand up and they leave and never come back. That is the same dynamic here. Same with Judas and same with the states. They get up and they leave. It is always that the tare is going to walk away.

We saw the issue the of slavery. We are in summary mode so we are not going through everything but we saw all the issues there. We saw that within the individual there is the pro slavery and anti-slavery. What did we call these two things? Two rivers, the two streams. We these being identified in 1996 in the history of U.S. is pro slavery and anti-slavery. So think logically. If you say you only want half slavery? No so you have to pick a side. If you say you want a little slavery then you do want the whole slavery. You cannot be in the middle. This is the problem with Judas. He listened with both streams. Why was he in both streams? He thought he could handle it. He thought he could control Jesus at that point. He sees the two paths before him but he says to Christ that he can navigate between the two affectively enough to force you to be the king. Judas was too smart for his own good at some level. He was trying to manipulate the situation. In doing so he tried to be a state that said he's for slavery but also against. It doesn't work. And so he walks away and betrays Christ and then kills himself. He lays out the dangers of being in both streams.

I want to end with this point. We mentioned several issues. What were the issues that the constitution was correct on and falls on them in the correct way?

You have slavery in 1865. Suffrage 1920. Religious problem 1950's. That is Eisenhower and a nice history that we didn't get to talk about. Then Civil Rights in the 1960's. Gay rights 2015. All these histories the constitution ends up on the right side. But what I want us to see is that we are living in the year 2019. I want us to notice a couple things. Slavery is in 1865. If slavery was dealt with in 1865 then why do we have a civil rights problem in 1960's? It never went away. What happened in 1865? What was made illegal? Slavery. What is that? Slavery is a law. Slavery laws can't force the heart. The issue of racism in the issue of slavery never went away. Did the South give up slavery because they wanted to give up slavery? No. They were forced to stop doing slavery and what happened? They just became underground racist. They couldn't legally persecute you in terms of putting you on a plantation like they did before, but they still looked at you the same way. They still thought of them as inferior. Nothing changed in their hearts. All that changed was a law.

Now we come to the Civil Rights act. The problem from slavery to the civil rights movement was that there were all these racist laws in place. You have this problem from 1865 all the way to the 1960's. That is a hundred years. For a hundred years there is racism and discrimination. And now it turns into the projects and the Ghettos. Slavery never left. What happens with the Civil Rights Act? Another law. It says you racist people stop discriminating in your jobs. You have to stop segregation. They south fights is tooth and nail. That battle did not give up easily. They were then forced and the racism went underground again. That heart just goes underground. So we come down here to our time and we know that racism is still there. It never left the heart.

Now the discussion is about reparations. Why are we talking about reparations here in 2019? The reason we are talking about reparations here is because what never got given here 1865? Reparations. They were promised reparations but they never got them. This was supposed to be the 40 acres and a mule. That was the slogan at that time. It never got given. We are trying to fix a problem that we made more than a hundred years ago. How does a group of the U.S. feel about reparation? We are not given reparations to nobody. They refuse to acknowledge responsibility. It is the same heart that is in all these periods of time. We are dealing with the exact same problem that we were dealing with in 1787. What happened in 1787? The constitutional convention. They are standing there arguing about slavery. The U.S. and people in the world have never gotten over slavery. The conception of the U.S. to the present to 2019 the heart of slavery is present. All the way from the first day to now. What is that? It's racism.

What are we saying are the three main issues we have to deal with? Race, Gender and Conspiracies.

I just want to focus on these two for a second. Who is the symbol of race? Obama. Who is the Symbol of gender? Clinton. And we know we have Trump, he is our Conspiracy guy. I just want to focus on race and gender for a minute.

Racism from 1789 all the way to 2019 has never been dealt with in the sense that the heart has never been dealt with. It always pops it's head out whenever it can. What is the Civil Rights Act and Reparations. It's like Wack-a-mole. That's what all these laws are. We hit one mole and another pops up. So we keep having to deal with it.

Women. 1789 how are women in the constitution. They are not there. Depending on how your read it. How did the founders feel about women? They didn't think they had rights. Same thing 1920 you have suffrage and they Wack-a-mole it. Did the U.S. give that one away easily? No there was pretty much a civil war with that one too. Same thing with Roe vs. Wade. Do women have the right to control their own bodies? Does a woman have autonomy over herself? Here in Roe v. Wayde says she does. Women become an issue. This is 1973. 2019 we are at the same place and we are arguing over abortion. It's the same thing. You can go to other examples too but I just wanted to show this.

My point is that the heart of gender and race have never been dealt with. They continue to be a problem. Now we are at a point where God is telling us that we have not changed our hearts. He is saying to us today that it is not a U.S. that has a problem but the movement. He is saying that the 144K have an issue with Gender and Race. It has now been brought to us and we are the problem now. The issue now lies on us. We are the issue. We need to look at ourselves and see how am I discriminating with gender and race. God is saying that we have a lot more

problems then whether or not you believe in the 2520. No one here in this room would say they are racist. You may not be by the top level definition of racism but race and gender are so much more than the ideas of man or woman and black and white. This is tribalism. How do you feel about your tribe vs. someone else's tribe.