

# The role of government: a fourteen-year olds response

Today I had the privilege of speaking at another Institute on the Constitution American Club where I graduated a host of young people from our U.S. Constitution Course! These clubs are comprised of young people who desire to learn and live the Biblical, American View of Law and Government.

During this presentation I asked the question, "Is abortion legal in America?"

One 14-year-old student named Camden answered "no," because it was murder and further explained that the courts aren't listening to God.

Camden nailed it. And I am so glad, because for years we have accepted what appears to be, rather than what is.

You see, many people have taken stances on issues of morality based on "what appears to be" considered the "law" today, rather than on "what is" the law based on the liberty and equality of the Laws of Nature and Nature's God.

There are many examples of industries in this day and age that are in some way, shape, or form, considered moral from the statutory standpoint of some public officials. They are in turn protected, and anyone seeking by force to put an end to these actions would be criminally prosecuted.

Many would say, "Of course there is nothing immoral about bars or restaurants that have nude dancing, or a doctor killing an unborn child; they are both legal."

Fifty years ago our country would have considered the above to be immoral and unacceptable to civil society. I would submit to you that this is a correct moral stance based on "what is".

This is because nature's God has said to His creation, "Thou shalt not kill", or "Thou shalt not commit adultery," and "even if you look on a woman to lust after her, you have committed adultery with her in your heart." This is a FIXED law that cannot be changed or abolished, regardless of what men or governments do or say.

All of you would agree that to lie under oath and cause unwarranted incarceration, or even death, would be immoral. If we were to change our laws to accommodate those who commit perjury, would it still be immoral? What if we stated that the family of a murder victim was required to pay for the rehabilitation of the murderer, no matter what the circumstance, would that be moral? How about a law that stated a woman was protected to kill her child within 2 weeks after giving birth, would that be moral?

Thomas Paine, in his book "Common Sense," stated, "A long habit of not thinking a thing wrong, gives it a superficial appearance of being right..."

Should we judge what is right and moral by "what appears to be" or "what is"?

The lesson for America today has not changed in 200+ years; God does not change in His character or justice. His Law is perpetual, and if we expect to abide secure under what the Preamble of the U.S. Constitution calls His "Blessings of Liberty", we must, with Camden, judge our own morality by "what is," not "what appears to be."

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and his "Institute on the Constitution" and receive your free gift.

© 2016 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved