

Tyler Sena Part 2 Alberta Camp Meeting, June, 2019.

### **Explain Line On Pages:**

Let's just give a quick recap of what we have done so far. What we have said thus far is we have read from great controversy 440 and 441. We are still working through that actually and we saw that sister White identifies and the Bible identifies through the translation in the Bible that "coming up out of the earth" means to spring up like a plant. We saw this as an allusion to the agricultural model and so we applied that over the top. We know from the agricultural model that there is a certain point where the seed is sown and germination happens which is at the waymark of 9/11. We did that and we made that 1798 where sister White is marking this. We said that this is the point where there is a time period after that marks the full progress of the plant but there must be also a time before that marks a ploughing and a preparation of the field. So you have a field that is broken or has trouble that needs to be corrected.

So we dealt with that briefly and we identified that with the first AM is to dispel the darkness that took place beforehand and the first AM is given and then it is developed. There is then an increase of knowledge on that message and then a formalization which we are marking here at 1789 with the constitution. The message came in 1776 and then you come to the point of establishment. When you come to the line and look at this with the US the problem that needs to be dealt with is the European connection and influence. We identified a chain from Europe to US and that chain gets broken in 1776 with the declaration of independence. The declaration of independence lays out ideas that we identified as radically different. They were the exact opposite of what was taking place here in the darkness. Those principles are only just that at the beginning. They are an idea and through an increase of knowledge on those principles they come to a point to where those things get formalized into a constitution and organization begins of that. There is structure now to those principles. That constitution is the thing that becomes the source of strength and the test for the remainder of its time period. And there is going to be a progressive increase of knowledge that is going to take place from the beginning of this history all the way to the end just like in our reform line. If you were to overlay the TOE all the way to the end there is an increase of knowledge. Technically we don't mark it that way but technically this increase of knowledge just continues.

We identified when you see that increase of knowledge what it tells you is that the information at the end must be greater than that at the beginning. We said that our information base and our understanding of the constitution and the fundamental principles that are enshrined there in, should be greater than that of the founding fathers who established the document itself. We should understand that in a more deeper way. This is a big high calling. We identified that when you are looking at this line there is almost a contradiction because the US at one level is being destroyed, and by the time you get to the SL the constitution is null and void. But what we are saying about the constitution is that that is its finest moment. We use the line of SDA to illustrate that principle that Adventism as a whole is going to get destroyed as an institution but a remnant comes out of Adventism and that is the crown jewel of that system. I would suggest the same thing takes place here at the SL (on the line). I guess the easiest way to show that is that it's the same people. The same people that are coming out of Adventism are also coming out of the US and they have a correct understanding of the religious aspect of theology and prophecy and they also have a correct and developed understanding of the principles of their civic duties or the civic side. So they have a correct understanding of the church and a correct understanding of the state. I'm not saying church and state I am referring to them separately as two aspects.

Then we dealt with Rev 13. We are identifying and doing a little bit of an exercise in how to read properly. And how to come to an understanding of the verses just with the

chapter that we are already in. We are developing a narrative for Rev 13.

Tyler's Question: "Does some one want to give me summery of an overview of Rev 13? What narrative is it telling us?"

We said that there are these two beast the Prey the US and the Predator which is the composite beast made up of all these animals the papacy. It tells the story of the interaction between these two beasts. What it is really showing is the corruption of the second beast and it going back to the first beast to pay homage to it. We ended with a question and the question is.... What is the problem with the lamb that speaks like a dragon? What is the problem with that lamb? What is the problem with that beast?

Answer from the audience, " a lamb doesn't normally speak like a dragon, so it's not in it's character, to be a dragon.

Tyler "Amen"

So there is a contradiction here. You can't be a lamb and a dragon at the same time something is wrong about that. They are opposite symbols because if you are going to expand the context of what we are looking at and bring Rev 12 in that. Rev 12 is the story of the dragon and you can see from the very beginning of the dragon from Rev 12 it's a persecuting power just by the nature of the dragon.

Then that carries over into Rev 13 and we read in verse 2 that the dragon being spoken of here is the dragon from Rev 12 gives this composite beast its authority. We know it's a persecuting power and it gives its power here to this first beast but it has some connection with the second beast. That connection is that this innocent lamb looking beast is contradicting its character by speaking like a dragon.

My question; is can you do those things at the same time?

No. I mean you could, but, today we would say you could, and we would call that hypocrisy but we have no reason to believe that this animal is hypocritical at least form its conception. We know that when we read the quote that we are looking at is that this is representing a transition and is going to contradict its character by speaking as a dragon at the end of its life.

Let's go back to GC 440 and 441

Does anyone have any Question about Rev 13, and how we dealt with that?

(Answerer to inaudible question: we know that when the US speaks as a dragon it is speaking as a dragon in the 7th kingdom so there might be something to that.)

Any one else with a question?

"Not hypocritical, but a sheep in wolves clothing, Lying deceptive, manipulating, representing the opposite of it's character. But it's character has changed into a dragon. So not hypercritical.

Tyler: " I think I see your point, but yes we know the character changes, if you just take it in it;s isolation there two opposites being applied to the same animal, the same beast. Thats why I'm saying Hippocratic because you look like a lamb when I look at you from the external, you have the horns, the lamb thing on this beast. So we say we have this lamb like beast, but then it speaks something where acting like a dragon. So there is a problem, a conflict between it's profession and it's action.

Speaking means legislation..

“And he had two horns like a lamb.” The lamb-like horns indicate youth, innocence, and gentleness, fitly representing the character of the United States when presented to the prophet as “coming up” in 1798. The Christian exiles who first fled to America, sought an asylum from royal oppression and priestly intolerance, and they determined to establish a government upon the broad foundation of civil and religious liberty.

So what has Sis White done in this sentence?

She has explained Church and State, and has given you both sides of church and state. You have the bad side of Church and state ; which is Royal oppression, which is the civil and then you have the priestly intolerance. The Church.

Then she says the opposite of that the thing that they are trying to fix. The way they are going to try to fix it, is by introducing civil and religious liberty. She gives you both sides the Church side and the State side, there is a problem with both of them. Then sister White is going to connect the Declaration of Independence to the Constitution, and bring them together.

The Declaration of Independence sets forth the great truth that “all men are created equal,” and endowed with the inalienable right to “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.” And the Constitution guarantees to the people the right of self-government, providing that representatives elected by the popular vote shall enact and administer the laws. Freedom of religious faith was also granted, every man being permitted to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience.

Notice again that sister White is repeat and enlarging on that concept. She says, “The right to self governance and governing civilly. She also says the freedom of religion. She does the same comparison, repeat and enlarge 3 times.

Republicanism and Protestantism became the fundamental principles of the nation. These principles are the secret of its power and prosperity. The oppressed and down-trodden throughout Christendom have turned to this land with interest and hope. Millions have sought its shores, and the United States has risen to a place among the most powerful nations of the earth. {GC88

441.1}

So she identifies the problem, which is “Civil, Royal oppression, and Religious priestly intolerance. To Solve that they are going to enact civil and religious liberty. She goes on to say “Self government and Freedom of religion, then she gives the same aspect but using different words, saying “ Republicanism and Protestantism.”

Question, Can someone define for me Republican and Protestantism? Using the paragraph?

Answer; “ Republicanism is free from royal oppression, it has self governance and Protestantism is free from priestly intolerance and has freedom of religious.

So sister White is giving a repeat and enlarge several times of the same thing. Republicanism would be Civil liberty, it would be self governance, and Protestantism is religious liberty and freedom of religious faith guaranteed by the US constitution.

What is the problem with Protestantism and Republicanism? A different way to ask this question, What is the problem with the United States. ?

Answer “ It's a contradiction of the First Amendment. The first Amendment allows freedom of all religion, not just protestant.

The First Amendment in the USA is the establishment act or claws, and it doesn't allow the government to choose a faith.

But Sister White is saying here the secret to the success to the states, is the fact that it is the protestant and republican, and those are secret to it's USA power.

So there seems to be a contradiction, where the USA is Republican and Protestantism, but the First Amendment is saying that There is a separation of church and state. But it also sounds like she is enforcing a religion for the USA.

Question: What is the definition of Protestantism?

Answer: The protest of Rome.

Question: Who were the first people to protest Rome?

Answer: The Princes.

Question: Who were the Princes?

Answer: The German Civil Leaders

Protestantism is born out of a Civil Action. It's the idea that the church was trying to tell the state what to do. And the state said your not going to tell us what to do any more. The princes came together they are not religious, they are not priests or what ever. These Princes came together and said we are not going to let Rome tell us what to do any more, and they Protested agains Rome. This is where the name Protestant comes from, the Diet of Spires- The foundation of Protestant has nothing to do with the Protestant faith. All it means is to protest against Rome for telling the civil power what to do.

This paragraph is not about anything to do with Christianity It is the identification of protestantism protesting the combination of church and state. That the church dictates anything to the state.

This quote makes the USA a secular government, which is important to see, its not established on any faith.

Its a very tricky situation where you can trap yourself in making the USA a christian nation.

1789 was the beginning of the Constitution, and they go for 10 years. (Referring to the Reform Line)

Cut info, Adriana's notes

Moving forward. I want to read a quotation from PK. Before I do I want to just bring us back to here. The problem in Europe is it a European problem? Is it a European only problem? No it's a worldwide problem. And one thing I want us to see is that the answer to the problem starts in

the US but one of the things that we are going to see, and even now we see it with the idea of two streams of information, that it's not a localized problem. It's a problem of the mind and it's a problem that goes global. It's a global issue that effects everyone so the European mind was a global problem

and the US was a local solution that was going to try to fix the problem. And they did fix the problem until the SL. So my question is what started off in the US was supposed to go to the World? Do we understand that? So it did and what you see take place is from this point forward from the 1780's you have a similar situation taking place in France with France having a very similar constitution and they are trying to do the same thing. They are trying to overthrow the European problem. What's the problem with France? there is a distinction between France and the US because they are trying to do the same thing and they have the same tools to do the thing to some degree. What I mean by tools is they have the same constitution to some degree but one brings you to freedom in 1798 and to the US and all that but the other one takes you to Napoleon.

So there is a problem they actually start out in the same way but they end up in complete opposites. but part of the reason was the influences of the people. But what I want us to see is that the same time this is taking place in the US is that the idea of freedom that was established here begins to sweep across the world and many people look to US in that time as "we want to do what the US did and overthrow our masters, to overthrow Britain and India, you know to overthrow the French or the Dutch, or the colonial powers and institute the same thing and there is varying successes around the world.

But what I want us to see is that the idea that started in the US the goal of what God was trying to do was not to isolate that truth and to make an isolated place of freedom but to spread freedom around the world was to spread the idea of freedom in the mind. By example.

Let's read this quote PK 708.

Ancient Israel fell into a very particular trap...Suggestion that the USA has fallen into that very same trap...

Through messages such as those borne by Malachi, the last of the Old Testament prophets, as well as through oppression from heathen foes, the Israelites finally learned the lesson that true prosperity depends upon obedience to the law of God. But with many of the people, obedience was not the outflow of faith and love. Their motives were selfish. **Outward service was rendered as a means of attaining to national greatness.** The chosen people did not become the light of the world, but shut themselves away from the world as a safeguard against being seduced into idolatry.

So one of the problems and hopefully we will talk about this if we get the time is that the US at one point try's to close itself off from the rest of the world. And depending on what president you are under and exactly how they want to characterize that but this is the idea of isolationism which took place during before WWI when that concept was really trying to be pushed. It was something they struggled with and that is part of the reason why it was hard for the US to get involved with WWI and WWII is because of that concept. But what I want us to see here is that Israel the internal was supposed to be the light of the world. I am saying that the US is also supposed to fall into that same category. The Israelites had the spiritual truth. The US here has the civil freedom, civil truth.

All I wanted to pick up with that quote is that in the external the US should be giving a message of freedom to the world and internally during the same period of time God's church should be giving a message of spiritual freedom as well.

Switching gears...

part of what I want to do is I want to read from AT Jones. This document is called *Appeal from the US supreme court decision making this a "Christian Nation"*. And just to give you a little bit of back story on what we are going to read A.T. Jones is addressing a supreme court decision based upon a particular problem that was going on in the US at the time. And part of the problem was an immigration problem to some extent. Importing workers. And the problem was that at the time there were laws that said you can't bring in hired help from outside the US if it takes the job away from a US labourer at the time. So if you have an American Citizen who can take the same job you have to give it to the US Citizen and you can't give it to a foreigner and bring them in. Part of the reason they wanted to do this is because they had a lot of unskilled being brought into the US and they would pay them a lot less than they were going to for the American counterpart for that same person. Very similar issue

that we have going on today in the US and a lot of countries actually. This is what kind of kick the problem off. There is a court case about it. This specific problem was that a church was hiring a pastor from Europe to come to the US to do a certain work for them. There became this controversy over that. The Supreme court rules in such a way and most of it is fine but they add something about the Christian nation that we are a Christian nation into their decision and A.T. Jones is going to comment on that. He gives a very long explanation for why that's wrong and how they went wrong in that history. So that's just a little bit of context. But we are not going to read most of it because of how long it is. Its 50 60 pages. But we are just going to read a couple pages. What we want to highlight is the understanding that he has of the declaration of independents and the constitution. So one of the things I want to do is I want to look at the constitution a little bit. Just some of it. We have already looked at the declaration of independence a little bit but A.T. Jones is going to give us an amazing explanation of this time period here and the problem that they faced in Europe.

So I'm not going to read that protest because he explains what I just told you to some degree about the decision. We are going to start where is says "On the reverse side of the Great Seal".

On the reverse side of the Great Seal of the United States there is a Latin inscription—*Novus Ordo Seclorum*—meaning "A New Order of Things." This new order of things was designed and accomplished in the American Revolution, which was the expression of two distinct ideas: First, that government is of the people; and, second, that government is of right entirely separate from religion. {1893 ATJ, AUSSC 3.3}

*So someone summarize those two things. Give me two different words for them. So he says there are two ideas. He says on the Great Seal it says "A new order of things" so he saying the new order of things is accomplished here. The process from 1776 -1789 the process of these principles being identified and then being established in the constitution, is the overturning of the established order of things. The established order of things at that time is the European mind it's the European influence. So he is saying it gets accomplished here and he says there are two things. He says the first one is that government is of the people and second that government is of right entirely separate from religion. So give me two words that classify those two phrases. **Republicanism and Protestantism**. He is using that without saying those words he is saying those things. So Republicanism by A.T. Jones definition is that Government is of the people and Protestantism is of right entirely separate from religion. That answers our understanding of the problem of the word Protestantism. He is using the same idea but he is framing it in a different way that answers to the problem we were stating before. So the new order of things comes with the American Revolution*

These two ideas are but the result of the one grand fundamental principle, the chief corner stone of American institutions,— And this is briefly comprehended and nobly expressed in the following words of the Declaration of Independence:— {1893 ATJ, AUSSC 3.4}

*So now he is going to tell you what that phrase is or what the principle is that is the corner stone of American Institution. And he says that first you can see it in the Declaration of independence. He is going to quote from the declaration.*

"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**. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that when 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 a new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness." {1893 ATJ, AUSSC 4.2}

Thus in two sentences was annihilated the despotic doctrine, which, springing from the usurped authority of the papacy to sit in the place of God, and to set up and pull down kings, and to bestow kingdoms and empires at its arbitrary will, had become venerable, if not absolutely hallowed, by the precedents of a thousand years—the doctrine of the divine right of rulers: and in the place of the old,

false, and despotic theory of the sovereignty of the government and the subjection of the people, there was declared, to all nations and for all time, the self-evident truth, the subjection of the government and the sovereignty of the people. {1893 ATJ, AUSSC 4.3}

*So what has he just done there? It's switched. The papacy was saying the doctrine of the divine right of rulers which is monarchy's and kings. They are saying they have a divine right to be your ruler and he is saying that all gets overturned and the self-evident truth that the founders realized was the principle of not that they had divine rule but the exact opposite the subjugation of the government and the sovereignty of the people. So the government is now subordinate to the people.*

This self-evident and unalterable truth of the supremacy of the rights of the people in government was set forth as the fundamental principle of the government of the United States when the national Constitution was formed; for the preamble to that document announces that— {1893 ATJ, AUSSC 4.4}

"We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America." {1893 ATJ, AUSSC 4.5}

So what has just happened. The US is founded not on the fact that the US has power in an of itself to be a nation but the exact opposite that the people found the government and they say we give you power to be a government. It's the exact opposite of what has taken place in the past 1260 years. And so the idea of the rights of the people is the idea that is enshrined in the constitution.

He is now going to quote from the 9th and 10th amendment to the constitution. The 9th and 10th amendment for those who don't know are part of what section of the US constitution? It's the bill of rights. Does anyone know what the bill of rights are?

It's the Bill of rights.

This is important. So the constitution says all the things it says and one of the things that it adds is a means by which you can change or amend or add things to the constitution. This is the amendment system. You can add things to the constitution. So there is an amendment system and the first thing they amend is, the first thing they do is add something called the **bill of rights** and the bill of rights is the first 10 amendments to the US constitution. The reason this is important is because at the time there is a problem. There is a battle between federalists and antifederalists. The federalists are the people who want big government (highly involved government) and the antifederalists are the people who want small government. And they have this battle that takes place. We will probably talk about that at some point. So the bill of rights was placed in there as a sort of compromise for the antifederalists to appease them because they felt that the constitution didn't explain their rights well enough as individuals. They wanted it to be explicitly mentioned that they had certain rights. And these two rights make up the last two amendments of the bill of rights. They are important. They are part of a more special part of the constitution. They end they are the last two thoughts of the bill of right.

And this truth became an established and everlasting fixture of this government, when the ninth and tenth amendments were adopted, for Article IX of Amendments says:— {1893 ATJ, AUSSC 5.1}

"The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people." {1893 ATJ, AUSSC 5.2}

There are a couple things I want us to pick up. One is what is the enumeration in the constitution of certain rights? Which rights are enumerated? What kind of rights are these? These are the rights you can't take away and they are the rights you can't give away. Those are the rights that are being talked about. So you have certain rights that are explicitly said in here. They are not to be used to deny or disparage other rights that are not enumerated in there. A.T. Jones is quoting this because he's identifying that the sovereignty of the individual or the people is greater than the power of the constitution. He is saying that there are rights that the government can't touch. It's saying you can't

use anything in the constitution to affect my other rights.

And Article X of Amendments says:— {1893 ATJ, AUSSC 5.3}

"The powers not delegated to the United States by this Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." {1893 ATJ, AUSSC 5.4}

So it's saying again it's the idea of the sovereignty of the people that the constitution and the government of the US isn't getting it's power from the fact that it has it's own self-evident power. It's getting it's power because we delegated (turned over) that power to it. We all come together and we say we are going to form a government right now. But we are going to form this government on the basis that everyone here is sovereign. And that you have certain rights that I can't touch nor can you give away and those have to always be protected. So we all come together and we say that. And we say ok Sister Christine ( we will make her the symbol of our government) we'll say Sister Christine, you can have this authority over us and we are all going to play by this social rule this social contract but there are certain things you can't do. And those things you can't do is you can't step on our unalienable rights. **What you need to see here is that sovereignty comes from the individual.** This is immensely important when we start looking into this history and as we go even further into our time today there is always the question of.....Let me say it this way there is always an underlying principle that touches what's being said here about the rights of the individual vs. not the rights of the individual.

Talking about Religious freedom..

It is, however, the rights of the people with respect to religion with which we have here particularly to deal, as religion is the subject of the Supreme Court decision and the acts of Congress that are to be noticed. {1893 ATJ, AUSSC 5.5}

The right of the people of the United States to be religious or not religious, each one for himself alone, without any notice or interference of the government in any way, is a natural, a constitutional, and a divine right. {1893 ATJ, AUSSC 5.6}

So he's now placing that in that framework. Again the reason we are going through this is to identify the differences. And we are going to do this in another way later. But what we are trying to do is identify this period of time here before 1776 and this period of time after 1776 where the new order comes in. The new order of things as it says. One of these is the fact that you have, where before it was the government was the one who had the power and the people were subordinate, now the people who have the power and the government is subordinate. And now he is saying your religious affiliation your idea to be religious or not religious is a constitutional and a divine right. It is a natural right.

Ending with this point. And this is an amazing point because they identify something that I think is particularly for us today as we come to the end of this controversy. Giving a little a little of the story. They want to make a law and it's before the constitution its in this time period a little bit before. They are going to try to make a law that says we can support pastors with state money. Basically what that's going to do is establish a religion because there is a and episcopal church that they are going to give money to, to support their pastors. What is going to happen is that Thomas Jefferson and James Madison are going to apposed this bill and this is in Virginia. A bill establishing the provision for teachers of the Christian religion that's what it is sorry. And there is a divide over it. One this that Thomas Jefferson and James Madison are going to do is fight against this. They are going to be the opposition. In the United States you have the federal government. As we all know you have the US government it's the federal government. And under the federal government you have the state government you have all 50 states. And the State has a government within themselves. And there is always friction and always has been friction between the government between of US and its satiates. And the friction and the distinction between state law and federal law are really important when we talk about the constitution when we come to slavery. It actually becomes important when we talk about a lot of issues but Slavery is the biggest one we are going to talk about. And so I just want to introduce the idea that there is always this friction between the federal government and state government. This



one we are talking about now with the funding of Christian teachers in Virginia becomes a religious problem. And so James Madison and Thomas Jefferson are going to be the opposition they are going to fight against this and they are going to write this long thing. We aren't going to read the whole thing I just want to read part of it.

"3. Because it is proper to take alarm at the first experiment upon our liberties.

What does this mean?. An experiment is the first challenge to our liberties.

We hold this prudent jealousy to be the first duty of citizens, and one of the noblest characteristics of the late Revolution.

So what they are saying is we literally just went through this history where our ideals were challenged our right were challenged and we took offence to that and we got into action. And he is saying that is one of the noblest and one of the first duties of the citizen is to realize when their freedom or their liberties are being challenged.

The freemen of America did not wait till usurped power had strengthened itself by exercise, and entangled itself in precedents.

He's talking about the men in the American revolutionary war. When sister Tiffany was talking about "In God We Trust" those are what I would say are precedence. And we let ourselves get entangled in precedence. Does everyone know what a precedence is? When you set a standard you set a standard of how we are going to deal with this type of case. There is sort of an understood rule that you are not supposed to go against precedence as much as possible if its good precedence. He is saying here that the founders didn't wait until Britain entangled itself in these precedence of usurping our power and we struck before it happened. But I am saying things like "In God We Trust" are precedence that have been set for over 50 years and now we are at the point to where those things are now enshrined into a generation of people to the point to where many people never knew when the idea of "In God We Trust" came into history. They just take it that we always had it since the conception of the constitution. They think it's always been there. Those things are the problem they are identifying there.

**They saw all the consequences in the principle, and they avoided the consequences by denying the principle.**

In this whole document that's the nicest phrase I have ever read. It's really nice. That is reasoning from cause to effect. Actually its even before cause to effect because there is no effect yet. It that we see the principle and we see where that consequence leads and we don't want to go there. They say we deny the principle thus we never get to that point. This is a problem we have had in the US that we as individuals we don't often understand the consequence of a principle and we don't understand where it leads. And there is the whole problem of policy and principle. This has implications in a lot of different ways but one of them is in the idea of understanding principles and understanding the effect of principles have.

We revere this lesson too much soon to forget it. Who does not see that the same authority which can establish Christianity, in exclusion to all other religions, may establish with the same ease any particular sect of Christians in exclusion of all other sects?

So this idea of the power of the government to remove a right or to establish a right is something that the founders dealt with and its even going to worm it's way into the idea of slavery and this is something we will talk about. It's the idea the government can be so strong that it takes away your right or that it establishes someone else's right instead of yours and so you never want government to get to that point to where it has the power to either remove your right or establish someone's else's right. You know something like that.

that the same authority which can force a citizen to contribute threepence only of his property for the support of any one establishment, may force him to conform to any other establishment in all cases whatsoever. {1893 ATJ, AUSSC 10.3}

I want to summarize what we have been talking about. We went through this line earlier and the last presentation and we looked at Rev 13 and what we spent most of our time on this presentation is we have been going through A.T. Jones document on this supreme court case and we are trying to identify the principles that he defines as the or the seal the US constitution describes is the New Order of things. And the New Order of things takes place during the revolution and it changes everything that was before it. So you have the old order before the revolution and the new order after. And the new order is established on two principles and he describes them as "Government is of the people and that Government is of right entirely separate from religion". So it's Protestantism and Republicanism become the new order of things that are written within here. And the principle that undergirds all that is the principle of the sovereignty of the individual over the state and so what I want us to see is that all these principles that are new are going to become apart of the constitution and are going to effect everything down the line.

At 9/11 what are we supposed to do in terms of the pioneers? This is an old thing we don't talk about this much anymore. At 9/11 we can mark it there but we know we have a duty to return to the old paths and to get back on track to where you have gotten off track. In doing so we realized we need to go back to the beginning of Advent history to understand the history in which you live in presently. And once you understand the past you can now operate and maneuver through the preset in a better way with all the spiritual implications. The same thing is true here with the US constitution. For us to navigate the political world and to navigate the conflicts that we know are coming in the future. The idea of the SL. We have to go back to the old paths of the US in the constitution and see the principles that were laid forth the paths themselves and see where we went wrong and see where those....we need to do what A.T. Jones said James Madison said. They saw the consequence in the principle. We need to see the consequence in the principle. When we see the principle set forth here in the constitution we see the principle we can understand the consequence of where we would be going. We can extrapolate into the future.

**END**