

## 4. 2018 & the Conflicting Ethos of Right & Left

---

Tess Lambert, 04.03.2022

### Youtube Video

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=490HRrq9J0U>

#### [00:00:06.590] - Tess

Dear Lord, thank you that we can meet together as a class and study how you have guided us in past history, and what that teaches us of our present and also of our future, of what that teaches us of you, of your character, of your love, what you love and also what you hate. We must understand both. I pray Lord, that you'll open our eyes, grant us that eye salve, that all of Adventism craves for. But we know that you can give through methodology, through what you are teaching us. I thank you for these Sabbath hours and I pray that you will be with us and direct and guide. In Jesus name.

#### [00:00:52.280] - Tess

Amen.

#### [00:01:00.290] - Tess

We went from 1888, looking at the internal of 1888. We wanted to know what it was like to actually be there, living in 1888 in the history of the Minneapolis conference, but also before that history leading up to it and what it was like in Adventism after that history. And why was it such a mess there? So we were looking at 1888. We saw how history is complex. It was in the past, it is in present day. And to be able to unravel that history and understand it, we need to know how to laterally read. So we introduced that as a concept. When we began looking at how we research and understand. Then we began to talk about shifting sources. We began to talk about shifting sources that are on the left side of the political spectrum, where we are as a movement. Because if we are in the left side of the political spectrum and we agree more with the world view of the left wing, then those are the sources we are going to mostly accept in our research. But even these we need to sift. So we began to ask how do we sift these sources?

#### [00:02:36.930] - Tess

We took a step back and we asked, okay, why are we here anyway? Let's go back a little more. Let's go back to 2018. Because from 1989 to 2018 we are a right wing movement. And what moved us from right wing to left wing. Why did we decide that most of these sources are of little value to us, prophetically as an end time movement? And why do we accept the world view of these sources? Of course heavily sifted. We went back to 2018 where the movement made this momentous switch from here to somewhere in this spectrum. We said it was predominantly four kind of subject or themes that moved us from right wing to left wing, all surrounding what was taught in September and October of 2018. September and October caused us to make this massive ideological swing. First of all was understanding the history, and connecting it with the Moral Majority and Republican Party. Some people made comments last week, that really blew up and expanded upon. Then the understanding of the history of Pyrrhus as representative of

the King of the south. What is embedded in Daniel 8:8, particularly the battle of Ipsus, which represented the 2016 election.

**[00:04:32.160] - Tess**

And now we had a prophetic explanation for that turning point election in American history, in the history of the glorious land. The United States and the glorious land being a prophetic subject. We should have a prophetic explanation for such a momentous event in the country. That prophecy shone the spotlight on. We had that with Ipsus. Then last week we added the third and the fourth, understanding the formalization of the message internally. But we also then looked externally and started to see, sure, there was the work of Elder Jeff Pippinger formalized internally in 1996. But when you look at the external, there was also a formalization, a formalization, though, in both the right wing and the left wing. The right wing formalized, a political stream of information. We titled that Fox, the left wing formalized their political stream of information. We call that CNN. But these are title of a lot more that happened in 1996. Number three, then number four, we discussed the line of the Nethinims. And the point is: How is God preparing not just this movement, not just Adventism, but God is preparing the entire world for the Sunday law.

**[00:06:09.160] - Tess**

They are already making decisions that will affect how they perceive the Sunday law event. So when we look at 2018 and say: In 2018 we moved from right wing to left wing, because of the message of two streams of information. What does two streams of information even mean? It didn't teach one subject titled two streams of information. It were key parts of all the messages that kind of coalesced around the midnight cry, from different directions. But they all agreed with one another. Prophecy always agrees with prophecy. And these different elements of the different parts of the message, whether it was understanding the King of the south or understanding the history of 1989, understanding 2016, understanding what is happening with the world, what has to be happening with the world. Understanding all of that, brought us from all of these different directions at once, to one central point, to one central conclusion. And that conclusion was this movement, to stay a history of success, had to change its political ideology. And people would either follow that and change their political ideology or they would leave the movement and go back to Adventism and reject everything God has taught us since 1989.

**[00:08:05.420] - Tess**

I hope we can see that all of these different points combined form what we learned to summarize as two streams of information. Does that make sense? We have all of these different points coming at once. And what we did in 2019, because people don't want to change their political ideology, is labor that over and over and over again. Which is why these points, presented simply in 2018, explode through 2019. Now, we don't just understand the Moral Majority, a ten year history. Now we can trace that politicized Protestantism all the way back to the first Great Awakening and through 1798, all the way until today. So from 10 years, it became 240. Our message became more and more rock solid. To try and stabilize people, to try and stabilize people, because it doesn't matter how clear the truth is. Changing our political ideology is painful, and people are not always willing to be guided by methodology and logic and prophecy. Not when it starts to conflict with deep set culture. So that's kind of a summary of what we did

last week. This combined equals two streams. A simple name to try and explain what those messages were teaching this movement.

**[00:10:12.650] - Tess**

This was the board work that we did after that, to explain why that fourth subject, that formed two streams of information that centered on how God has to prepare the world for the Sunday Law. He has to prepare, not just Adventism and people within Adventism. God has to prepare the entire world for the Sunday Law event. And we went here to illustrate why that's the case. I'm going to erase this. Where we left off after this was, we said all that's well and good. That's where we got to. But then the last point we finished on, we said, what's the point? Because what does it even mean to be right wing? And what does it even mean to be left wing? Because if we don't know what the right wing stands for and we don't know what the left wing stands for, then this ideological change is quite meaningless. We don't know what it means for us as individuals, as us as a prophetic movement. So I asked people: in few words, give me an explanation of what the right wing stands for, and what the left wing stands for, what their ethos is. We began to do that, and then we ran out of time.

**[00:11:53.870] - Tess**

What I want to do now. I have a list of people who have communicated are participating. If you haven't done so, then feel free to raise your hand and talk. But I won't ask you questions, because I don't want to put you on the spot. If you've chosen not to participate. But those who have chosen to participate, I want to ask them. I have nine people. I'm going to go to you one at a time. I want nothing more than two words, one word to tell me what the left swing stands for and one word to tell me what the right wing stands for. Try and get to the point, the ethos, of right wing and the ethos of left wing. And I think that one word can summarize both. I don't think that that is an oversimplification, and I hope that we can illustrate that. Moly has his hand up, so I'm going to let Moly speak. You all have time to think. I'm going to erase the board, so everyone has a few moments. Moly, did you have a question?

**[00:13:21.330] - Moly**

No, I was putting up my hand to participate.

**[00:13:29.530] - Tess**

You're participating. I'll put you I have ten people. That is a nice round number. Never complete without you.

**[00:13:43.430] - Moly**

Do you want me to say anything about the left wing and the right wing?

**[00:13:49.040] - Tess**

Please wait for a moment, so I can get this erased. And then I'll call on people because I want to write as you speak. We'll document. Josephine, did you have a thought or a question? Please don't answer one word about right wing and one word about left wing. Yes, but do you have a question or thought?

**[00:14:19.630] - Josephine**

No, because I'm participating, so I'm raising my hand.

**[00:14:29.750] - Tess**

You are one of my ten. I didn't want to erase this before we started, because it helps us to see to bring it back. Because a week is a long time in 2022. It's long enough for an invasion. So I'll draw up the line of politics. It might get harder for those who go later on. If you want to. If you see a word on the board and you want to repeat it, that's fine. But I'm going to draw left, and right. And then we can start documenting one word answers. Moly, one word for right wing.

**[00:16:17.410] - Moly**

Moral maturity.

**[00:16:24.630] - Tess**

Is it okay if I put morality. Because that is kind of the ethos. We're trying to get to the ethos behind it. I guess they've put it in their own title for a reason. It's all about morality. One word for left wing?

**[00:16:49.170] - Moly**

Progression.

**[00:16:52.650] - Tess**

That's a good one. Josephine?

**[00:17:08.750] - Josephine**

Do you want me to use some of the words we used last week, or you want me to say a new word?

**[00:17:15.290] - Tess**

You can repeat anything you like, but as long as it's one word.

**[00:17:21.810] - Josephine**

Okay. I say Republican for the right.

**[00:17:31.610] - Tess**

Republican.

**[00:17:36.030] - Josephine**

And on the left Democrat.

**[00:17:56.050] - Tess**

John, do you want to give a word?

**[00:18:00.310] - Moly**

Socialism for the left.

**[00:18:10.070] - John**

And conservatism for the right.

**[00:18:15.090] - Tess**

Conservatism. A loaded word. Thank you! Marie?

**[00:18:33.830] - Marie**

I'll put reactionary for the right, and I'm really stumped for the left. I'm going to say equality.

**[00:18:58.630] - Tess**

Equality. Great. Thank you. Greg?

**[00:19:33.770] - Greg**

Adverse to change, adverse to bringing new things in. That kind of thing. They like to keep it how it is, like Antigones, to keep it the way the ancestors had it.

**[00:19:52.130] - Tess**

So adverse. It's kind of like conservative, isn't it? They're trying to conserve.

**[00:19:58.910] - Greg**

And if you try and bring in equality or something, they go, no, we don't want that. We don't accept that. So when you're trying to bring in things from the left, they're quite adverse to those things from the left.

**[00:20:12.330] - Tess**

Yes.

**[00:20:13.470] - Greg**

They're not progressive.

**[00:20:14.860] - Greg**

They're adverse to progressive.

**[00:20:16.170] - Greg**

They're adverse to socialism.

**[00:20:20.710] - Tess**

We can see that on the Supreme Court, a literal and original reading of the Constitution, other than a progressive reading. So that's what you meant by adverse. Adverse to change and willing to change, correct?

**[00:20:39.750] - Greg**

Yup. Willing to try new things.

**[00:20:49.370] - Tess**

Ray.

**[00:20:56.970] - Raymond**

I was thinking oil on the right and renewables on the left.

**[00:21:02.850] - Tess**

Now we're getting. Is that the ethos of the parties? Do you think they got inside their mindset?

**[00:21:10.950] - Raymond**

No, I think I've been listening too much to Rachel Maddow. I guess they sort of fit under conservatism and progression.

**[00:21:26.990] - Tess**

I put a smiley face with it. Oil and renewables. Kind of what ties into what Greg said about willing to learn and change and not really willing to try new things.

**[00:21:53.710] - Raymond**

Sorry.

**[00:21:54.970] - Tess**

No.

**[00:21:56.110] - Raymond**

The other one I was thinking was capitalism for the right.

**[00:22:02.390] - Tess**

Capitalism. Is it okay if I get rid of oil and put capitalism, because it's kind of related?

**[00:22:13.470] - Raymond**

Maybe put a sad face with capitalism.

**[00:22:29.810] - Lynn**

I was thinking nationalist and globalist.

**[00:22:36.950] - Tess**

That's a good one. So globalism.

**[00:22:42.630] - Lynn**

Yes. Globalism and nationalism.

**[00:23:03.250] - Tess**

Catherine?

**[00:23:07.550] - Catherine**

Can we do workers on the left and employers on the right, businesses becoming.

**[00:23:19.810] - Tess**

Workers and.

**[00:23:25.550] - Catherine**

Business owners.

**[00:23:34.410] - Tess**

We see that through their taxes. Don't we? Think that fit's. Rachel?

**[00:23:53.820] - Catherine**

I was thinking what Lynn was thinking.

**[00:23:54.680] - Catherine**

But to put it differently, really simple. Community.

**[00:24:02.690] - Tess**

Community?

**[00:24:04.070] - Catherine**

Yeah. I can't remember. I think I said something like self.

**[00:24:18.910] - Tess**

How would we go if we put individual with that? Is that what you were thinking?

**[00:24:24.800] - Catherine**

Yes. Exactly.

**[00:24:25.720] - Catherine**

Yeah. That would be better. Community being global. And self being like me, myself and I.

**[00:24:38.610] - Tess**

So you're tying it into nationalism?

**[00:24:55.070] - Catherine**

Yes.

**[00:24:57.410] - Catherine**

Globalism and nationalism is what I had in mind.

**[00:25:06.450] - Tess**

I think that that brings us to quite a good point. Brodie?

**[00:25:18.850] - Brodie**

I thought for the right, could we say freedom?

**[00:25:25.010] - Tess**



Right wing freedom?

**[00:25:28.490] - Brodie**

Because freedom counterbalances equality for the left.

**[00:25:34.490] - Tess**

And equality, which we have up here. So you're saying freedom and equality.

**[00:25:42.780] - Brodie**

Yeah. That's contrasting.

**[00:25:46.950] - Tess**

Okay. James, you have your hand up.

**[00:25:53.830] - James**

Sorry.

**[00:25:54.380] - James**

I was thinking of patriarchy for the left, contrary to equality, since it's man over woman.

**[00:26:05.470] - Tess**

So patriarchal over here.

**[00:26:07.610] - James**

Yeah.

**[00:26:13.190] - Tess**

And this is?

**[00:26:15.290] - James**

I was thinking equality. Yeah. I don't know another word to put there for the left.

**[00:26:40.330] - Tess**

You don't have to come up with a new one, if you feel like one of these is most fitting. That's fine. And you've centered on equality, which I would agree with. Sorry. Who was that?

**[00:27:10.290] - Josephine**

Patriarchal. Opposite feminism.

**[00:27:13.470] - Tess**

Feminism. And you've chosen the word from right wing. This is patriarchal. Josephine?

**[00:27:41.970] - Josephine**

May I add another word? It might not be the right word. Ideological for the right. Non-ideological with the left.

**[00:28:08.110] - Tess**

What do you mean by non-ideological? Could you give a little bit of an explanation of what you conceptualize that to look like?

**[00:28:25.710] - Josephine**

I think the left does not have a set of principles that are. Well, I may be wrong. I mean, the right has their set of principles and they're out to have the state to enforce that. The left maybe does not really have... They aren't like the right in a sense that... Their way of thinking. Their template for everybody else. Whereas the left are sort of easy going. If it's equal, it's all right. If it's progressive, we're happy. But I think the right is more.

**[00:29:37.170] - Tess**

So because they are conservative. They have to have an ideology to conserve.

**[00:29:45.010] - Josephine**

Yes.

**[00:29:45.610] - Tess**

Whereas if these are not trying to conserve anything, you don't think that they don't have this ideology that they're clinging to? Because I think in one sense we could think that both have an ideology. Both are standing for something.

**[00:30:02.500] - Josephine**

Yes.

**[00:30:03.990] - Tess**

But I can see a point because if I understand you correctly, what you're saying is that these are non ideological, because they are moving, they're changing through history, whereas these are conserving. They're holding on to what you have termed an ideology.

**[00:30:25.830] - Josephine**

Yes. That's exactly what I'm trying to say.

**[00:30:30.930] - Tess**

Okay. I'm having a little trouble loading for a second. I want to look something up. Sandy?

**[00:31:09.090] - Sandy**

I was thinking for the left inclusive, and for the right exclusive.

**[00:31:21.010] - Sandy**

I guess all ideas. All people and exclusive.

**[00:31:26.490] - Sandy**

You have to fit into their category, into their mold.

**[00:31:32.510] - Tess**

And if you don't, they cancel you. I think that there's a lot of truth in the words that have been given. I didn't say it this week. I did say it last week. But I think it would be good for a certain part of this discussion if we try and approach it from an unbiased position as possible. Now, bias is normal and natural and good. We have to have an opinion. We have to have a position that we hold to, and then it becomes virtually impossible to not look through that lens. But I think this sad face sums it up a lot, that we are looking at this side and seeing all that's wrong with it. We're answering with a 2022 movement brain, not a 2018 movement brain, which is good because we're in 2022. But if we were to look at both sides and actually want to define the right wing, how they would see themselves and define the left wing, how they would see themselves, I think we would start seeing some of this as more complicated. So if we talked about the right wing is patriarchal, I think Marjorie Taylor Green would disagree with us.

**[00:33:12.470] - Tess**

I think that lots of women Republicans would kind of disagree with that. Does she disagree? I believe a lot of them would disagree with that. Republicanism and the Republican and Democrat Party have become more cemented in the left and the right over the last decades, but it didn't used to be that stuck. Originally it was not that fluid. Brandon messaged in with a thought. He is unable to speak right now. But I want to bring in his thought, because I think it's one of the couple that I want us to really recognize. Big government. Sorry, wrong way around. If you're left wing. It was actually right. If you're left wing, you believe in a big federal government. That is what you expect of the federal government. It's going to be big. If you're right wing, you're going to believe in a small federal government. Now why is that? Why does this side believe in a small government and this side believe in a big government? Because that concept, the fact that this side believes in small, and this side believes in big, explains to us and demonstrates what their ethos is. Greg?

**[00:35:27.550] - Greg**

Big government is more inclusive because it's having more members from different areas and communities.

**[00:35:56.230] - Tess**

You cut out a little. So I'm going to try and repeat what I think you were saying.

**[00:36:01.030] - John**

Okay.

**[00:36:01.580] - Tess**

Big federal government on the left wing, because they're trying to be more inclusive. So bring in more people who are representative of the general population. But what if you had five people, and they're all white men and this site has small it has three people and it has a white man, a black woman, and a trans man. It's smaller, but it's more inclusive than this.

**[00:37:08.230] - Tess**

More community representation in the large government. That's true. If you let every member of the community in. I think there's part of an answer in what you said, but I don't think it's getting quite to the point.

**[00:37:26.410] - Tess**

Raymond.

**[00:37:33.030] - Raymond**

I was going to say that the right tends towards deregulation of businesses. Because that was my understanding of why they like small government. They don't like the government interfering with people's activities, and they sort of approached it from an economic model.

**[00:37:57.850] - Tess**

Stop there and give me one word. They don't like government interfering with people's activities. What would you call that?

**[00:38:13.970] - Raymond**

Freedom.

**[00:38:17.970] - Tess**

Freedom is the ethos of the right wing. I would suggest that if you cut out what they don't agree with, cut out what is impacted by their ideology. If you got to the very root of the right wing, that is their ethos. So sorry to interrupt you, Raymond, would you finish your thought?

**[00:38:47.870] - Raymond**

Don't be sorry. I was going to say that the sort of economic mindset they approach it with, by deregulating businesses that allows them to do what corporations do. And they expect wealth to trickle down, which doesn't really happen. But yeah, I think we sort of answered the question.

**[00:39:21.390] - Tess**

So what you're saying is this small federal government is small, because it has less to do.

**[00:39:32.250] - Raymond**

Yeah, let's go with that.

**[00:39:36.200] - Tess**

Why is the left wing big?

**[00:39:43.750] - Raymond**

Because they're trying to protect people from unfettered capitalis. Protect minorities from people trying to force their own way of life unto them.

**[00:40:10.990] - Tess**

It sounds like you're describing freedom. So they're protecting minorities. You've got the point that you hit the nail on the head. They're protecting people, and that is work. Do you have a word for that?

**[00:40:33.390] - Raymond**

I was thinking restraint.

**[00:40:39.010] - Tess**

What are they restraining?

**[00:40:43.370] - Raymond**

Oppression.

**[00:40:47.610] - Tess**

They're restraining oppression. What do you think their ethos is then? Someone's going to write to me at some stage, and tell me I'm using the word ethos wrong. But it's all I can think of for now.

**[00:41:08.330] - Raymond**

I see freedom on the right, and I keep thinking freedom on the right.

**[00:41:11.730] - Raymond**

And then on the left, I keep thinking freedom from.

**[00:41:22.950] - Tess**

Freedom from what?

**[00:41:33.210] - Raymond**

I'm thinking this through, and it doesn't make a lot of sense to me anymore because when I go to articulate, it sounds just like the right. So let's scratch that.

**[00:41:44.050] - Tess**

We can come back to it. Marie.

**[00:41:56.190] - Marie**

I was going to suggest socialism.

**[00:42:04.090] - Tess**

Socialism is the opposite of capitalism, and I'm kind of wanting to get to the root. It's true. There's opposites here. There's a capitalist leaning perspective and there's a socialist leaning perspective. But you have people over here like Joe Mansion, who is capitalist, and Kirsten Cinema. They're capitalists. We're dealing then with more of a financial system. And I think we can get further into the root of the difference between these two sides, because we could spend weeks on all that they stand for and all how that ties together and same for this side. But I want us to get to the very root so we can make this as simple as possible, because I find politics confusing and hard, and I think other people do as well. But we can get to the very root of the difference between these two sides. If we can do that, we know the swing we took in 2018. It wasn't a swing based on turning us from capitalists into socialists, but it did turn us from prioritizing one thing and learning to prioritize another thing. I wouldn't say that we were letting go of prioritizing nationalism and learned to prioritize globalism.

**[00:43:38.130] - Tess**

There are implications to that swing, such as capitalism to socialism. There are implications. But that wasn't what the swing was designed to change in us. That's not the original point God was making that he said, you idealized this and you need to change and you need to see this as the priority. I know I've missed some hands, Moly.

**[00:44:15.540] - Moly**

Equality

**[00:44:17.250] - Tess**

Equality. That was what I was considering. Freedom is the ethos. If you got to the heart of right wing. It delves through all, through the exclusiveness, the patriarchal nature, the individualism, the nationalism, their moral stance on some things, their conservatism, their capitalism. If you swung through all of that, and got to that pulsing heart of the right wing, you would find that label freedom. That's what I want to suggest. And if you swung through the socialism, the progressivism, the globalism, the community nature, the inclusion. The feminism of the left wing, because there is all different leanings of that. Some people in the left wing are certainly not feminist. If you swam through all of that and got to the beating heart of the left wing, what they prioritize is equality.

**[00:45:33.770] - Tess**

Sharon, did I miss your hand?

**[00:45:39.870] - Sharon**

I was just going to say equality, but that's okay.

**[00:45:45.570] - Tess**

I'm so annoyed at myself for missing you. Is there anything else you want to say about to make that point?

**[00:45:55.570] - Sharon**

I think, just from what we see is the right wing offers freedom in exchange for equality, if that makes sense. So in my mind, I'm not sure if this is making sense, but it's like the right gives freedom in exchange for equality. For example, the Religious Freedom Act that prioritizes freedom for the majority, not the minority, if that makes sense. I don't know if I'm making sense.

**[00:47:06.410] - Tess**

You are making sense. You're already seeing the problem. Okay. Behind saying this is freedom and this is equality.

**[00:47:16.210] - Sharon**

Yeah.

**[00:47:21.390] - Tess**

Because what I anticipated people might see, and I think that's what you've highlighted is freedom for who.

**[00:47:28.890] - Sharon**

Yeah.

**[00:47:33.970] - Tess**

Do you have anything else you wanted to share?

**[00:47:38.510] - Sharon**

Not that I can think of.

**[00:47:45.990] - Tess**

Thank you. Someone has told me that ethos is the Greek word for character, and I am using it correctly. So we're getting to the heart, the very character of the two sides. I'm sorry for missed hands. Lynn.

**[00:48:12.110] - Lynn**

I was going to comment on what you were saying about freedom for who. They have this concept of freedom for the individual themselves. It's kind of like they're looking out for themselves, and their right and their freedom as opposed to the other side that looks, in a sense, more from the concept of equality in the sense of freedom for the society as a whole. So one side is looking very internally, the other is looking a bit more externally, sort of. Obviously, that's a lot more than one word. But anyway.

**[00:49:01.170] - Tess**

I think for a little while I want to, if I can use this terrible phrase. I want to play the devil's advocate. I want to defend this. Because I want us to see how good their arguments are and where they come from. So first of all, if we were to define freedom and equality. Freedom: I am pulling up dictionary definitions. Freedom is the condition or right of being able or allowed to do, say think, etc, whatever you want to, without being controlled or limited. Freedom, the condition of all right, of being able, allowed to do, say, think whatever you want without being controlled or limited. Equality is a situation in which men and women, people of different races, religions, etc, are all treated fairly and have the same opportunities. I want to give some illustrations. I want to open a business, so I rent a store. This business is going to sell carpentry equipment. Forget the words. It's going to sell things for building. And so I want to employ people that know how to build, and there will be some heavy lifting. And I have a prejudice. I am a little sexist. So I say that in this store, that is my business that I created in the building that I own, I am going to employ only men.

**[00:51:28.890] - Tess**

I own the business. I own the land. And I say, only men are going to work here, only one men. And then the government steps in. The government's going to come and say, that's not fair. We are going to force you against your will. We're going to force you in the business you own on the land you own to employ women. If we go to the definition of freedom, the condition or right of being able or allowed to do, say,



think whatever you want to without being controlled or limited. Is it a woman's freedom that she can work at this business? Marie.

**[00:53:04.790] - Marie**

My Internet stopped partway through when you were speaking. I'm sorry.

**[00:53:11.150] - Tess**

That's fine. I'll repeat myself. What was the last thing you heard?

**[00:53:19.410] - Marie**

You were talking about someone who's a bit prejudiced, and they have their own business and they only want to employ men.

**[00:53:31.450] - Tess**

And then the government is going to come and force the owner of this business with the business he owns, with the land he owns, they're going to force him to employ women. My question was for the women. Is that freedom?

**[00:53:55.850] - Marie**

For the women? Is that freedom? It's equality.

**[00:54:07.030] - Tess**

So it's equality, but it's not freedom.

**[00:54:11.470] - Marie**

Well, it depends who's using the word freedom. If we're talking about the right, then no, that's not freedom.

**[00:54:27.590] - Tess**

I agree with you. It's not their land. It's not their business. I don't have the freedom to go walk onto NASA and say, I want to be an astronaut. I don't have the freedom to do that. When a man starts his own business on his own land. And the government to force him to employ women isn't giving the women freedom. It's giving them equality. Is anyone confused or does anyone disagree? No hands up for that. Confused or disagree? No one has the freedom to walk into my house and eat my food, do they? Sandy.

**[00:55:49.590] - Sandy**

When you were explaining it I actually was a bit confused. But then when you can see the difference between equality and freedom... It think it was quite clear. Once you understood that that wasn't freedom, it was actually equality for the woman to have that right. So I found that helpful.

**[00:56:23.990] - Tess**

Unless we become really precise, the terms sound kind of the same, kind of interchangeable. We're fighting for women's freedom. To a degree we're not. We're fighting for women's equality, because whose freedom is being violated here? It's not women's. For all the people who want to come just walk into the house and have keys and eat my food. Whose freedom gets violated if they're not allowed to do that? Theirs doesn't. But if they do that, it's my freedom that gets violated. Josephine?

**[00:57:09.790] - Josephine**

Yes. I was going to comment on what you said about the people coming into your house eating your food. There, your freedom will be violated. Do they have the right to eat your food? What about if they're starving and there's food there in your household? Stealing is not the right thing, but they could pick it up from the floor. I'm going a bit biblical. The woman gets what is on the floor. But maybe I'm confusing.

**[00:58:04.330] - Tess**

I'm sorry, I can't quite hear you. I think I'm missin parts. Are you able to repeat that thought? It's a little muffled.

**[00:58:13.390] - Josephine**

They violate your freedom when they come to your food. But what if they're really starving because the food is not divided equally?

**[00:58:28.970] - Tess**

It's still my food.

**[00:58:31.070] - Josephine**

Yes I know. I'm asking. I understood it's your food. They have no right to steal it. But on the other side...

**[00:58:45.750] - Tess**

They have no right to it. Then for them to take what they have no right to means they're violating someone else's rights. Does that make sense?

**[00:58:59.390] - Josephine**

Yes.

**[00:59:01.330] - Tess**

They don't have a right to it because it's mine. So for them to take it would be to violate my rights.

**[00:59:08.850] - Josephine**

Yes.

**[00:59:13.430] - Tess**

We can make ourselves feel so sorry for them. But if we strip that away, it's still a violation of my rights. It's a violation of his rights as a business owner, as a landowner, to force him in his business on his land to employ women. The women do not have freedom to work at that business. That's not giving them freedom. It's giving them equality.

**[00:59:46.250] - Tess**

Brodie?

**[00:59:49.830] - Brodie**

When we consider the freedom in the right, the freedom is of individual, isn't it? So if we were to compare that to what is happening to the woman on the left, that individual woman doesn't have the freedom to work at that business. She is still subject to the due process of employment, and she may not get that job. He may pick another woman.

**[01:00:18.150] - Brodie**

Does that make sense? But she has equality in that she can attend interview, submit her resume, and be considered amongst a pool of candidates that would have excluded her in the past. So that gives her equality. But she doesn't have the freedom to work there. She might not be as skilled as another applicant, female or male or something else may exclude her. Is that a right way of looking at it?

**[01:00:56.030] - Tess**

I kind of want to get away from the idea that she doesn't have the freedom because we wouldn't have the freedom to walk into someone else's house, let alone someone else's business. This thing belongs to him, therefore, it's his to give out however he wants. So I agreed with most of that. The only thing I think I would consider is when we say that women's freedoms are restricted when they don't have access to work some jobs. I'm not talking about government jobs. I'm not talking about corporations. I'm talking like a small business owner. Maybe that's where I think it gets more confusing. Or just this business that owns their own business, that has their own land. So if we were going to expand this out, like into the health care system, into institutions that have government involvement, I think it would get a little more complicated. Does that make sense?

**[01:02:12.850] - Brodie**

I think so. Maybe I wasn't clear or I might have missed a point. So I was saying that she still doesn't have the right concept of freedom because the right concept of freedom applies to individuals.

**[01:02:39.090] - Brodie**

Sorry, I was just trying to differentiate freedom from equality, because she's been given equality, but not the right concept of freedom in this instance. But I might be confused.

**[01:02:54.330] - Tess**

No, I think my brain is slow. I kind of start to grasp for that. But I might need to labor with me a little more. If this was, say, a National Park and the government was to say only men are allowed on this National Park, that would start to be a different because it's public land. Let's say it's public land. If it's public land. Then men and women should be allowed on it freely, because it's owned by the public. And if it's owned by the public, it's owned by men and women, they should have equal freedom. But this owner is a man, and this belongs to him. So for him to have to practice equality against his will takes away from his freedom. I want to read a quote. I want to remind us of the definitions. Freedom is the condition or right to be able to to do, say, think whatever you want to without being controlled or limited. You have your individuality, your space, your business, your social media platform. And you have the right to do with that business, to do with that platform, to say on that platform whatever you want to. You should not be controlled or limited.

**[01:04:43.050] - Tess**

That's the definition of freedom. But my social media platform is mine. Someone else does not have the freedom to come in and write, take over my statuses and put up their own statuses. This thing belongs to me. They don't have the right to do that. If they did that, they would be violating my freedom. It's understanding. This is mine. I have freedom in my sphere. Let's say this is a government agency. It's NASA. They have freedom in their sphere. This is a man that owns a business and they have freedom to operate and employ and pay who they want to, how they want to, in what manner they want to. If you run a business, a government on the principle of freedom, you only need a small government because they don't have much to do. They don't have to look at to monitor all of these businesses and make sure they're employing people properly. These businesses belong to people. It's their property. So you don't need a very big government. But if you're going to be a government that runs on the principle of equality, where that is your ethos, you're going to have to be big.

**[01:06:13.760] - Tess**

If you want to watch what everyone is saying on social media, make sure there's no hate speech. You have to be big if you're going to look at how everyone is running their businesses, how everyone is operating. To make sure that they're practicing equality. When you do that though, every time you do that, you are taking away their freedom. Let's say that this owner owns a cake shop. And he doesn't want to make a wedding cake for an LGBT couple. Right wing says his business, he has the freedom, the right to discriminate with his own property. The left wing says he does not have that freedom. We run off the principle of equality and if he doesn't behave properly with his own business, we will step in and make him to do it. I want to read from the American Bar Association. This is the American Bar Association from their website, because I'm talking about a real case that went before the Supreme Court. Masterpiece

cake shop versus Colorado Civil Rights Commission. So we have an owner who says he will not make and sell a cake to an LGBT couple that doesn't violate their freedoms.

**[01:07:53.580] - Tess**

I hope we can see that distinction. It does take away from their equality, though. It's his business. He can do with it what he wants under the principle of freedom. If you're right wing and you are out because there are LGBT people who are Republican, we have to remember that if we take off our bias. There are homosexual men and women who believe that freedom should be the government ethos. And they would take his side because they would say, I don't like what he does, but it is his business and it is his right to sell cakes to whoever he wants to sell cakes to. Even if I don't agree with him. Do we know that phrase? I will disagree with what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it. Have we heard that before? There are people who would say, I disagree with you, but I will defend to the death your right to say what I disagree with. There are LGBT people here who say, I disagree with this business owner that I will defend to the death his right to sell his cakes from his business on his land to whoever he does or does not want to sell cakes to.

**[01:09:22.810] - Tess**

So if we can remove... I want us to strip away the kind of language of bias that we have to become familiar to, to get to the root of the disagreement. Because not everyone in the right wing is homophobic or believes that gay people shouldn't have wedding cakes. What they believe is that freedom should be the underlying principle. So this is from the American Bar Association. Quoting them: 'No case before the US Supreme Court in October 2017 received more attention, or raised more important issues, than Masterpiece Cake Shop Limited versus Colorado Civil Rights Commission.' In the name we should see. First of all, it's the Cake Shop versus Civil Rights Commission and the Colorado Civil Rights Commission. If they have civil rights in the name, you know, their ethos is equality, not freedom. Their ethos is equality. They're looking at him and say he does not have the freedom. So they take him all the way to the Supreme Court. 'The underlying issue is profoundly significant. Does a business have a constitutional right to discriminate based on its owner's belief?' This is the sentence that's the root of the issue. 'All antidiscrimination statutes pose a tension between equality and Liberty.'

**[01:11:03.330] - Tess**

Any law that prohibits discrimination, whether based on race or sex or religion or sexual orientation or any other grounds, denies the freedom to choose, who to serve or who to hire. What the American Bar Association is saying in the context of this Supreme Court case, is that anytime you have a case like this arise, why it is such a divisive issue is not because one side believe that homosexuals should have wedding cakes and one side believe that they shouldn't have cakes. It comes down to the ethos where you either believe that freedom governs or equality governs. They can coexist. People over here believe in freedom. People over here believe in equality. But what do you do when the two come head to head? Because they constantly clashed on one another. And when they come to a point of clash, which one surrenders to the other? Does equality surrender to freedom or does freedom surrender to equality? All antidiscrimination statutes pose attention and bring into conflict liberty and equality. Any law that prohibits

any type of discrimination, denies freedom. This is the bar association. So they're using these terms of equality and freedom very accurately, very precisely.

**[01:12:49.520] - Tess**

And they're recognizing this conflict between liberty and equality. And any time these cases come up, the issue is which one surrenders? And if this business owner is forced to employ, or to sell to, or to act against his ideology that he believes in, that violates his freedom. Equality has superseded freedom. Does that make sense? Marie.

**[01:13:45.250] - Marie**

I was going to say in answer to your question, when they collide, which one's correct? And I wanted to say, well, that's when we have to go back to the Constitution. And look at what the Constitution says about our rights as opposed to when we harm another person.

**[01:14:21.270] - Tess**

I agree with you. Need a moment to gather my thoughts on that. Greg, I missed you. How's your connection.

**[01:14:38.890] - Greg**

I've taken my headphones off, so I'm just using my computer. Can you hear me all right? You can. Oh, good. I was actually going to say, when you were talking about the Carpenter shop with only males, I was going to say, that sounds like a marriage cake, before you got to it. But talking about the Constitution it all depends on how you read the Constitution. Because we know how the right reads and how the left reads. How we read, how we used to read is different. So you can come to different conclusions depending on your methodology of reading the Constitution.

**[01:15:29.130] - Tess**

I agree. And I also suggest on how much you actually should care what 18th century white male slave owners thought. Do we worship and follow their exact words, or do we see the point of what America was to be? And I would like to suggest that the glorious land is glorious because it's supposed to have both. We're not against freedom. I have sympathy to their position. It's the Statue of Liberty, not the Statue of Equality. That is what the United States celebrated from the very beginning. Can get into probably next week complications. But that was the ethos of what America was celebrating, how badly they often did it. It was the Statue of Liberty. It was about freedom, which is Liberty. They were escaping control, authoritarianism to find freedom in the new world. So I think we can see that this is not bad. It's when these two collide, because there are people here who don't like racism, who don't like sexism, who wants to see LGBT people married, even thrive. But they believe that at the very center of the United States, when these issues invariably collide, that freedom has to win.

**[01:17:24.080] - Tess**

So you will see people on this side make a kind of argument that what if the person owning this cake shop is LGBT and they only want to sell cakes to LGBT people? They will say, well, be consistent. This is the problem they will have with things such as women's only spaces, women's only gyms. They will see inconsistencies with this side. So they will say, give everyone the freedom. Just give everyone the freedom. And then let society be convinced in their own minds, change in their own time as we reason and educate them. So I know that we're out of time, but I want us to see in this light, not the ugliness of this, that there's a point to freedom. That someone who is LGBT, and people did, supports the owner of this cake shop because however much I disagree with what someone says, I will fight to the death for their freedom to say it. You don't have to be anti LGBT people to believe that he has the right to be prejudiced. This side says he doesn't have that freedom. He doesn't have the right to be prejudiced. And we will have a bigger government because we're going to push through quality.

**[01:19:05.070] - Tess**

So I might close for time. We're going to come back to this next week. We need to consider equality and freedom. If you have thoughts or questions not answered or that come up during the week, that would be good. Who can I ask to pray to close? Who haven't I asked lately? Josephine, would you mind? I'm sorry. I know I haven't gotten to anyone, but we can pick it up here next week. Josephine, would you be able to pray for us?

**[01:19:48.810] - Josephine**

I'll be happy Elder Tess. Lord, we thank you for this wonderful privilege that you have given us to attend Elder Tess's class. We have so far learned so much from her and also to communicate with her and with one another. And we thank you for the fact that many of our leaders will be watching this recording and we thank you for the fact that many around the world will benefit from it. And I thank you for those who have participated and I pray that we'll be open and participate, because this is what helps our class to grow and to expand. And I praise you for this wonderful Sabbath day, and the joy we have of meeting together. And I know there are many more out there that would love to be able to join this class.

**[01:21:01.760] - Tess**

They will count it a privilege. I do so and I'm sure many in the group or all of the members of this group will regard it as a privilege. We praise you and thank you, Lord, and we look forward to learning more as you reveal to us and expand our minds to receive it. We praise you in the name of Jesus's name. Amen.