

8. From Gamergate to January 6

Tess Lambert, 08.04.2022

Youtube Video

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eVYQPMOP2tk>

[00:00:05.770] - Lynn

Dear, loving Creator God. We come before you again on another Sabbath day. We thank you for this blessing. We thank you for the opportunity that we were able to come together and really that we're still living in relatively peaceful, in peaceful times. And we thank you, Father, God, for all the blessings that you do provide for each one of us. And we think of those around the world who may be not in as fortunate as a situation. We ask for a special blessing tonight on this whole meeting for a special blessing on Elder Tess, as she's sharing these things with us. And we ask that you will open our hearts and minds, give us eye salve and to be able to see and understand, to hear and understand all of these wonderful truths. And we thank you for this blessing and we ask this and pray this in Jesus name. Amen.

[00:01:10.350] - Tess

Amen. Thank you Lynn. It's good to see everyone again. The weeks go quickly. I want to erase the board work behind me, and draw it up just a little bit differently to see if that helps what we're doing make some more sense. I'm going to draw this line slightly differently. I didn't want to erase it before we began because just seeing what was there from last week, I think, can help orientate us. It helps bring back what was said and done. We had the spectrum. Someone gave this quote. We were tying back this election to both sides of that curtain of the great controversy. If we talk about that curtain that separates the spiritual fight that Christianity understands between Christ and Satan, if we peel back the curtain and see that fight, and then right in front of us in the political world around us in the United States, we see that fight. If we peel back that curtain, we see that it's all the same thing because it's all centering on an election. A choice between two governments, two types of governments. And that's the significance of seeing Ipsus in 2016. That's the danger of Adventism thinking that they shouldn't understand politics, misusing Ellen White quotes, to that end. I'm going to leave this here because I love that visual to bring our minds back to the fight between freedom and equality and what that looks like in reality. I think, Rachel, you'll tell me. I think that's meant to be an eight, so I might fix it before I erase it, just in case it's confusing me. We went into Reddit to see that far right community. We talked about the trinity. I will erase this for now, so we have more room to work with. But we're probably going to redraw most of that, because we've only started discussing the militia groups in the United States. There was an Atlantic article recently, maybe a month ago, that discussed teaching in the United States like professors, school teachers, and how these teachers or what category of teachers were explaining current events, especially in an informative, progressive light. And to understand what the teachers were saying about the most significant turning point events in recent history, they looked at what these teachers, how these teachers were instructing their students on five historical turning points. I tried to find it just before we started. I can't remember what they all were, but I know it was something like the fall of the Berlin Wall, 911, Arab Spring and January 6, 2021.

[00:05:22.070] - Tess

It goes in a list with 911 for them. And I think it is legitimate that I think that's a legitimate perspective of the significance of January 6. And we definitely need to, and we'll discuss January 6 in more detail. Instead of having the line up as it was before, just this straight line, I want to just try and illustrate it slightly differently. A question was asked. We were discussing 1888, and a question was asked, how do you Tess, because you were asking me, how do you sift left wing sources? Because you take some and leave much. You might leave more than you take. You might discard more than you take. How do you decide what to take on board and what to discard? How do you know that what you're discarding is even wrong? How do you know that what you're taking is even right? And my response to that would be that I understand what to take and what to leave because I'm doing so have done so from the very beginning, from a prophetic perspective, with rules not based on what I like or don't like. The question centered on the left wing.

[00:06:45.820] - Tess

How do you sift the left wing? But the problems with the left wing are intrinsically connected to the problems with the right wing. It didn't do us much good if to go into the issues the left wing had if we don't understand the problems with the right wing. Instead of just discussing the left wing, we've pulled back and we spent the last weeks and we'll probably spend a couple more discussing what the right wing and left wing even stand for, what their ethos is and breaking down the complicated political soup that is the right wing. Instead of drawing it as we had before, I want to draw it in this way. You have the center and then you have left wing. Is that too high or is that showing just you have the center, you have the left wing and then you have the right wing. Now, Rachel, I'm going to squish this movement a little bit back towards the center than we were before. If anyone objects, that's fine. But let's say we circle maybe this faction. And I want to title this faction Protestantism. This is left wing.

[00:08:27.140] - Tess

This is right wing. In 2018 and 2019, we start identifying the role of Donald Trump in prophecy in a way that hadn't been done before. Before it was recognized that he had a role in prophecy. But in 2018, we become much more formalized in saying this is not just Trump, but Trumpism. This is not just one man, but Republicanism. This is not just the Republican Party. This is the entire right wing that now needs to be understood from a prophetic perspective. And in 2018, we go from just talking about Trump as this one figure completely cut off from right wing context, but as a dangerous prophetic figure. In 2018, we put him back in that context and say, this is about one man. This is about everything that he stands for. This is about the entire right wing political spectrum. And when we say that in 2018, it shakes this entire movement, because when we attack the right wing political spectrum, we attack this movement because this movement is in the right wing political spectrum. And this movement is in the right wing political spectrum, because Protestantism Evangelicalism is in the right wing political spectrum, because Catholicism is in the right wing political spectrum.

[00:10:07.960] - Tess

And we all have a problem of not shedding our link to the source of Christian apostasy. That's the significance of 2018. Trump was already understood as a prophetic figure. But in 2018, we really say we need to stop seeing him as just this isolated, evil figure. And it could have been Clinton, it could have been anyone. He stands for an entire political party that is appealing to an ideological base that is the right wing in the United States. From 2018 to 2019, and we are continuing to and we won't stop this side of the Second Advent. We continued to link Adventism where Protestantism sits on the political spectrum. We did that by tracing Adventism's history back into Millerite history through seeing the first and second Great Awakening and the role of the Millerite movement in the Second Great Awakening. We went to the article by Goldstein: '*How the Constitution Became Christian*' over and over again, the book '*The Evangelicals*'. We kept highlighting this portion of the right wing, and we did that because that's where Adventism is. Therefore, that's where this movement is. We needed members of the movement... Because that's who we were speaking to prior to going to work.

[00:12:08.680] - Tess

We're speaking to each other. We needed to warn members of this movement. You're here because Protestantism is here. Protestantism is here, because it carried that over from Catholicism. And you, if you wish to be a member of God's political party, you need to move over here. That's why we are saying that over and over and over again. What I'm saying does nothing to undo that. I hope we can see that there is none of that that is erased or diminished in value. But as this movement has progressed, especially from the end of 2019 to now, is... Remember what we said before about things being more complicated. You see this simple picture, but it is more complicated than that. And the problem is that people saw Christianity as this entire problem, and it's not. And that's the point I'm trying to make now, but it's not a new point. I've been trying to make this point for probably about 18 months knowing what I was doing without necessarily having it as clear as it is now. We're going from this and I'm expanding it out and saying, look, this is only part of the story.

[00:13:46.460] - Tess

If you want to see what is wrong with the United States today, you need to see all of this. And if you're going to see all of this, then what is the underlying ethos that's driving the right wing? Because it's not Christianity. I don't want to say it's not traditional values, because traditional values come through many cultures, many religions and atheism itself, but it's more than Christianity. If you are running for the US election and this doesn't matter if you are running for President or if you're running for the Senate, if you're running for any election in the United States and you want people to vote for you, you want as many people to vote for you as possible, don't you? So if it's the 1980s and you're Jimmy Carter and you're a Democrat, you want the Protestant vote too. So you're going to stand up as a candidate for presidency, albeit a Democrat, and you, Jimmy Carter, are going to start saying, I'm a really good Christian, I really love my faith. I treasure my relationship with God. I pray every day you're going to appeal to the Protestant vote. You have to.

[00:15:13.060] - Tess

So when you look at the US government and you see US presidents like Donald Trump appealing to Protestantism, that isn't because that's the entirety of their base. It's only part of it. Does that make sense, Josephine, does that make sense? You're muted sorry.

[00:15:41.370] - Josephine

I think I'm beginning to get the picture.

[00:15:53.170] - Tess

I'll repeat that. And then I might ask you again, because I didn't phrase that very clearly. I wanted to make sure this is the left wing, this is the right wing. And if you're Trump or Carter and you want votes because you want to win election, you're going to appeal to this, aren't you? You're going to start talking about the role of God in your life.

[00:16:22.210] - Josephine

Sure.

[00:16:24.190] - Tess

But that's not the entirety of what you're appealing to. They might not be even the majority of your base. Someone over here will be an atheist. They don't really care whether or not you're Christian. If they are right wing, they're going to vote for you whether you're Christian or not. If you sell your faith, even if like Trump, everyone knows it's fake, if you sell your faith, you'll get a portion of votes. But you're not going to turn these people away from you. They're used to Christians in Congress. They get elected because they're vying for these votes, whether they believe in God or not. When you look at Congress and you look at the history of American presidents, you're going to see people who sell their Christianity.

[00:17:18.010] - Tess

But that doesn't mean that they are driven by Christianity. That doesn't mean that they're genuine, that they actually even believe what they're saying. Does that make sense, Josephine?

[00:17:33.670] - Josephine

Very clear.

[00:17:35.890] - Tess

So Donald Trump, he has to appeal to the evangelicals. And we know he does. We've taught that for a long time. But all he had to say to appeal to the evangelicals, what did he need to say to appeal to an evangelical, to get an evangelical vote? Marie, what do you think Trump could say to appeal to an evangelical?

[00:18:04.490] - Marie

He would say that he read the Bible.

[00:18:09.750] - Tess

He read the Bible. He's going to sell his Christianity. But what about his politics?

[00:18:18.490] - Marie

Well, he would have a conservative rhetoric that would appeal to the Pentecostals and also many others as well.

[00:18:34.850] - Tess

Conservative rhetoric, I agree. Do you want to specify parts of that rhetoric or do you want to leave it as the conservative? You can leave it as a conservative if you like.

[00:18:50.190] - Marie

Well, he even appealed to the QAnon people. It wasn't just conservative. It was extreme right movements that he would appeal to as well.

[00:19:10.510] - Tess

But QAnon isn't necessarily Protestant. Like if he's trying to get Mum and dad down there in Texas... My mind is blank on the States. But if he's trying to appeal to this traditional values, Protestant, laid back farmer family country living down in the south, it's not necessarily QAnon. That's going to be the selling points for these close knit Christian communities.

[00:19:56.190] - Marie

He would say, 'Let's make America great again'. Let's go back to when we first became this country and we were Christians and we had solid values, and that's how America was raised up.

[00:20:19.330] - Tess

So values Christian heritage. How is he going to do that?

[00:20:28.010] - Marie

Well, he's going to go along with changing the history and painting a nice Christian Church and state combined picture.

[00:20:55.030] - Tess

Do you mind and if I put Christian morality? With little asterisks, because I don't think that's actually biblical. Yes. If you want to change a law in the United States, if he wants to change laws, what does he need to change? What's the mechanism for changing law in the United States?

[00:21:23.300] - Marie

Significant laws, the Constitution.

[00:21:27.350] - Tess

The Constitution. And who gets to define what the Constitution means?

[00:21:33.110] - Marie

The Supreme Court.

[00:21:35.150] - Tess

The Supreme Court. Thank you, Marie. Yes, Christian morality, but there's going to be a few key phrases that he can say to appeal to Protestantism. He can say... Josephine, you had a thought.

[00:22:19.990] - Josephine

Morality that Maria has already said, about abortion and moralizing the law.

[00:22:43.410] - Tess

I agree with you, but I'm going to avoid trying to be general about morality, because we'll go back to Rachel we'll make Rachel review Reddit, and then we'll see Reddit. We'll see about one in three American men on Reddit. We'll see men's rights groups and we'll see men's rights groups where I think it was 86% atheistic foundation. And men's rights groups are all about tradition and they're atheist. I'm trying to target Protestantism. I'm trying to be a little bit narrow, a little bit specific here, because, yes, there is a morality here, but it's based in a specific biblical style morality. He's going to talk about the Supreme Court. He's going to talk about abortion. Those are phrases that he will get. That's enough for him to get the Protestant vote. He didn't need to say more than that. But the problem is, if you look back and see all the things that Trump said and did, he appealed to a lot more than the evangelical vote. That was only part. Only a portion of his rhetoric was designed to appeal to this. What about the whole rest of the right wing?

[00:24:13.860] - Tess

What about the 86% atheistic, 90 something percent libertarian, men's rights activists that exist over here? Trump only has to say a couple of limited things to appeal to the Protestant vote. Protestants don't like the way he's acting. I'm being general. The vast majority of Protestants don't particularly like to see him swearing, carrying on, abusing people, calling people names. They weren't necessarily attracted to the anger, the bad behavior, the success as a supposedly extremely rich billionaire who could supposedly have any woman he wanted. That's not appealing to the Protestant vote. But he appealed to the right wing in a way that has not been seen in history, to a radicalized right wing that has not been seen in history. And that radicalization element is not Protestant. I'm wanting us to expand our view from what we've spent years doing where it is this narrow picture of Trump elected by evangelicals, evangelicals

feeling threatened and therefore becoming emboldened in their efforts to link Church and state. That's not what is truly happening in the United States if we come out of our bubble. Catherine.

[00:25:51.470] - Catherine

It's okay. I was going to mention something you were asking earlier. Thank you.

[00:25:57.110] - Tess

Then do you mind repeating it in your own words for the benefit of all of us?

[00:26:01.450] - Catherine

Sure. Yeah. I was just going to mention how Donald Trump had he was talking about placing judges on the Supreme Court that would be put forward by the Federalist Society. And that was something that really appealed to Protestants at the time.

[00:26:22.890] - Tess

Thank you. And you've brought in more detail there. The Federalist Society. He knew what he was doing. He knew who he needed to appeal to. And the catchphrases that would make sure they understood that he was on their side, that he definitely had their agenda at heart. Brandon.

[00:26:52.150] - Brandon

I was going to say the Supreme Court as well. And explain to them how they're not going to be dwnetrodden anymore. He met them as victims and he was going to fix Christianity not being dwnetrodden anymore. And part of that story was the Supreme Court.

[00:27:30.030] - Tess

And this is coming back to our document that feeling that they're threatened that Christianity is under threat, but they vote for him despite his behavior because they believe he can protect them. A large part of his behavior isn't appealing to them. They vote for him despite that behavior. Who is that behavior there to appeal to? Just general questions. You don't have to answer it.

[00:28:06.650] - Brandon

I would say the radical right that we're going into now. That is celebrated, that behavior on these forums that we're going into now, that sort of behavior, even though it's despised by the Evangelicals.

[00:28:35.470] - Tess

Yes, exactly the type of behavior that made them think this isn't great, but we'll vote for him anyway because he will protect us. He's the monster who will protect us, protect Christianity and biblical traditional values. Raymond. If we could perhaps not comment on the chat. If you want to message me privately,

then I can read it out there. Just reminding. It's okay. Sometimes we forget. I might come back to you in a moment. You can message me if you like. Lynn.

[00:29:39.250] - Lynn

I was just going to say he's going to appeal to their desire for freedom. In other words, he's referring to things like the establishment draining the swamp, all of those things because they're all oppressed. He wants to restore their freedoms, to be able to do like the gun laws, for example, to be able to have their guns and other things like that. Plus, he wants to build the wall so that keeps out people who are going to threaten their jobs or whatever his excuses were for that. So basically, he's appealing to the right in overall on the basis of maintaining or reestablishing their freedoms. And he throws in bits of the Christianity there with things like abortion laws. He also just from his behavior illustrates, regardless of what he says about women, his behavior certainly shows that he puts women in their place. That would appeal to those far right extremist groups, I would think. Anyway, they were the thoughts I had. I'm not sure if that's picking up on what you were talking about or not.

[00:31:13.530] - Lynn

But anyway, that's it.

[00:31:18.010] - Tess

At this stage. I was being specific to what he said to appeal to Protestantism because build the wall, drain the swamp. They aren't phrases that necessarily [...] to here.

[00:31:27.990] - Lynn

Oh, sorry.

[00:31:33.210] - Tess

They are things to keep in mind when we discuss the whole of the right wing.

[00:31:44.180] - Lynn

I thought you said we finished discussing that.

[00:31:50.230] - Tess

Yes.

[00:31:50.820] - Lynn

Sorry.

[00:31:54.050] - Tess

We will go into the broader soon. Josephine.

[00:32:02.130] - Josephine

What about immigration? Stay with America as the white nation and not bringing all of these different immigrants. Does that fit in there? Immigration laws. Maybe that comes later?

[00:32:25.870] - Tess

Times coming when I'm going to get into trouble. I know that. I know I already am. Because I'm pushing back on putting white nationalism and racism in front of everything. He did even better with the Hispanic community over time than he did in 2016. Why? I'm not asking for an answer to that, but we need to get deeper. And the problem going to start complaining about the left wing prematurely. There was an article recently, I think we all are aware what happened at the Oscars. And the article said, why do black women always have to be the butt of the joke? And I thought about it and thought, you know, what this author is doing? If he just said, why do women have to be at the butt of the joke? No one's going to click on it because it isn't appealing enough to a whole lot of people who still feel uncomfortable with feminism, with standing up for women's rights. But if he makes it or takes what happened at the Oscars and the joke that a black man made to a black woman and brings it away from sexism and into the sphere of racism, then he knows he'll get through to people because at least one of those issues, enough people care about at least one of those issues, not feminism, doesn't no longer have that extent of stigma attached to it.

[00:33:55.680] - Tess

You can talk about racism, you talk about feminism, and someone starts to feel sick in the mouth. It has to be tied to that. But just seconds before, seconds before he makes a joke about a black woman, he made an awfully sexist joke about a Hispanic woman and her marriage. The subtext of that joke being that women, this Hispanic woman, are jealous and difficult and like making their husband's lives miserable if they aren't satisfied. Before that, you had female comedians through other parts of the Oscars ceremony making jokes about women's sexuality, about women's body hair, about women's body weight. The entire Oscars ceremony, which now in 2022, can no longer stand alongside Trump and look progressive. Now they don't have Trump to make them look good anymore. The entire Oscars ceremony was centered on jokes about women. But the author of a left wing article can't say that. He has to say that black women are always the butt of the joke. That was not the issue at the Oscars. It was a sexism and misogyny issue, and it was much more than one joke. It was the entire affair. I am pushing back.

[00:35:21.760] - Tess

And this is one thing I sift with otherwise good articles that, yes, even with immigration, there is a segment that is for a white America that has that strong invisible racist element. And we did this at the camp meeting. You're going to get that segment. That third group of people who believe that America should be white and racial discrimination is good. But the first group in the second group are just as much part of the problem. And one of the reasons the right wing gets so annoyed is because they all get put in with here. So just to complicate the picture even more, I want to share screen. This is a member of the far right militia Bugaloo movement meeting with Black Lives Matter, signifying his support and marching alongside them. Okay, it's complicated. This is a far right militia group aiming for a civil war part two in America,

allying themselves or trying to with Black Lives Matter, albeit Black Lives Matter leaders saying, please don't come. But there was an attempt by the Bugaloo movement to say we are on the same page with Black Lives Matter. We are with you.

[00:36:52.620] - Tess

We believe in racial equality and we want to defund the police, too. We have goals in common. I'm trying to get us to see the complication. And that is hindered when white nationalism is always put in every single context. It's there. It's definitely within that third group. But it goes beyond that. And I'll bring it back to the words by Enrique Tarrio, the man who burned a Black Lives Matter flag. We have to get beyond that, naturally, see what they're standing for, which is what we start to get to when we get to the ethos of the right wing, when we get to men's rights groups and freedom over equality. And the left wing does this over and over and over again when they are not willing to stand up for women's rights and they have to link it to racism. Because if they just pulled out just the sexism of the Oscars, people will feel that they're hearing something feminist, they'll cringe and they'll turn off. And no journalists want that. I agree with you and understand what Trump is saying about immigration. But two points with that. First of all, it's not necessarily just targeting Protestant Christianity, again, where then expanding it out to something that appealed to the millions of votes that he got from atheist.

[00:38:37.990] - Tess

That's definitely appealing. Code words, dog whistles, as you said, Ray, to a larger segment of the political spectrum, but it's not specifically Christian. And I want us to see that. Graeme.

[00:38:57.170] - Graeme

My mind went to Donald Trump's international endeavors, particularly with Israel. How that would gain a lot of attention for the Protestant group.

[00:39:12.450] - Tess

Israel is a good one. It shows that just one thing he had to say or do that the rest of the right wing wouldn't particularly care about. But it enabled him to get this segment of the votes. And when you consider that Hillary Clinton got more votes than he did, it mattered to get their votes. It genuinely did. But it also mattered to get their votes. We need to, again get deeper into what the right wing stands for and what is motivating them. We're looking at the right wing soup. And Trump is appealing to the right wing and different factions of it for different reasons. But there is that underlying feeling of being threatened and also feeling connected to that feeling of being threatened, that freedom is being eroded. We moved beyond talking about Republicanism and we started to talk about libertarianism. I want to remind us of something that I'd said a couple of weeks before Rachel taught us about Reddit. It was an article by the Guardian in 2016. On December 1 of 2016, after Trump's election, the Guardian writes: "Everything that we're seeing today with Trump selection had its precedent two years ago in 2014".

[00:41:00.270] - Tess

And what they're speaking about is Gamergate of 2014. It was the precedent that led to Trump's victory in 2016. Now, is Gamergate was any of that Christian? Remember, we're talking about young men on video games, online. The same faction of the right wing that you're also going to find on Reddit, on men's rights forums that, as we saw, was 80 something percent atheist and 90 something percent with a libertarian bent. Gamergate was not Protestant. It was not Christian. It was atheistic in nature. The people that is. Gamergate led to 2016, according to the Guardian. And I would say, it was a few years too early. But January 6, 2021 had its precedent in 2016, and in 2014. The January 6 insurrection was not some type of Christian Protestant revolution. It's the same type of community. It's the far right, it's the neo-right, it's militia groups. And I want to draw some distinctions between this right wing soup. They have an underlying ethos that's the same. Freedom over equality, and the feeling that freedom is under threat. Let's picture it this way. You're a Republican, you are alive, of age.

[00:43:00.230] - Tess

Following the event slowly of 2001, George Bush his election. He comes into office, then September 11 happens. And from 2001 through George Bush's two terms as US President, George Bush expands the power of the executive branch beyond what it had ever been before. And he does that in the context in the shadow of September 11. The power of the executive branch grows exponentially. The problem with that for a Republican is what happens if a Republican loses power. This is the same issue the Democrats are facing. The Democrats are looking at the filibuster and saying, we should abolish that. And the Republicans are saying, you go ahead and you abolish the filibuster. Wait till there's a Republican in office and see how that works for you. The Republicans are watching George Bush expand the power of the executive branch for eight years, they're watching the Patriot Act. Quite broad expanses of American power, domestic as well as some international. And all of a sudden, in 2008, you have this massive left wing populist movement galvanized around a populist newcomer called Barack Obama. I was 10, 11 when George Bush was elected. I was 18, 19 when Barack Obama was elected.

[00:44:45.290] - Tess

I was coming into an age where I was paying attention to that feeling of pop culture in the United States and what was here as well. And I remember well even then, the excitement, the fascination with seeing Barack Obama in 2008 stand up and speak. He is a fantastic speaker orator and it was a populist movement. He was an outsider, not to the extent that Trump is, but he was still an outsider. He was still outside the swamp. And if you're a Republican in 2008 and you have watched the power of the executive branch that much, you are going to watch all of that get handed over to this populist left wing. He's gonna shut Guantanamo, going to make the US progressive. A populist relatively young Barack Obama. And that was terrifying. Now, if you're also racist, that is definitely a part of it. But it's not just a reaction to a black President. That's part of it, but it's much more expansive than that. They saw that expanded power in the executive branch get handed from George Bush, who'd done that expansion in the shadow of 911, to this wildly popular young Senator, Barack Obama.

[00:46:23.130] - Tess

In 2008 and 2009, America begins on a path of radicalization. And we've talked about this before, the Tea Party movement of 2009. We've connected that internally with Elder Parminder. There's this change of

leadership. And in this movement, what's going to prepare us for the Sunday law is also this external Tea Party radicalization that's going to set the United States on the path for the Sunday law as well. And that path to the Sunday law is heavily based on this radicalization within the Republican Party. That radicalization didn't just start in 2009. It's a little bit like watching Vladimir Putin kill democracy in Russia. There are very clear markers. But 2009 was a major turning point marker. I want to speak of another marker, though. I'm going to quote from Chris Ladd. He is Republican, so there are large parts of his article and also the way that he uses the term freedom that I don't think are technically accurate. And as he is a centrist Republican and he obviously has views that we as a movement don't agree with. But he also makes a point about the Republican Party that I think is worth listening to.

[00:48:04.020] - Tess

Chris Ladd refers to himself as a Texan in exile. He is Texan, he is conservative, he's Republican. But he writes this article in 2016 as he watches his political party, the Republican Party, follow Donald Trump. And it's deeply upsetting for him. Because he's not within that extremist Republican camp. He's a centrist. He rejects Donald Trump in 2016. That's why he calls himself a Texan or a Southerner in exile. He really still belongs to them. He knows he belongs to them, but he's not popular with them anymore, because he's conservative but didn't like what Donald Trump was selling. He's going to write this for Forbes magazine in 2016. It's called the Libertarian Civil Rights Paradox. And he says, "the long, sad decline of the Republican Party as the primary vehicle of black political expression corresponds closely to the rise of libertarian philosophy as a force inside the Republican Party". I'm going to read it and then try to paraphrase it. "He says the long, sad decline of the Republican Party as the primary political vehicle of black political expression that corresponded with the Republican Party taking on a libertarian philosophy." So Josephine, you asked a few weeks ago about how the Republican Party, which was originally the party of Lincoln that was on the right side of the Civil War, became this right wing conservative freedom instead of a quality party today.

[00:50:12.550] - Tess

Josephine, were you able to watch the video that we sent you?

[00:50:18.710] - Josephine

Yes, I had looked at it.

[00:50:22.070] - Tess

Did it make sense how the Republican Party changed?

[00:50:25.730] - Josephine

Yes.

[00:50:30.570] - Tess

Good I'm glad. He just adding to that, because he's saying that this switch that happened particularly, he's going to highlight the mid 20th century. That split corresponded with the Republican Party turning from its original roots of prioritizing equality to taking on libertarian philosophy. And I like that he uses the word philosophy. We're not saying that the Libertarian Party as a political party in the United States matters that much. It's weak. It doesn't have much political power. I don't think it's ever going to have much political power. What we're trying to show is the libertarian philosophy, and that libertarian philosophy is embedded in the Republican Party. He calls it a force inside the GOP. And then he's going to go into the civil rights era and explain what we have already covered in our last classes about libertarianism in the civil rights era. And that's what he calls a paradox. Republicans began embracing libertarian ideas about a decade before the Libertarian Party was even formed. Barry Goldwater embraced individual Liberty as a paramount political value in the early 60s. Libertarians formed a separate political party in the early 70s. To this day, figures like Ron Paul. We spoke about Rand Paul and Ron Paul.

[00:52:19.790] - Tess

Ron Paul or Gary Johnson move easily between libertarian and Republican circles, because the boundaries are muddy. The libertarian movement today is still the heir of the Goldwater Republicans. It was Goldwater who launched the Republican shift toward libertarianism. And it was under Goldwater that libertarian thinking flunked its first big test of real world effectiveness. I think he was referring there to the Civil Rights Act. Modern Republicans, troubled by their party's racism, are eyeing the Libertarian Party as an alternative. Ironically, it was Republicans flirtation with libertarianism, not the political party, but the philosophy that destroyed our traditional role as a political outlet for minorities. It was libertarian policy and rhetoric that converted the south into a Republican stronghold. Does everyone understand the point that that's making, even if we're not explaining what that means yet, do we get the point that he's making there.

[00:53:33.490] - Josephine

Yes.

[00:53:35.590] - Tess

Josephine, I heard a yes with many s's.

[00:53:38.770] - Josephine

Sorry [..]

[00:53:42.910] - Tess

It made me happy. Raymond says yes. I'm not saying that the libertarian political party has a major role in the Sunday law. What we're talking about is libertarian philosophy. And that philosophy is embedded throughout the right wing, but especially throughout the far right.

[00:54:16.610] - Tess

And it's embedded through the Republican Party, which is why the Republican Party ceased being a party representative of minorities, ceased being a party that prioritized equality and chose freedom because it took on libertarianism. Libertarianism saying freedom over everything, freedom over equality. We're not going back to Goldwater to illustrate that. But this Republican in exile, looking with a sense of shame on his own political party, is blaming libertarianism for that. I just want us to see that that's happening. If we have no thoughts or questions at that point. Brandon.

[00:55:26.850] - Brandon

Yes.

[00:55:26.850] - Tess

Explain to me what 'tough on crime' means and be as negative as you like.

[00:55:40.030] - Brandon

'Tough on crime' in the context of what's that book, The New Jim Crow. In that context, is that what you're referring to?

[00:56:07.850] - Tess

I'm asking you to explain the phrase and you can do that however you want to. Because this is like one of those slogans, isn't it? What does it mean?

[00:56:23.430] - Brandon

They call it a dog whistle, I guess. Deal with drug related crime.

[00:56:36.590] - Tess

So you're saying they're talking about drugs.

[00:56:40.850] - Brandon

In the past, that's what it's been used for.

[00:56:49.950] - Tess

Sure.

[00:56:51.210] - Brandon

But now if I was to look at it now, it was used to address a lot of the Black Lives Matter protests around America as well.

[00:57:27.270] - Tess

If you're going to bring in Black Lives Matter, I want to bring in 'Defund the police'. Because again, it's attacking... Do you see these two as linked?

[00:57:49.550] - Brandon

Yes. They're on opposite side, though.

[00:57:54.540] - Tess

'Defund the police'. Oh, I'm talking about tough on crime as negative. Sorry. That looks a little deceptive. I'll write opposed.

[00:58:10.140] - Brandon

Maybe I'm not understanding the question. Sorry.

[00:58:20.530] - Tess

Let's say we oppose.

[00:58:23.710] - Brandon

Yes.

[00:58:26.290] - Tess

The tough on crime approach that particularly began with Ronald Reagan. And we support.

[00:58:39.870] - Brandon

Defund the police.

[00:58:41.910] - Tess

Yes.

[00:58:42.600] - Brandon

Okay.

[00:58:45.510] - Tess

Explain to me what these mean, because they're saying very similar things. If you defund the police, they're going to stop being tough on crime. I want to suggest they're different phrases that are attacking the same problem. What's the problem?

[00:59:14.570] - Brandon

What's the problem? I'm not sure what the problem is. I feel like I'm not seeing something.

[00:59:45.170] - Tess

What does tough on crime mean? If you're not sure, it's okay. And if you think of something, I can come back to you.

[00:59:53.370] - Brandon

Tough on crime? Yeah, maybe come back to me.

[01:00:06.590] - Tess

Raise your hand.

[01:00:12.270] - Brandon

I feel like I'm not seeing something at the moment.

[01:00:16.050] - Tess

That's fine. It'll click. Be my explanation. That's at fault. Josephine.

[01:00:24.310] - Josephine

I don't know if this helps or complicate things. Give [...] less control on what's going on. In other words, give us more freedom, individual freedom.

[01:00:46.370] - Tess

Individual freedom.

[01:00:48.950] - Josephine

Yeah.

[01:00:50.330] - Tess

So we're fighting for freedom now.

[01:00:53.450] - Josephine

Yes, but we worded differently.

[01:00:59.570] - Tess

Freedom from what?

[01:01:03.290] - Josephine

The government from coercive forces, from police surveillance, control.

[01:01:26.290] - Tess

So you've put freedom here. Opposing tough on crime means standing for freedom. That supporting the work to defund the police is supportive of freedom? Is there anything else Josephine?

[01:01:47.000] - Josephine

Yes. Supporting freedom. They just want a small government. They don't want interference from big government.

[01:01:56.590] - Tess

Freedom. Small government.

[01:01:59.110] - Josephine

Yeah.

[01:02:00.060] - Tess

Oke. Lynn?

[01:02:13.670] - Lynn

That's more or less what I was going to say. They would be opposing big government, and therefore they don't want lots of laws that are going to be creating more crackdown on crime as they see it. That would be limiting people's freedom, like Josephine said. Things like defunding the police would reduce big government, therefore it would be promoting small government and freedom. I was pretty much agreeing with what Josephine said.

[01:03:08.740] - Tess

Do we disagree with the Black Lives Matter movement? Because the Black Lives Matter movement is saying to defund the police and stop being tough on crime, which is a call for freedom and small government.

[01:03:29.910] - Speaker 6

So I guess this is where some of the complications come in, because we don't necessarily disagree with everything that Black Lives Matter stands for. But if they're standing for small government and promoting things there, then obviously we're going to disagree with that. It's part of the complications I'm assuming that you're trying to bring out.

[01:04:03.010] - Tess

Yes. Very observant Lynn.

[01:04:09.430] - Lynn

Oh, good.

[01:04:10.620] - Graeme

Graeme

[01:04:18.350] - Graeme

Tough on crime as a slogan. To me, that represents a group of people that are going to be harshly treated, who are generally found in the lower social economic status of the country and who are categorized in minority groups, who are then in turn removed from being able to vote, which affects the whole of the US.

[01:04:55.470] - Tess

You're tied in voting there. Can you expand on that? Give a little bit more of an explanation of why you included voting?

[01:05:04.470] - Graeme

When were it tough on crime in the US? You become a felon and you're unable to then vote. When you're unable to vote, you're unable to add your support, one way or the other. It affects the voting. And if you're in a lower socioeconomic status of society, that can often incorporate minority groups coming from lots of different areas, whether you're African American, Hispanic, whatever it might be lacking the opportunities that many other people in the US have, you don't have those same opportunities pushing you into an area where you have to resort to some sort of crime to survive.

[01:06:03.240] - Tess

You're bringing in minorities. You took tough on crime and you narrowed that. It wasn't tough on all crime and it wasn't hurting everyone the same. Brandon.

[01:06:37.370] - Brandon

You said there was a problem with this, and I possibly have no idea what I'm saying, but the problem appears that we're in agreement with libertarian on those two topics. Is that correct, or am I totally missing the boat.

[01:07:01.030] - Tess

Now you know why a far right militia group is turning up for Black Lives Matter protest.

[01:07:07.330] - Brandon

That's the problem. They're in agreement. And that's the problem. Is that the problem or is there something else?

[01:07:24.810] - Tess

The Bugaloo movement, a portion of them, because there are definitely white supremacists within that movement. A portion of them saw the Black Lives Matter movement, saw the death of George Floyd, saw that fight to defund the police and said, we're on board with that. We'll support you, my brothers. We will march with you. We will bring our assault rifles. And members of the black civil rights community, leadership within that community, were saying, yeah, we're not on the same page. And they're saying, yes, we are. And they're saying, no, we're not. And they're saying, yes, we are. And the civil rights leaders are saying, no, we're not. And that's the fight we're having inside the movement and have long been having inside the movement. People saying we have the same platform within this movement. We support what this movement says it supports. And leadership is saying, no, you don't. We're on different pages. You might keep saying we're on the same page, but we're on different pages. This is where I want to show the complication. This is where the left wing and the right part of the left wing, not the problematic part. The correct part of the left wing is saying similar things to the far right.

[01:08:50.790] - Tess

And we need to understand why. And what I want us to see is that these phrases, they're too simplistic. Because they mean slightly different things to different people. That's why I asked you to define them. What does tough on crime mean to you? To a person in the right wing camp, tough on crime is bad because it's impinging people's freedom. In France now, if a man harasses a woman on the street, that is a criminal offense. Someone in the right wing will say that impinges his freedom to free speech, that does not do harm to her. And they don't constitute harm as anything beyond really the physical. It's his free speech. His freedom to speak, to harass her on the street trumps her right to be treated with equality in society. In France now it's illegal. You're not allowed to shout and harass women on the street. Even with your free speech, someone in the right wing would see that as being tough on crime in a negative sense. When the left wing looks at these slogans and sees tough on crime, it doesn't see tough on all crime. It sees tough on specific types of crime that are targeting and harming specific communities.

[01:10:22.730] - Tess

Does that make sense? Catherine, you're nodding. Do you have another way to word that better than I just put it? You don't have to if you don't want to.

[01:10:44.610] - Catherine

The left wing would see the problem with tough on crime because there's minority groups that are being disadvantaged, because of the way it's being treated. The motive that they have for opposing the tough on crime issue is based on an inequality perspective. Because they'll actually want to be tough on discrimination. There's certain types of crimes that they want to be tough on, and there are certain types of crimes that they don't want to be targeting specific groups, especially disadvantaged groups. Whereas

on the right wing, they're saying it differently. They just want all hands off, and they're not coming at it from a point of view of equality. Their priority is the freedom aspect of it.

[01:11:53.490] - Tess

Yes. I'm hoping that that rephrasing in a slightly different way helped everyone. It helped me. You can have the same belief seeming to be the same belief. This is why we could put other things different context here, but we could put gay marriage. And you could see that a libertarian, someone in the right wing and someone in the left wing, both might support gay marriage. But why you support that, where you're coming from, really matters. It certainly matters at certain points in American history, such as January 6. Then all of these things start to especially matter. Tough on crime is not for someone in the left wing saying that the United States is too tough on all crimes targeting all communities. That's not what that phrase has ever meant for the left wing or for civil rights leaders. What that means is tough on crime. I specifically didn't write it because it narrows it down immediately for us. Is tough on crime also is another way of saying the war on drugs, because it isn't all crime. It's especially drug crime, and it's especially drug crime because that has disproportionately targeted minority communities, because the police force, whether individually or institutionally, is racist.

[01:13:40.430] - Tess

It's targeting parts of the community over some crimes and doing harm to those communities. That's the left wing approach to opposition to the war on drugs, to criticism of the tough on crime policies, and when they talk about defunding the police. How often do you hear the story of a man is abusive, stalking, threatening a female partner or ex partner, and he's let out on parole, he gets a slap on the wrist, no one takes her concern seriously, and he kills her. How often does that happen? Over and over and over again? The left wing has never said that the United States is too tough on domestic violence. That's not what they're saying. They're not saying they're too tough on men. They're not saying they're too tough on white people. That has never been the left wing position on these simplistic phrases. But if you're a libertarian, you're going to hear the same phrase and say that appeals to me. I agree with that. The Black Lives Matter movement wants to defund the police. They should be defunded, because prostitution should be legal, because we're impinging on people's freedoms, left, right and center, because freedom.

[01:15:15.650] - Tess

And then some of those members will turn up to Black Lives Matter protests. And then they will also often be the instigators of the worst of the violence that occurred at those protests because there was violence. But it wasn't all left wing. A decent percentage of it was right wing and far right participants turning up fighting to defund the police because that appealed to their fight for freedom. I'm not sure where I got to with comments. I'll work backwards, Marie.

[01:16:01.270] - Marie

I was just going to say that the police force were a law unto themselves anyway.

[01:16:09.950] - Marie

From a left point of view, defunding the police was to take the power from the police's hands.

[01:16:28.770] - Tess

They talk about institutional racism in the police force. It's hard to get proper data on this. But from what they have done, they can see that the families of a police officer are two to four times more likely to experience domestic violence at their hands than the general population. And you can bring up case after case after case. 30 year old veteran police officer shot his wife and then himself in Colorado Springs earlier this summer. This is an article from 2014. It's a few years old, Tacoma Police Chief David Brame, who perpetrated another murder suicide in April. Sergeant Ryan Anderson, a narcotics officer, broke into his exwife's home and fatally shot her before shooting himself. Crandall police officer shot and killed his wife before killing himself. Nevada police officer killed his wife, his son, and then himself. Joshua borrown killed his wife, their two children, his mother in law, and then himself. Hours earlier she had threatened to leave him and take the children. Confronting him because he had been raping her. It comes up over and over and over again, the misogyny and the domestic violence that occurs within the police force and then their ability to cover that up because they know their way around the system and they also have a whole lot of friends who think they wouldn't do that.

[01:18:16.590] - Tess

And if anyone wants to bring in mental illness into those stories, if you didn't over George Floyd, if you didn't over racism, don't do that now. Let's be consistent. If you're not concerned about the mental health of the police officers being charged with racial instances, don't bring this into gendered instances. What you do then is you just make this a domestic issue. And it's not it's power. It's an issue of power and control. The police force, the entire justice system has an issue. But it's not an issue where they're trampling down on people's freedom. It's an issue of power and control and abuse. It's an issue with equality. The left wing says the police force needs a radical rethinking, not because they're being too hard on abusive men. A lot of the police force are abusive men. The very men who are meant to answer a call where there are cases of domestic abuse, and they abuse their own families. Two to four times more likely to do so than the general community. The police force needs a radical rethinking. The left wing understands that. The right wing also thinks the police force needs a radical rethinking.

[01:19:37.900] - Tess

And I'm not talking about the Republican centrist right wing. I'm talking about the far right. I'm talking about libertarianism. They agree with the left. Say we need to rethink the police force. This side does it from a perspective of equality. This side does it from a perspective of freedom. And this is what we are encountering over and over again within the movement as well, because we have a position on something. And people say we agree with you and we say, not really. You might agree with some of the conclusions. You might agree with gay marriage. I keep going back to that, because it's a clear example between left wing and republican agreeing for different reasons. But whether or not you're actually doing so from a proper prophetic perspective, again, bringing it back to both sides of that great controversy curtain, it matters what political party you vote for. We're out of time. I go over time every week. That's why it feels normal. Sorry, but people remind me. I'm not changing anything that we've taught before. We still will target Protestantism. And we did that. And we'll do that going forward because we're in the history

where we're talking to Levites. We are already talking to Levites. And as we do that, we're trying to convince them that Adventism has a problem and we're showing them Adventism has a problem by showing them that Adventism is following Protestantism. And if you read basic Ellen White, you should know that that's really concerning. We had to do that and we've done that. But in the light of Gamergate and Trump's election and the January 6 insurrection, in the light of the fact that many members of the movement, some even still thinking they're members of the movement, they thought they moved from here to here, but they just moved from here to here. And I'm still calling out to them saying the light behind you is going out. The light behind you is going out the light of the midnight cry. Because instead of moving like you were supposed to in 2018, you're just jumping into different camps of the right wing soup. I'm wanting to put Protestantism to one side for the moment. We're breaking apart the problems with the right wing. We've got down to the fundamental issue, which is what happens when freedom and equality collide.

[01:22:22.190] - Tess

And I'm wanting to focus on not America's past, the rapidly disintegrating evangelical community. I want to focus on America's future. And that is what Gamergate gave us a window into. Gamergate was not elderly people. Elderly evangelicals worried that they were losing power and they needed to shore up church and state. That was not gamergate. 2014 showed up America's future because this is especially young men. This is heavily atheistic. It's not Christian based. It's heavily libertarian, which means they can use some of the same language that we use, but it is very opposed to equality. And when equality and freedom collide, some of them are the most dangerous. And the Vox article, the point of the Vox article was to show us those men that spoke out in 2014. That small group of openly abusive men are supported by millions who say, sure, they went too far, but it's a fringe few and they were driven to it. It's not their fault. They're still the victims. It's supported by millions who still agree with the fundamental point that those men in 2014 were making anti-feminists, that hostile point. We'll close now, and we'll come back to this next week.

[01:24:12.440] - Tess

If you have questions or thoughts, please bring them. If it helps. You can write them to me during the week if you're going to forget them. And then I'll make sure so that when we start again, I might not answer you privately because that would really take away from the classes a little bit. But if we can then incorporate them early on into next week. I don't want to move beyond wherever each one of you are comfortable. I don't want anyone to feel left behind or to have a point or a question that we don't get to. So please, if you want to put them into writing, write them down and send them to me. And next week we'll go over it again. We'll discuss it more, answer any questions you have and any thoughts that you have. And I want to start addressing some of the militia groups, just to make a few points, as we were going to do on the Proud Boys, the Three Percenters, the Oath Keepers, and those. We have to understand January 6 as a prophetic turning point and all that it represents. I did make the point, and I'm hoping people don't misunderstand me, when I'm saying that simplistic phrases that bring in white supremacy can miss the point of what's happening.

[01:25:35.150] - Tess

It can be a way to highlight the ugliness that these groups can incorporate, but it doesn't necessarily represent their fundamental ethos. And we need to get to the fundamentals if we're going to understand them. If you kneel with me, we'll close in prayer. Dear Lord in heaven, thank you for our blessings. Thank you that you are helping us understand these complicated political events and changes within the United States. We understand that it's a glorious land for a reason, but it has so much to teach us about your government and about the opposition party. I pray that we will understand it so that we can understand the Sunday law, so we can understand current events, but much more fundamentally so that we can understand your government the way it should have been and the way that you're promising it can be again. If we vote for you if we decide to follow you wherever you go even if it requires a deep look at self even if it requires a high degree of unlearning. Thank you for this group that's so willing to wrestle over these things alongside me. And I pray that you bless their Sabbath hours. Bless them during the week as they think on these things and as they think of questions or thoughts or contributions to share.

[01:27:20.970] - Tess

I pray that you'll continue to bless these studies. I know that you are with us. I pray this in Jesus name, Amen.