

14a. There is no Church - State Union - Part 1

Tess Lambert, 21.05.2022

Youtube Video

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=F12H880Qxeg&t=1s>

[00:00:06.130] - Marie

Dear God in heaven. Thank you for the Sabbath day and for the rest and for the blessing. I thank you that we can all come together and be benefited by this afternoon Vespers. I pray that your Holy Spirit will be here to help us to grasp the importance of what Elder Tess is teaching us. Help us to not miss the key points. Help us to be able to take it away and meditate on it. And allow it to change us, change our minds, change our behaviors, change the way we think. In your mighty name, Amen.

[00:00:55.370] - Tess

Amen. Thank you, Marie. That was an encouraging start. We've lost our board work from last night. Which isn't a negative because of the fellowship we had this morning. I just saw something on the New York Times that I thought was interesting to mention. We know the election is today. And it validated what we were seeing. They make this point about the Australian election. They say that the coalition in many ways is being pulled to the right wing on a number of issues. And there is an increased effort by labor to move to the center to try to pick up some of those moderate Liberal voters. That's Natasha Kassam, director of the Public Opinion and Foreign Policy Program at the Larry Institute. It's interesting to hear it said so explicitly what I think we've seen and said. The Liberals are moving even more right wing. I suppose the coalition has something to do with that. But the labor party tries to pick up the centrist voters they've left behind. And they make the point that this is really strategic. And some of them say how clever this is, that it's really clever because they're trying to pick up the centrist voters that the Liberal Party in moving more and more right wing is left behind.

[00:02:36.400] - Tess

It's left that left wing portion a little bit more empty, at least when it comes to the two most major parties. It's just interesting to hear that. A small comment on the election. I asked last night, why are we studying the Trinity? And I think all of the answers were good ones. I didn't see anything that I would disagree with. They were all reasonable. They were all, I think, defensible. But I believe the most important reason that we're doing this is not to see what is in existence outside, but what is in existence inside the movement. And to try and demonstrate how that happens, I talked about straw man arguments. Waiting for someone to write to me and say straw person. I'm not sure. That straw person image that we can create. And it's very tempting because that is what especially since the beginning of cable news has been popular on both sides. Although the left wing is often accurate. For example, on abortion. They're always seen as creating a straw man argument where the right wing is trying to abolish Roe versus Wade. And the right wing would say, no, we're not.

[00:04:15.140] - Tess

We're just nice little Supreme Court justices. We know what precedent means. And often the left wing was quite accurate in how they portrayed the right. And the evidences of that are becoming more and more apparent. But it is still something that both can engage in. And this isn't something new that's being said in these classes. We went right back to a Libertarianism when we discussed the Freedom Truckers. We made this point. It's all too easy for the media to go down to those protests and see the neo-Nazis and find the swastika. That's what happened. News now is built upon ratings. That they need engagement. It's not just there to share news. It's now increasingly become a form of entertainment. The written media is a lot safer than what people find on cable. CNN is a headline, but I would probably not watch CNN. I'd go to a written source. But it is based on viewership and engagement. They're going to speak to their base. They go to the Freedom Truckers in Canada. They'll take those cameras and show their base something sensational.

[00:05:49.620] - Tess

And it is there. The far right is there. They'll find a swastika, they'll find the neo Nazis, they'll find the white supremacists. But when they do that, the problem is they miss all these people. When they find the neo-Nazis, they miss Bob, who has been trucking for 30 to 40 years, and is concerned about the erosion of his freedom. He's there with his grandkids who doesn't want violence. And that is a much larger portion of that group than the neonazis. I feel like I should swap this around as more reflective of right wing and left wing. So I don't confuse. When we put it all over here. All too easy to say, and not just for people in this movement. It's all too easy for those who consider them Democrat or progressive in the United States to say, look how good we are. Because we don't like swastika's, we don't like neonazis, we don't like white supremacy. Aren't we great? It's too easy to do that. We needed to go in and see the argument about freedom. And I wanted to sell it. I wanted to make it look beautiful.

[00:07:17.930] - Tess

Small government, education, individual philanthropists doing that work of educating. Raising money to support schools and mental health institutions. And churches taking care of the poor and the needy. That's their purpose. It's built around such a beautiful argument. I wanted to see us to see the beauty of the argument, that we could identify the libertarianism in ourselves. And then have us see the reality of that. When it comes head to head with equality. And how that is playing out prophetically in the United States over civil rights. And then if we don't get what's happening in the last 30 years. Take it back to the civil rights movement. And say, you like that picture? We need to start dismantling the Civil Rights Act. We didn't quite get into the far right, the militia groups, Gavin McInnes, the Proud boys. But that's where you also see all of it. And when it's sold to young men, predominantly young men, it is sold as a beautiful package. And that is what is so dangerous. And that is what has been pervasive throughout this movement. And some people, a minority. But some people have written to me since those presentations and said, I get it now.

[00:08:59.300] - Tess

I was thinking that way. I thought freedom was beautiful. That's why I was doing these things. Or wearing these things or acting this way. And now I can see it. And that has been encouraging. I just wish it was not a minority. So we can't just go to the freedom protests and see the swastika is. There is a reason there are swastika's there. There's a demographic in which you feel comfortable and there is a demographic in which you don't feel comfortable. And there is a reason that far right groups feel comfortable in that environment. I don't know how many people have a Netflix account, or know someone who does. Even if you were to spend a little. I don't like to promote things that cost. But I do think it is worthwhile to get one if you don't have one, or try and get in contact with someone that has one. And watch the two part Netflix documentary series on Jimmy Savile. Does everyone know who Jimmy Savile is? Does anyone not know who Jimmy Savile is? Moli, do you know who he is?

[00:10:29.150] - Tess

No? A few people don't know who Jimmy Savile is. This is a very painful documentary. Does anyone know who he is? Who would like to explain who he is? If not, I'll just open up Wikipedia and do my best. Katherine.

[00:11:05.230] - Catherine

He was a philanthropist and a fundraiser for some health institutions in England, I think. And then he was exposed not all that long ago for having abused girls in those institutions.

[00:11:40.770] - Tess

Yes, he was a cultural icon for about half a century, 50 years. One of the most famous figures in the UK. From about 1950 through to the early 2000s. He died in 2011. An English DJ, television and radio personality on the BBC. Hosted a number of shows, including shows targeting children. Jim will fix it. He'd take requests from children who wanted him to fix something. And then he'd meet these children and he'd fix things. He was a huge philanthropist. He raised an estimated £40 million for charities during his lifetime. Was widely praised for his personal qualities and as a fundraiser. The problem was that for over 50 years, he was sexually abusing, mostly underage women. I can't express how awful that documentary is to watch. But it is so educational on how society and culture treats these personalities. But the reason I mentioned him in this context is because he had an order of the British Empire. And one of the reasons he got knighted, it's Sir James Wilson Vincent Savile. One of the reasons, especially that he was knighted, was that Margaret Thatcher petitioned the Queen over and over again.

[00:13:26.530] - Tess

Margaret Thatcher loved Jimmy Savile. In fact, the whole Royal family loved Jimmy Savile. When there was national emergencies, a disaster, a plane crash. Prince Charles actually wrote to Jimmy Savile and said, you're really good with the public. You tell us. You tell the Royal family how we can respond to the public, what we need to say. How we need to present ourselves before the public. And he sent the Royal family. And it was given to the Queen to read advising the Royal family on how to handle themselves in public view. He was the favorite of Margaret Thatcher. He was also very popular with Princess Diana. She just used to go visit him to hang out. He was incredibly popular. But his misogyny and sexual abuse of

underage women was not very hidden. And the reason I just mentioned him now was because of his popularity with Margaret Thatcher. The reason Margaret Thatcher loved him was that she was a right wing conservative libertarian. And with that mindset, the government needs to be small. The government doesn't raise money to keep key institutions funded. Instead, you have people raise this money. And he represented to Margaret Thatcher what libertarianism was capable of. When you had just an ordinary citizen go out to the public and say, look, this institution that houses vulnerable young women needs funding.

[00:15:06.270] - Tess

And will the public please donate to fund this institution? And people love him and people donate. Government is entirely out of it. That's the beautiful libertarian view. It's these philanthropists, it's these activists that are completely separate to control of their government. Appealing to the good hearted members of society to help fix and educate their society and support these institutions. But because the government was not involved, he was then able to turn up in his car and take those vulnerable young women and do whatever he wanted with whoever he wanted. How whoever he wanted. And those women, hundreds and hundreds of them. Because they were vulnerable, because he was famous and loved by society. He was untouchable until after he died. He had put on his tombstone after he died, it was good while it lasted. And that was seen as so offensive to the people that he had abused. That when the full scale of his abuse came to light. They took his tombstone at night, tore it up, took it down to a shed. This is police officers, people who are angry. It was too late for justice. Because he was too popular, because government was not involved, because you don't take down a great man just because of a few troublesome young women.

[00:16:43.840] - Tess

They spent all night hammering and chiseling that phrase off of his tombstone. Just like Hitler's bunker is a parking lot today. So no one could ever admire it again. That was the extent of his fault after he died. He lay in stay for a number of days after his death. I think there's a few things we can learn from that. But that's the danger of the beautiful trust that Libertarianism wishes to have with society. And how it empowers individuals without big government oversight. That is the reality of Margaret Thatcher's vision. And it is horrific. And it's worth watching the documentary, just to get that point. We tried to show how there are these extremes. It's easy to see and create the straw man over here. And say they're all neo-Nazis or they're all Roy Den Hollander. But that's not the reality. The vast majority are in here. And when we see this and make ourselves feel good, we feel comfortable sitting in here. We don't realize that's where most of the right wing is. And I hope that that point had come through when we discussed libertarianism. It sells itself as progressive and beautiful.

[00:18:25.450] - Tess

The reality of it, whether you want to look at Jimmy Savile, the Civil Rights Act, January 6. The reality is always awful, and that is the type of way Satan messageses. It sounds wonderful. There's been a lot of talk this last week about the white supremacist terrorist. He's here. But I just wanted to mention Tucker Carlson and his popularity. *"In October 2018, Tucker Carlson Tonight was the second highest rated news show in all of primetime after Hannity with 3.2 million nightly viewers. By April 2020, Carlson's program*

surpassed Hannity as a highest rated primetime cable news show with an average audience of 4,56 million viewers. During the second quarter of 2020, Tucker Carlson Tonight garnered an average audience of 4,33 million viewers, the largest for any program in the history of cable news. In July 2020, Tucker Carlson Tonight broke the record for highest rated program in US cable news history, garnering an average nightly audience of 4,33 million viewers. In February 2022, Mediaite reported that in the month of October, Tucker Carlson was the number one watched host among Democrats in the key 25 to 54 age demographic across all networks."

[00:20:05.490] - Tess

So that is 4,33 million people, minus a few, who don't intend to engage in white supremacist terrorism. That is 4,33 million people who do not consider themselves racist. And you have the left wing connecting Tucker Carlson to a white supremacist terrorist. And 4,33 million people in the United States will disagree with that. Because they see Tucker Carlson as logical and reasonable. He says he's not racist. He is in here. And there's 4,33 million people in here. More people who say they are Democrats, aged between 25 and 54, watch Tucker Carlson than watch Rachel Maddow. That's the scale of the problem. And it's frightening when we see it that way. So if we take the message and we cut it down and we twist it slightly and then we add to that what is left, a little of our justification. It's like processed food. We process the message through our own little factory. And what it does. It puts all the bad people over here and it puts us as left wing progressives.

[00:22:09.340] - Tess

It's not that simple externally. It's not that simple internally. And we're going into men's rights arguments and libertarianism to try and prove that point. I agreed with everything that everyone said and put up yesterday. We discussed it. Then how do we vote? And I wanted to make the point. It can't be through what we say we are. We have to, when it comes to someone like Tucker Carlson. We have to listen to what they say. Because if we'd put 4,33 million Americans here and they say that we're not, they are not. They're going to start saying, well, the left wing does just put out fake news. Because I know I'm not a white supremacist terrorist. They start seeing the left wing as creating that straw man argument. And I think it damages the cause. Tucker Carlson doesn't come out looking better by understanding the complexity of what he's saying. The rationality and reasonableness seemingly of what he's saying. I don't believe that he comes out looking better, but we come out with a much clearer view of the dangers of some of our own thinking. Especially when it comes to gender. So listen to what they say.

[00:23:35.900] - Tess

And, 2) Don't listen to what they say. Because when an evangelical pastor says, I am not a member of QAnon, but these pedophile cults in Congress, these pedophiles like Hillary Clinton and key members of Hollywood... Someone doesn't need to say they are a member of a QAnon group. It's not really a formalized group that way. Men's rights activists and the men's rights movement, I think that's a misleading term. It's not such a coalesced movement. It's not necessarily all activists. All we have to do is support their ideology. If a pastor stands up and starts talking about Hillary Clinton being in a pedophile ring, then I don't care whether or not he is or isn't part of an organized QAnon movement. He is part of that ideology. And I wanted to make that point also, when it comes to the man's rights arguments, it's

about the ideology that we believe in and we promote. That is how we vote. And I also want to be clear. Brenden, you said 'what we say'. And what we say does matter. And Elder Parminder and I discussed that afterwards. And he got your point. And I think you have a point.

[00:25:11.210] - Tess

Sometimes what we say is the only thing we've got. Our voice is important. The point I was trying to make, though, is it can be very misleading. It's ultimately not our words that determine which way we vote in this political election that we term the great controversy. So why all this sexism in the world? We've been going into the misogyny. I just wanted to read that actually. We went into the sexism that pervades from the book *The Gendered Brain*. Just a little paragraph she thought to put at the beginning by Stephen Gold. "Few tragedies can be more extensive than the stunting of life. Few injustices deeper than the denial of an opportunity to strive or even to hope by a limit imposed from without, but falsely identified as lying within." The way she's using that thought in the context of this book. She talks about the tragedy of the stunting of life and how extensive this occurs, when it comes to gender. The gendered injustice, when women lose the opportunity to strive or even to hope. Not by something that lies within, not by biology, but by a limit imposed by society and culture that she says it's falsely identified as biology, a biological limit.

[00:27:16.090] - Tess

And it's that concept of the biology that she's fighting. And we tried to show how this is not the standard thought of the scientific community. This is not the standard thought of atheism and has never been. So I want to ask. If we can see that. When it comes to the Sunday Law, which is misogyny, and the attack on women's and LGBT rights through the branches of US government. And also worldwide. When we see that, and the escalation towards that, and we say it's not the whole of Protestantism, and it's not the cause, we wanted to say what is the cause? What then is the cause of this misogyny and this development towards the Sunday Law, if it isn't Church and state? Does anyone have any thoughts they wanted to share or perspective before I continue? Not at this stage. So I'll ask a question. What's the purpose of the *Midnight Cry*? Ray, what's the purpose of the *Midnight Cry*?

[00:29:28.610] - Raymond

Well, it's the light that guides us all the way to the second Advent. That's a nice textbook answer. The purpose of the light is to show us the way. By showing us obstacles that might be in our path. Showing us when not to tread as much as where to tread.

[00:30:01.770] - Tess

Sometimes the textbook is the most poetic. But I think you said that in a lovely way. Just want to draw up what this movement has been since 1989. We'll skip to the *Midnight Cry*. Remember, they don't understand the nature of the Kingdom until you get into this history. 2014. 2016. 2018. You lose sight of this on the line of 144,000. But like you said, Ray, this is the light that doesn't stop shining. So it's not restricted to that. I don't want to cut the line for this. It's going all the way through to the Sunday Law, close of probation, 2nd advent. But I want to take this history especially. I'm going to take that, and

expand it some more. And we'll just take 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021. I'm getting tied up with dates. Brodie, you had your hand up.

[00:32:13.890] - Brodie

Answering the question about the purpose of the Midnight Cry I was going to say, to wake us up.

[00:32:22.970] - Tess

Yes, because what's coming?

[00:32:27.750] - Brodie

The Second advent. A wedding.

[00:32:36.470] - Tess

And before the wedding, the door is shut. And before the door is shut. What I want us to see is what it's warning us of is of the Sunday Law. We know that there's a wedding down here and there's a shutdoor. And it's a complicated parable, depending on the lesson people want to draw. I think there's a couple of applications in there. I'll leave that one to Elder Parminder. But they need to awaken because the Sunday Law is imminent now. And they have to understand it. The Midnight Cry is going to give the sleeping virgins a little bit of a kick. And say, can't you see it? It's here. You need to be ready for this. And if I can combine some parables, maybe I'm not allowed to do that. You don't understand what it looks like. Open your eyes. See what it looks like. Can someone give me the dates for this? That was November 9. Then we had May 2020. Which was Externally George Floyd internally the Apis Bull. I've just got tongue tied here. Katherine, you have a good memory.

[00:34:11.970] - Catherine

2021, we had the formalization. The wedding of Cana, and I think that was in August 2021. And then in 2021, we had radical feminism, and I think that was in October. I don't think I know anything beyond that one.

[00:34:44.510] - Tess

When did we do LGBT?

[00:34:51.690] - Tess

That was August 2021.

[00:34:52.090] - Tess

We understood gay marriage, radical feminism Apis Bull. So the virgins need to be awoken because the Sunday Law is coming, and it's coming with a test. A test for them. The Midnight Cry is given in Arkansas in 2018. The first angel is there. He doesn't understand the nature of the Kingdom and he's not going to like it. But I have so much respect for him. I do believe that he had insight that was not human, and I think we can learn a lot from his response. And I don't mean to be disrespectful to someone who I do think suffered more for the development of this message than we realize. And I still feel the need to show him utmost respect for what he has done. But his response when he heard the message, Wake up, the Sunday Law is coming? What did he say? Marie, did I miss you?

[00:36:31.850] - Marie

I put my hand up for the question you asked before about why had a Midnight Cry. So I'm not sure if you want to go back. I was going to say that it was to take us out of our conservative Adventist mindset and to put us into a Liberal way of thinking. And that's very broad to say that. To prepare us for the Sunday Law.

[00:37:08.030] - Tess

Yes. So it's going to take Elder Jeff and it's going to wrench him from something. And how does he respond to that, when he's wrenched from something? Raymond.

[00:37:26.250] - Raymond

Didn't he say after two streams of information was taught, why did she have to teach that?

[00:37:34.470] - Tess

Yes, it was offensive. Offensive and painful. Because he felt he was being attacked. Josephine.

[00:37:51.650] - Josephine

I might be wrong. But his response to the Sunday Law? He thought it was fanaticism, but I could be wrong.

[00:38:09.210] - Tess

He loved everything except for two streams of information. He loved everything except what I said about Fox News and rightwing politics in America. Everything else, Raphia, Panium. The general concept of information war as it relates to the King of the north, the King of the south. November 9, World War II. He loved all of that. Pyrrhus. He said, why did you have to teach that? He didn't mean the whole of the message. He said, I love this message. Why did you have to go and ruin it by teaching two streams of information, and attacking right wing American politics?

[00:38:54.910] - Josephine

What's wrong with that?

[00:38:58.610] - Tess

That's what I want us to see. Katherine.

[00:39:07.510] - Catherine

Are you asking specifically on the day? Because I'm thinking about how he said he wanted to go back to Laodicea. But I'm not sure if you want it to go that far ahead in time.

[00:39:19.750] - Tess

I wasn't. Because he has a full year to develop that argument. This was his initial reaction to feeling attacked. Because I think it is in that initial reaction, that initial defensive posture, that he hit the nail on the head of what he felt he was being attacked over.

[00:39:42.230] - Catherine

I wasn't there. But did he say something about, the next thing they're going to do is say gay marriage is okay.

[00:39:49.430] - Tess

It doesn't really say that until 2019.

[00:39:52.460] - Catherine

Okay.

[00:39:54.830] - Tess

All comes later. That wasn't his original concern. We weren't even teaching gender equality in 2018 explicitly. It's built into attacking right wing politics. Which I'm sure was the subject. Gender had to have been on his mind as we're attacking the right wing position. That wasn't his underlying issue.

[00:40:25.530] - Graeme

I was there. And there were lots of different things that were said. So I'm not entirely sure it's precisely the one that you're talking about. But if I was to merge a couple together from that time period. It would be that a woman who is a European socialist is telling me, an American about my politics and how I receive my information here in the US.

[00:41:02.710] - Tess

Yes, that is precisely the point I wanted us to see. His first gut defensive position was that he was being attacked. He's not saying you Tess are attacking Protestantism, you're attacking Adventism, you're attacking Ellen White. That's not his problem in 2018. All those arguments develop later. His initial problem was not anything that we said about Christianity, Protestantism, Adventism, the Bible, how to read. He didn't care about any of that in 2018. Raymond.

[00:41:52.230] - Raymond

I thought it might have been that the Nethinims and the Levites are being plowed by sources outside the movement. As coming from that two streams.

[00:42:12.990] - Tess

Because he makes that argument that he's under attack, not his Christianity, but something else. Then in the late months, December 2018, we come back in and use the line of the Nethinims to try and show him that it has to be this way. That there has to be two streams of information externally. That comes later to try and help him see that it's an irrefutable point if you follow the reform lines. Yes, that's important, but it comes later. That particular defense of two streams, Brenden.

[00:43:01.980] - Brenden

He felt attacked because... This is more of a question. Did he feel attacked because it identified what his political ideology was, was actually on the wrong side? Everything would have been fine if you didn't say that. Is that basically where he's at? So you felt victimized by the left coming in? How is it possible that this left wing is the correct stream? Is that something he couldn't compute in his mind?

[00:43:51.450] - Tess

Yes, I think so. When he hears two streams of information, which is the Midnight Cry. And he digests that. He is upset that Wednesday night, where prayer meeting is canceled and we all stand in one room and I try to bury myself in a corner. He is upset but not once was it about how we read the Bible, or what we were doing with Ellen White quotes. He spent 20 to 30 years attacking Adventism. He doesn't care if we attack Adventism. He spent 20 to 30 years going to Ellen White quotes to make points. We weren't attacking him on the level of his religion. If we did, he would have come back with a religious argument. He does do that. But it's a year later that he's able to scramble together religious arguments to fight this. But that was not what this fight was ever really about. Josephine.

[00:45:13.470] - Josephine

I'm guessing. But was it his political stand. He was closer to the right side rather than the left. And that means he's going to have to change.

[00:45:33.490] - Tess

Yes, to a degree. I just don't want to give out what I think, until I get through people's questions. So I'm sorry if it's not a very good answer. Yes, I'll come back to it. But it might not help just say what I think if people still have points to make. Marie.

[00:45:54.950] - Marie

It seems from what Greame said, that the fact that you were a female and that the message was coming from outside of the United States of America, this seemed to be more of an issue than anything else. I'm sure there was more to it than that. But there must have been very big issues in his mind for him to actually talk about it.

[00:46:33.250] - Tess

I think it added to the feeling of being bruised for sure. Brenden.

[00:46:49.410] - Brenden

In what Graham said. You European socialists coming in, intervening in telling it seems nationalistic as well. You've got external people coming in telling me what is right and wrong. I'm just trying to get my head around it.

[00:47:25.410]

Josephine.

[00:47:31.570] - Josephine

What I'm going to say might sound offensive, but I'll say it. Because I don't mean it that way. I just want to say what I think. Do you think it's because he feels that this whole thing is being wrenched from his hand? The message is going to a different messenger that he wasn't aware of. He didn't understand it. Could God be giving it to someone else to carry it on from there? And he feels hurt?

[00:48:24.930] - Tess

This isn't getting to the point that I wanted to make, but I'm just going off what you said. He saw the Midnight Cry. He cut off the bit about two streams of information and gathered what was left. He twisted what was left to what more suited his beliefs. And then he started his own. Including concepts such as predicting all kinds of events at Panium. All kinds of things. He went through this exact process between the giving of the Midnight Cry, and when he finally left. There is, I think, in that process the feeling that this message no longer suits him. But why does it no longer suit him? What did it attack that he felt he had to do this? Sharon, you don't have to answer that precisely.

[00:49:26.530] - Sharon

I'm not sure how relevant it is. But it's more of a question. I've only really heard bits and pieces as to his response. But was it that he could see through the two streams of information the issues that would come like feminism, LGBT? I know it's very early. I don't know if this was a question or a point.

[00:50:22.510] - Tess

Works either way. I do believe that the increase of knowledge of the Sunday Law in 2019 is feminism gender equality. The formalization of understanding the Sunday Law is 2021. Radical feminism, radical gender equality. And both of them are left wing concepts. They are not right wing. They are not conservative. They are absolutely not libertarian. Both of them are left wing concepts. And so I'm sure that everything that comes packaged with the left wing, whether it was his conscious or his subconscious, that was part of what he was hearing. I do think your point is valid. I'm going to take Moli and then Lynne and then I will wrap up this discussion part. Moli.

[00:51:35.450] - Moli

I think from the response that he gave, it's shows he feels weakened. When The Midnight Cry came with two streams of information, he realized that he was exposed, him being a nationalist. And then he knew by the two streams of information that the movement would be split. And that's why he responds so defensively.

[00:52:20.110] - Tess

No other part of the message attacked him. That's why he was not defensive to any other part of the message. The point I want us to bring to is precisely what was attacked, because what was attacked was not his Adventism. Lynne.

[00:52:45.950] - Lynne

I was going to say some of his traditional Adventist views. However, I was also going to say that he had a very literal to literal perspective of prophecy. We all did. I mean, not just him. And he really had a very patriarchal view. And I think that even though he voiced the political perspective that challenged him, the two streams of information, that's why he mentioned things like 'the weaker vessel' and things like that. It would have been really hard to compute how that would fit into his biblical patriarchal perspective, or worldview. He couldn't sit with a Democratic view, because it had to sit with a Republican view. It just really didn't compute in his patriarchal worldview, and his religious worldview. Political, religious, anything. Would have been very challenging. That was my thought.

[00:54:35.190] - Tess

At this stage, with two streams of information, we're not going into two streams within Adventism. We haven't done that. We haven't done two streams within Protestantism. We don't do two streams within Catholicism until late 2019, over a year later. All we've done is go into the United States itself. Look at Donald Trump, look at Fox News versus CNN, look at Tucker Carlson versus Rachel Maddow, for example. And say these two sides that are fighting in the United States is part of the fight over the Sunday

Law. And that Fox News and that stream and everything, including Trump, that it's connected to is the stream that is wrong and the stream that will bring about the Sunday Law. So we haven't gone into attacking his Adventism, his religion.

[00:55:30.450] - Tess

What I believe Elder Jeff was saying was not: you're attacking my religious belief. Not that you're attacking the Bible or the reading of Ellen White. Not that you're attacking Adventism or Protestantism. What he said was you are attacking my **culture**. I don't believe it would have mattered if I was Australian and a woman, or a Californian man who watches Rachel Maddow on his left wing and male.

[00:56:10.060] - Tess

I don't think it would have made him accept the message any more if I was some Liberal from California, or a socialist. I didn't vote for the socialist party, by the way, I mustn't be a socialist. I don't know why that came to mind. But I don't think that was the core issue. What he said was you're attacking my culture. And it's culture that I want to say is the cause. It's not Protestantism, it's not religion, it's culture. And we need to understand the difference between the two you.