

Current Affairs # 13—Constitutions of Power

Sam Soleyn

May 12, 2019

As we continue our discussion of power, I want to take it out of the realm of spontaneous occurrences that may be used by whomever to say whatever. I want to speak about the more orderly understanding of power, because power underlies every culture that exists. Power does not exist to authenticate anybody doing anything they want to or saying anything they want to. Not unless you are the source of that power; then, you can do whatever you want to, say whatever you want to. But whenever power exists, there is the existence of a kingdom. And with that kingdom, there is an entire cultural framework for which power is the calling card. It is impossible to systemically exercise the power of the Kingdom of Heaven without any knowledge of the Kingdom itself. It is impossible to be a representation of a power you do not understand. We saw from the first message that within the Kingdom of Heaven, the delegations of power as between the Father and the Son, and ultimately to us, is rooted in the most intimate of relationships. “The Father is *in* Me; I am *in* the Father,” Jesus said; “Let them be one *in* Us,” as it refers to us (cf. John 17:21). Then, I spoke briefly about the mindset that is captured by and dominated by the Spirit of God controlling the mind of our spirit, thereby enabling us to exercise the legitimate authority of Christ.

Now I want to step back and talk about constitutions of power, which is to say that there has to be—and I want to pick up a term I introduced in the earlier presentation, the term: *basilica*—a foundation or basis of power and rule. That is endemic. It underlies the existence of every kingdom. Let me take a moment and explain this to you in contemporary terms. My intent is to show from where the constitution of power has been derived, as it relates to the Kingdom of Heaven. And further, to say that any delegate—anyone demonstrating the power of the Kingdom of Heaven—must be in abject submission to the King. I repeat: Any delegate *must be* in abject submission to the King, with no independence from the mindset of the King. This will empty out into a discussion of faith, and the work of belief that God has sent.

Because, you see, these concepts lead to a culture. It is this culture that has been lost. And it is this culture that has been thwarted by persons who desire to have the demonstrations of sovereign power with no intentions of submitting to that rule and that authority of the King, that will change their culture, that will change their mindsets. Culture, you see, is the filter through which we evaluate everything. You cannot have the culture of independence. You cannot have the culture

that promotes the individual as sovereign, and also be a representation of Christ. You cannot. It is impossible. When that comes about, you will seek an alternative of power—whether it is the consent of the governed, or the existing power of a state, or however you align yourself—and you will be intrinsically false. But, that is down the road. Eventually, I want to also in this series, talk about how this power is effective in engaging the enemy, and I want to entirely redefine the armor of God, as found in Ephesians, the sixth chapter. You can see I am on a trend to go into the very heart of unexplored country.

But, back to the notion of *basilica*. How is power constituted? By way of examples, let me speak of how a constitution of power has been formulated or constituted in the familiar venue of nations—kingdoms is another word, nations and kingdoms. Kingdoms may include multiple nations, but every independent nation, every nation truly independent, has a sovereignty of its own. In the United States, we used to belong, first, to the British Empire. Some of the persons before there were founding fathers decided that King George V of England was a tyrant and was taxing without allowing their voices to be heard in the circles of British governance. So, a revolution was engaged. Once the War of Independence resulted in the overthrow of British rule, the question was: What is the basis of our sovereignty? Now, prior to the war, and perhaps the first act of war, was a convention of the states that formed a constitution, the Constitutional Convention. At the heart of this convention was the question of the source of power. If the king, who was the source of authority and power, was overthrown—if the king’s authority was to be rejected—what would be the authority that would replace it? The answer was that the authority should arise from the “consent of the governed,” words that are terms of art. Because all of the people could not be called together every time a decision needed to be made, a decision was made that the people, based upon certain geographic and political definitions, would send representatives to a central government. This was spelled out in the agreements that formed this constitution of power.

The idea was that the people are the sovereign, therefore, they possessed and possess the greatest bundle of rights. These rights were said to have been granted to individuals “by their Creator,” and these rights were said to be “inalienable”—the term simply means you cannot alienate or give away these rights. Law and political functionings could never be presumed to take these rights away, because the basis of these rights were conferred by the nature of being. Which is to say, in

those days when those founding fathers still believed in the existence of a divine deity, a transcendent God who was also Creator, their view was that these are rights that are endemic to the creature. Of course, since that time we do not necessarily have unanimity of belief within the present population of the United States concerning those things, which of course is problematic to the issues of value and to the issue of culture itself. In fact, that is what is being played out. Because the sovereign, the people, in order to secure for themselves certain basic freedoms, which were considered fundamental, gave up portions of their rights to form a government that would be representative of the people and accountable to the people. In the famous words of Abraham Lincoln, “government of the people, by the people, and for the people” in his famous address. So, the people remain the sovereign. There was an acknowledgment at that time that the people could be the sovereign because they were possessors of certain inalienable rights—rights that could not be given away or they might ever be presumed to be separated from these rights.

The resulting arrangement of this power, given up out of this bundle of rights that the citizen is said to have by the prerogative of Creator and by the nature of being, was to be administrated through various forms. Three forms were evolved and in a sense, sovereignty was bifurcated into three components:

1) The Legislative Branch

One that formed the law to determine how the sovereign himself would be governed, namely, how the people would be governed. That was called the legislative branch—the branch that would legislate, which would make legal. *Legis* is from the root word, law or legal. The Latin word is *lex*, and the notion proposed by, actually, a British jurist was the term, *Lex Rex*, where the law is king, because it was what represented the will of the people. So there was the body that formed law, and it was comprised of two chambers: one that was elected to a shorter term, called the House of Representatives; and another that was elected to a longer term, called the Senate.

2) The Executive Branch

Once law is created, it had to be administrated. So, a ruling body that was headed by a chief executive was established, and that chief executive was called the president, whose job is to uphold the law in the Constitution of the United States in executive fashion, which is functionary. The idea was that law has to be executed, the law has to be administrated, so

an administrative branch headed by an executive was part of this sovereignty. And answering the question of overreach, whether or not the executive would be accountable to the law, the question was: Who would decide? Would the executive decide if he was properly following the law, or would the Congress decide that this was or was not their original intent?

3) The Judiciary Branch

So, a judiciary branch was formed. Again, the term “judicial” coming out of law speaks of juridical process, which holds the executive accountable and also which decides, in the case that the executive might appeal from the interpretation of law, whether or not the Congress acted properly within the scope of the authority that the people gave to them. So, the Supreme Court or the court system, the judiciary headed by the Supreme Court with a chief justice, had the authority to decide whether or not the Congress had acted properly in formulating law according to that grant of authority that the people had given to it.

That is the anatomy of the Constitution of power; it is the outline of it. Obviously, as the decades rolled by, as the centuries rolled by, for this that was formed in one period of time to continue to be representational of the people’s sovereignty, it had to be an evolving union. So, the people set out what they wanted for their sovereignty to promote within the domain called the United States and they elected three things: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Now, many believers do not understand. They assume, and they talk about, and certain of their preachers have promoted the notion that America is a Christian nation. It never has been. It could not be. Do you know why? Because, God was never the acknowledged sovereign, and the law is not the Bible. Now, it permits the individuals, as citizens, to hold beliefs in God, to hold beliefs in the Lord Jesus Christ, to hold beliefs in the Holy Spirit, and to hold beliefs in the Scriptures. The law certainly permits that, but certain ones have thought if we could influence the law to adopt the positions of Scripture, then we could have a Christian nation. That is bogus. I do not know how else to say it more emphatically. Because, until the nation’s sovereign ceases to be the people and starts to be Christ the King, we cannot presume in any way, in any manner, in any form that this is synonymous with the Kingdom of Heaven. And if it were, the goal of its sovereignty would not be the promotion of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, because whatever sovereignty exists, when it is given the form of law, it is to promote the ideals of its sovereign. Every kingdom, every nation exists to

put on display the nature of its sovereign. So, with ‘We the People’ as the sovereign, ‘We the People’ have decided that within the domain subject to our sovereignty, we will promote three things: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

That is why we have debates about when life begins. And for the Christian, life has divine purposes. For the non-Christian, life is as exists from the point where you are born to the point where you die, and law, they argue, should govern what happens when you are born to the time you die. It is the Christian idea, it is a notion of the Kingdom of Heaven idea, that you have purpose before you are born. That is not a secular idea. That does not come from sovereignty of the people as sovereign. Even if the individuals believe that, what constitutes sovereignty ultimately—functional sovereignty within the United States—is the majority of the people. Because it is the majority of the people who elect representatives to formulate law. The people we send to the Congress as our representatives are not sent as representatives of God or the Kingdom of God; they are sent as representatives of the people. And Christians keep being shocked when they vote the will of the people.

The problem is, we look up to certain ones of them because they know how to manipulate the population to get them to vote for them. And Christians are among the most gullible of constituents. These politicians will tell them, “Oh yeah, we will introduce this or that law” based upon their beliefs as believers, when the truth is they will only introduce law that does not jeopardize their re-election. Because without being in office, they have nothing. We keep losing money on the instant replay, as the joke goes. We keep sending people and talking about these people as if they are champions of the Christian faith. If they were, they would be apostles of the Kingdom of God. They would not be politicians. Where did we ever get the idea that the representatives of the people are also the representatives of the Kingdom of God? That is to have a truly Greek notion, which is enshrined in the term, *Vox Populi, Vox Dei*- “the voice of the people is the voice of God.” That is blasphemous. You are speaking here of a theocracy where God is actually sovereign, not where the people are sovereign. I am astonished at the ignorance of God’s people and how, because of that ignorance, they keep chasing vain hope that in the political process, somehow the ways of God are going to be advanced. Look, we have our own Kingdom. We have our own Kingdom, and there is no question about when life begins within that Kingdom.

It is why we have debates about liberty. All the debates about gun rights are about liberty issues. All the debates about the pursuit of happiness that are summed up in the debate over same-sex marriages, that is because that is some people's notion of happiness. In the kingdom in which the people are sovereign, the people have a right to have these discussions and they have a right to make these decisions. But do not let us for one moment confuse these issues with the nature of the Kingdom of God, because the purpose of *that* Kingdom is to put on display the nature of its sovereign, the Lord Jesus Christ, the King. His purpose was to show the Father. The Kingdom of Heaven is not about life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That is the kingdom of America. That is the kingdom governed by its own sovereign, the people. So, they will continue to have these discussions. And Christians are likely to continue to be duped into thinking that somehow they could coopt a kingdom based upon a sovereignty that is not the sovereignty of Christ, and somehow, by coopting it, they could make it a kingdom responsive to Christ.

In the process, they abandon altogether the existence of the Kingdom of God. That is why most of the proponents of a politically Christianized nation do not believe that the Kingdom of Heaven presently exists. They are waiting for Christ to come back from heaven to bring the Kingdom with Him. They do not understand that He established His Kingdom on the earth from the Day of Pentecost onward, and that that *basilica* projects His power and rule and projects the basis of His sovereignty in the earth, into and up to the present time, and will continue until He is released from the heavens to come back to the earth and to continue His reign over *all* mankind—over every kingdom and every nation. This is the great prophecy of Daniel, the second chapter. In the days of these kings (the days of the Roman kings), the God of heaven will set up a Kingdom that shall never be destroyed. It will break into pieces and it will consume all other kingdoms, and it will stand forever. It is the enduring Kingdom, the Kingdom of Heaven, but its mandate is integrated with and central to its prime purpose: the revealing of the nature of the sovereign King, who in turn, took on the responsibility to present the nature of the invisible Father. Look, as believers—members of the Kingdom of Heaven—we are not here to pursue our own lives. We died, and our lives are now hidden with God *in Christ* (cf. Colossians 3:3). We are not here to pursue our own liberty, for if the Son sets us free, we are free indeed (cf. John 8:36). And we are not here to pursue happiness; we are here to manifest the joy of His eternal existence within us.

In the next broadcast, I want to get further into this notion of delegated authority and the concepts of power and rule. Then, beyond that, I want to talk about the culture that results from the existence of this Kingdom. Further after that, I want to talk about the opposition that comes against the Kingdom and how our place in the Kingdom of God allows us to successfully demonstrate the sovereign power of the Lord to overthrow the rule of Satan, which has kept men in captivity and in blindness all of their lives.

I am Sam Soleyn. I hope you will continue to listen and join me in these discussions. God bless you. Bye-bye.