

# 12. State Nationalism

---

Tess Lambert, 27.06.2020

## Youtube Video

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Kp3t36oEj9o>

**[00:00:12.760]**

Amen. Just for the benefit of the camera. And there have been a few other people join in the last couple of minutes. This is possibly my last presentation of this series for maybe a month. Next week, I won't be presenting, others will present. And then the week after that, in two weeks time, the Canadian ministry are conducting an online camp meeting. A camp meeting via Zoom, similar to what Elder Parminder did in Portugal. My participation in that will be hosted from here, of course. And my participation will consist of eight presentations over Friday, Sabbath and Sunday.

**[00:01:05.960]**

You'll be maybe happy to know that they're going to keep me to about an hour. The eight presentations is probably worth about two sabbaths. This is about possibly the last that I'll be doing of this series for about a month, but others will be presenting.

**[00:01:26.320]**

I want to try and wrap up some thoughts today. You can see that I've erased most of the board. I was really sad to lose our growing list of conspiracy theories. I was quite fond of our growing list of conspiracy theories.

**[00:01:41.510]**

It seems that new ones could be added every week. I think we could have a whole board of conspiracy theories, if we put our minds to it. And how they operate. We've lost our portion on the top left corner, showing the compare and contrast between ancient Israel and modern Israel. The ancient Idolatry and the modern Idolatry in each history, three particular dispensations, particularly considering the Alpha and the Omega. We looked a lot at those lines also through the lens of progression, which we will do quite a lot of this morning.

**[00:02:33.190]**

I wanted space. I'm really grateful. Sister Josephine asked a question about what we're all teaching, and it was a really good question because it actually helped us draw this out and think about what are we teaching, what are we challenging? What Adventist beliefs are we challenging?

**[00:03:06.390]**

And I think what we were trying to demonstrate was we're not actually challenging the core conclusion. When you believe that there's going to be a One World government, we all believe that. We all believe in the concept of the Sunday law. The Sunday law is the breaking of the Republican horn, of the lamb like beast. We believe in the breaking of the Republican horn.

**[00:03:30.850]**

We believe in church and state, we believe in true and counterfeit, we believe in secret societies, we believe in all of those things. But what we were working out together was, what does that look like for us compared to the Adventist church structure? The Adventist church structure and apostate Protestantism, because you can lump them in one. And we tried to demonstrate that through the study of idolatry. We showed we believe in this.

**[00:04:05.440]**

But there's two different definitions of what that looks like. One is this threat by saying that the threat is globalism. Fox News will tell you that the threat is globalism. CNN will teach you that the threat is unilateralism.

**[00:04:28.160]**

Fox will tell you the threat is globalism. If the threat is globalism, you believe that through conspiracy theories and Donald Trump becomes your hero. CNN tells you the threat is unilateralism. Uni meaning one, one superpower. You will understand that through the methodology of parable teaching, one example is World War I plus World War II equals World War III. Triple application.

**[00:04:55.620]**

If you believe in this, Trump becomes the dictator. While we believe the same thing. What you believe that looks like changes your perspective of where the threat is going to come from. And when you understand that Donald Trump becomes the dictator, it changes your entire world view. At the same time, you're not challenging that core conclusion. You can do the same thing with secret societies.

**[00:05:26.130]**

We all believe in secret societies. Protestants believe in secret societies. We showed that in 1798 with the Illuminati threat. Conservative Adventists, Walter Veith, they all believe in secret societies. We believe in secret societies.

**[00:05:42.790]**

We talked about that when we discussed Dominionism. Seven Mountains theology.

**[00:05:53.790]**

How they defined Ninja sheep, the people that they have in these seven mountains that are trying to take over, or control the culture of the United States particularly.

**[00:06:09.640]**

And we went to Ellen White quotes to show that. We would define the Ku Klux Klan as a secret society. So both sides believe in secret societies. We disagree on what that looks like. And when you understand what that looks like, it changes your expectations or your entire end time worldview.

**[00:06:33.790]**

Putting that to one side at the moment, this is a little bit of a detour. In anticipation of a Canadian Zoom camp meeting, for those of you that will be participating, I'd like to suggest a project, some homework. It's really difficult when we consider that the lockdown, the change in travel plans, schools have been canceled. Even though we can do some on Zoom, many camp meetings have been canceled. By now I was to do at least three camp meetings since Portugal. None of them have taken place.

**[00:07:15.280]**

Our plans have been very much derailed. We were soon to have an international camp meeting. There was to be schools, weeks of studying together, digging out these lines and truths. So due to the shutdown, much of this has not been able to take place. And part of the difficulty of covering in about two presentations a week what we need to be remembering at this time.

**[00:07:42.270]**

And I become concerned that we start to lose our place on the lines. I want to suggest a project to anyone who's willing. Go to the lines that you know, of all the lines that show our experience. If you have copies that someone has done, some people have done online PDF copies. I try to suggest everyone, even if you have those online, formally done copies of the lines. Draw them yourself. And what I'd like you to do, is put a dot or a little person where you are on those lines.

**[00:08:24.490]**

Take each one of them, go through them one by one and say, this is where I am on that line. I'll give some suggestions of where to start. There are many more lines than this, but these ones are the ones that are in my mind.

**[00:08:47.360]**

I need to take these off.

**[00:08:58.830]**

Take Acts 27.

**[00:09:05.700]**

That was the foundational message of the Midnight Cry. With the increase of knowledge of our latter rain, Sunday Law history. There is so much in Acts 27 to explain our experience as Adventists. Take the study of Acts 27. There's two lines in that study, the ship of Adramitium and the ship of Alexandria. For both of them, place yourself on that line.

**[00:09:34.490]**

We're going to come back to Acts 27 in a moment. We all should know where we are in the history, the end of ancient Israel.

**[00:09:53.200]**

And I want to remind us that you can place yourself there twice.

**[00:09:59.880]**

You can do two applications with that line. End of ancient Israel times two. Because in that history we have the baptism and also the cross lining up with the same way mark. Elder Parminder gave a really good example of that in Portugal. Explaining how we do that. Beginning of modern Israel. History of the Millerites. And I'll explain myself later that you have at least two applications of that that we should be all familiar with. The beginning of modern Israel times two. Place yourself on that history twice, two different places.

**[00:10:50.270]**

Doesn't matter if you make a mistake. Discuss it together. Do it. Discuss it with your with your brothers and sisters in the message who are around you. At least try to know where you are on these lines.

**[00:11:04.890]**

Coming out of those applications, we can't forget the line of the priests and the line of 144000. Diadochi Wars.

**[00:11:28.410]**

Place yourself in the history of the Diadochi Wars. Two world wars. World war I, and World War II.

**[00:11:41.790]**

Know exactly where you are on the lines of the world wars.

**[00:11:50.340]**

This one's interesting. I'm not sure what people would do with this, but we've been studying since it was done in October 2018, and I've mentioned it a few times since. They're comparing the contrast between the internal and the external. Compare and contrast, internal and external.

**[00:12:19.460]**

Remembering. It's an election year. Revolutions, I'm going to lump them all into one.

**[00:12:32.210]**

Know where you are on the line of the revolution. The counterfeit, it's a little like the internal external.

**[00:12:47.590]**

Know where you are in that history. This is about 14/15 different lines where you can go to them and you can map yourself. The problem is, is that when you're missing one of these lines, you're missing part of your experience. There is something about your experience right now that you don't understand, that you won't understand if you're missing your location on any one of these lines. And I know that they are not the only lines in existence.

**[00:13:19.350]**

There are others, important ones. Elder Parminder presenting in Portugal. The history of Turkey and Egypt. And he shows where we are in that history, where we stand in 2020. We should take that line. There are others. But with these, we should all be able to know, or at least have on record so that we can check for any one of them, to locate yourself on that line. So much that people are struggling with today would be answerable if they knew where they stood on every one of these lines. It is an anchor for our faith.

**[00:14:04.560]**

That's a little bit of a detour. Because I wanted people to start thinking about that and looking at that prior to the Canadian camp meeting.

**[00:14:17.370]**

Coming back to Acts 27. If we were to remind ourselves about what Acts 27 teaches, it teaches us the experience of the United States and not only the United States, but Adventism. In two different ways. It's going to show you, what I will oversimplify and call the negative perspective of these institutions, from 1989 and it'll take you all the way to the Sunday Law.

**[00:15:02.710]**

It's going to show the United States and Adventism. The United States through Felix, and Festus, showing our theme of the United States. Through a Agrippa, Adventism. You have two different institutions being given a warning message. This first ship of Adramitium is showing the negative perspective. It means to abide in death. And it's going to take us through this history of 1989 through to the Sunday Law.

**[00:15:42.690]**

This other ship. It also shows us that it's this other ship that what I will oversimplify and call the positive ship, that actually shows us the problems that that ship faces. How it goes off course, how it doesn't follow directions, how it's hit by the east wind, and finally, shipwrecked. There's negative aspects to this story, but overall, it's portraying this ship as a good ship. It's designed to take Paul to his destination in Rome, where he is to spread the gospel. It has its problems, but it's a positive perspective.

**[00:16:22.800]**

And it takes you from 1798. And this positive perspective of the ship will show its begin in 1798. It will go off course in 1863, but it will struggle through its history, fulfilling its job function.

**[00:16:54.710]**

And it gives us quite neatly the dispensation of 144000.

**[00:17:08.110]**

The early rain of the 144000 that begins in 2001, has an increase of knowledge in 2019, is formalized in 2021. This second ship particularly gives us a neat perspective of that early rain dispensation for 144,000.

**[00:17:37.410]**

Both of these ships take you to the same point in time. Both of them take you to the Sunday Law, where these two institutions are going to be shipwrecked.

**[00:18:03.760]**

These two institutions will fall, United States and Adventism. Both falling or shipwrecked at the Sunday law. Why am I mentioning that now? Through our studies over the last month, we've been particularly addressing one subject. Two questions. One subject, all taught through Acts 27, but two specific questions.

**[00:18:34.490]**

We took us in our studies to well before 1798. We went right back to 1619.

**[00:18:51.230]**

And this was a turning point year for the United States. In 1619 is this a lamb like beast rise up? No, it's 179 years before 1798. It's almost 180 years before the Lamb like beast is described as rising up out of the earth. It's a year before the Mayflower even lands in the colonies.

**[00:19:24.480]**

In this year, there's these small British colonies. And for the very first time, they institute a system of government, a representative government in the colonies. You have the beginning of representative government. And at the same time as these representative government forms, you have through this

representative government, within a period of weeks, the enactment of Sunday laws and the arrival of slavery. You have this problem in the United States from very early on.

**[00:20:09.550]**

It's not lamb like in 1619. There's nothing lamb like about these colonies. There was no religious freedom. There was no freedom. We can see that the United States had issues back in 1619. These two subjects that are dealt with first in 1850 and then in 1888 are already in existence. When we come to the United States in Bible prophecy, it's not represented as a lamb like beast until 1798. They have to go through the Revolution, enact the Constitution, form a representative government, form the Bill of Rights, etc. It's demonstrating Acts 27. It is rising up here, and it's going to go through this history.

**[00:20:56.950]**

And what this leaves us with is two particular questions we've been trying to address in our studies. The first question is, what is the sin of the United States? Now, write these questions on the board. First question. What is the sin at the Sunday law? I put Sunday law in parentheses.

**[00:21:30.480]**

What is the sin of the United States at the Sunday law? What makes it shipwreck at this way mark? Our second question. The United States falls here. The Republican horn is broken.

**[00:21:47.800]**

We're looking at what that looks like. But our second question is what we are focused on for most of the last month. And that is, why does Adventism fall here?

**[00:22:04.790]**

Why does Adventism fall at the Sunday law? One question that we've been addressing relates to the institution of the United States. Another question we've been addressing relates to the institution of Adventism. And what we're trying to understand is why those two institutions fall at the Sunday Law. The United States is going to enact a particular sin. We want to understand what that sin is.

**[00:22:33.650]**

Adventism is going to fail. When the United States enacts that sin, why do they fail? We have spent most of our time on the second question: why does Adventism fall at the Sunday Law? And we understood why it's going to fall at the Sunday Law. When we compared and contrasted, went back to ancient Israel and recognized the Apis Bull, the sin of idolatry, and the fact that we are following this in the footsteps of apostate Protestantism, and have been for some time. Our worldview is on this side of the equation, and this is a side that's going to lead us to the Sunday Law and to Adventism's acceptance of it.

**[00:23:28.130]**

To understand the first question, I'm putting the second question to one side so far, we've done with that question. Why does Adventism fall at the Sunday Law? The idolatry, the Apis bull, the conspiracy theories, Walter Veith. All that we've done, Mary Relfe, to Walter Veith, the conservative worldview. We've dealt with this question as much as we're going to for now, .What I want to look at is what is the sin of the United States? This is the direction that we're heading in. To understand that, we began to go back through this history and take our triple application. Our triple application being 1850 plus 1888 equals the sin of the Sunday Law. You could say this another way. You could say that the account of Early Writings, plus the account of the Great Controversy, equals the sin.

**[00:24:59.610]**

I had another way to put it. It passed my mind.

**[00:25:06.730]**

Looking at the ten commantments. 1850 is a crime against who?

**[00:25:14.690]**

It's breaking the six about our fellow man. 1888 is breaking the 4. Crime against God. 6 and the 4 equal the 10. You can look at this in different ways. It's 1850 plus 1888 equals the Sunday Law, the account of Early Writings, the account of a Great Controversy equaling the sin of the Sunday Law.

**[00:25:39.680]**

And you also have the six Commandments broken, then the four Commandments broken. Combined to see the Ten Commandments broken in their entirety in this dispensation, the end of modern Israel.

**[00:25:59.590]**

As we look at these chapters, it's Early Writings and Great Controversy. It's 'the sins of Babylon' and 'the Scripture the safeguard'. Those two chapters, with some surrounding context, combined, show us what the Sunday Law looks like today. But we have to remember, we're going from literal to spiritual. This is early writing, slavery, literal application, spiritual.

**[00:26:25.740]**

Great Controversy: sunday laws literal. Application, Spiritual. This is literal plus the literal, these two literal histories to give us the spiritual or the symbolic. We need to understand all of this, to understand the Sunday Law in our own time.

**[00:26:52.380]**

What I want to do today is before we start cutting the history of 1619, and particularly 1798 to the Sunday law, up into these 1850 and 1888 dispensations, I want us to look at the whole history as one connected story.



**[00:27:20.580]**

One of the reasons that conspiracy theories exist is because people cannot recognize that we are dealing with the same issues that have plagued America for over 400 years. The issues being faced today are connected to the issues that have been in existence from the very beginning of the United States as a colony. So for now, forget about cutting the line. We're going to look at this whole history as a progression. Nothing comes out of the blue unexpectedly.

**[00:27:55.550]**

Do we know what that phrase means, come out of the blue. If you're looking at the sky, nothing is going to suddenly flash out of the blue, out of the sky that you don't see coming. When I say it's not going to come out of the blue, it's not going to come out of the blue sky without you seeing it on the horizon and seeing its progression, seeing it come to you. We can look back all the way to 1619 and see that Sunday law as it comes to us. It's not going to come as some type of surprise. Not if you're prepared.

**[00:28:38.710]**

We're going to take this line. If you don't mind, I'll rub out here what we've done with Acts 27. I wanted to do this so we could have a memory, and truly understand what two questions we were trying to answer over the last month. Both questions you can take from Acts 27. We're dealing with the two institutions and why they fall.

**[00:29:10.940]**

What is the sin of the United States at the Sunday law? We're heading in that direction. We've spent most of our time focusing? Why is Adventism fall here?

**[00:29:30.010]**

I want us to look at the history of the United States all the way back from 1619. It had the first representative government in the colonies and his first representative government enacted a Sunday law at its American section. And at the same time, weeks apart, so began the slavery within British colonies in the Americas. We'll skip about 170 years. In this history, you have the American Revolution.

**[00:30:29.380]**

They fight for their freedom from Britain, they form the Republican government, they enact the Constitution, they write the Bill of Rights, all of that history leading up to 1798. And in this history they make two particularly relevant claims to us. First of all, they separate church and state.

**[00:31:01.550]**

Second says all men are created equal. At the very beginning, they have the issue of Sunday law as they form this new nation. They separate church and state. They put this wall between church and state. The second issue of slavery. They say all men are created equal.

**[00:31:30.580]**

We remember 1798 rises up like a lamb like beast. You have this issue over the election, John Adams versus Thomas Jefferson.

**[00:31:42.730]**

But what this really represented was a split within Protestantism.

**[00:31:59.160]**

There is this split within Protestantism through the two Great Awakenings.

**[00:32:07.080]**

You have socially conservative Protestantism following John Adams, and you have this more socially liberal branch of Protestantism, inspired by the American Revolution, following Thomas Jefferson. In 1798 this conservative branch introduces conspiracy theories, the illuminati threat to try and take down the enemies of John Adams on both sides of the political spectrum, Hamilton and Jefferson. You have the introduction of those conspiracy theories. I want us to look at this issue as it progresses, on the subject of slavery. Both sides of that argument, of abolition and for slavery, are both led by Protestants.

**[00:33:18.170]**

We need to remember what particularly what Elder Parminder taught in Portugal when he discussed this time period and he discussed the writings of Litch. And when Litch talks about the clergy and the public, who are the public? The public are Protestants because everyone in the United States there comes somehow under this concept of being a Protestant. There's a few Catholics, they're not liked, they're persecuted. But essentially everyone is Protestant, if I can be a little bit broad with that. When you have this huge fight over slavery, both sides of that argument, north, south, for slavery, for abolition of slavery, are both led by different factions of Protestantism.

**[00:34:14.840]**

And it's particularly interesting. What I'm not trying to do is cut our line. Because I'm not trying to cut our line, I'm not going to try and focus on key we marks of that history. I'm going to not care about what dates I'm putting with that. I'm going to put the relevant ones for our subject.

**[00:34:36.290]**

But I do want to mention this, and I used this book in Portugal. It's a book titled America 1844, Religious Fervor, westward Expansion and the Presidential Election that Transformed the Nation. I'm going to read from page 41, just a small section. The year 1831 had been a propitious one for the Embryonic abolitionist movement. 1831 was a key year in this abolitionist movement.

**[00:35:12.820]**

And why is 1831 important to us?

**[00:35:20.460]**

It's a formalization of our message, 1831 to 33. William Lloyd Garrison founded the newspaper the Liberator, in 1831. Abolitionists in Boston founded the New England Antislavery Society, and slaves led by Nat Turner rose up against their masters in Virginia. Southerners were annoyed by Garrison and the fledgling society.

**[00:35:45.080]**

They were scared to death of Nat Turner. They were annoyed by the antislavery Society. They were scared by the slave rebellion led by Nat Turner. Two years later, in 1833, the American Antislavery Society was founded. Its leaders soon launched a campaign to petition Congress to end slavery.

**[00:36:09.590]**

1831 to 1833 are two key way marks in that beginning of this key abolitionist movement. And if we go back a little more, to 1824. In 1824, an English Quaker, Elizabeth Coltman Hayrick, published a bold tract titled immediate, not gradual, Abolition. She was the first of many devout women to defy the more conservative male leadership in the antislavery cause in both countries. Her influence was instrumental in the eventual passage of the Emancipation Act of 1833, which began the liberation of West Indian slaves.

**[00:36:54.050]**

Although she had died two years earlier. So she's an English Quaker. On both sides of the Atlantic. She's had this influence. In 1833 you have the Emancipation Act, beginning the liberation of West Indian slaves. Whether you're in on either side of the Atlantic, these we mark still become quite crucial.

**[00:37:18.890]**

No less important were the female antislavery societies where such noted speakers as a Quaker, Lucretia Mott, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, the Eloquent Black, Sojourner Truth, and others began their speaking careers. Most famous of all were Angelina and Sarah Grimky, quaker converts from South Carolina who spoke to the horror of the conservative clergy at promiscuous mixed male and female audiences. It was promiscuous then to have a mixed male and female audience in an auditorium. Women were supposed to only address and teach other women. But, to the horror of the conservative Evangelicals, these women would address mixed audiences.

**[00:38:13.340]**

All of this and other efforts by other individuals led to the American Antislavery Society of 1833, an abolitionist society formed by William Lloyd Garrison and Arthur Tappin. Frederick Douglass, an escaped slave, was a key leader of this society who often spoke at its meetings. By 1838, the society had 1350 local chapters with around 250,000 members. When you think of 250,000, that's quite a lot of members to this society when you consider the population in 1838.

**[00:39:00.140]**

I'm not trying to mark way marks in this history, but I do want to mark 1833 and the Anti Slavery Society.

**[00:39:21.350]**

Now you have two sides starting to form in the United States, two sides of Protestantism. Because everyone is Protestant. We talked about Charles Finney. He's a leading Protestant evangelical teacher. He was an abolitionist who led Oberlin College. This was the first American college to accept women and blacks as students in addition to white men.

**[00:39:47.420]**

From its early years, its faculty and students were active in the abolitionist movement. They participated together with people of the town in biracial efforts to help fugitive slaves on the Underground Railroad, as well as to resist the Fugitive Slave Act, the Sunday law of that time period. These people were on the right side of the Sunday law. They are Protestants. Charles Finney is a Protestant.

**[00:40:15.890]**

You have these two split sides developing through Protestantism conservative Protestants, socially conservative and socially liberal. This all leads up to 1844. In 1844, it all unravels for them. That growing tension over decades blew up into a schism in the three main Protestant denominations of the United States.

**[00:40:52.830]**

It's split the Methodist church, the Baptist church, and the Presbyterian church, those three denominations all divided in two, essentially along the lines of north and south. And this was the church split, the schism that was not reconcilable, that led them directly to the Civil war. And the socially conservative were in favor of slavery, socially liberal in favor of abolition.

**[00:41:50.630]**

We have to be careful against articles that actually claim to support our beliefs who manipulate this history. Just so we're on our guard. Even an article that is fighting against slavery in this history that's saying our millerite pioneers, were against slavery, were leading abolitionists. Even articles that support our beliefs can manipulate Millerite history to support them. And it becomes dangerous.

**[00:42:21.580]**

Whether we like the article, whether we like the conspiracy theory. It doesn't matter what it is. If it manipulates history or uses wrong methodology, we should discard it. An article was shared with me this week that said how millerite were leading abolitionists in this time period when very few people were fighting against slavery. That's so easily disproven. You don't have 250000 members of one antislavery society at a time period when the population is so much smaller than today without many people fighting against slavery. Many abolitionists who were not Millerites.

**[00:43:06.170]**

That isn't to discount our history of our leading pioneers as being people who stood for equal rights. Who stood for the abolition of slavery and recognized it for what it was. They did do that. We should recognize that legacy and what they stood for and the sin of the United States that they were able to recognize.

**[00:43:32.380]**

But any article that even supports our beliefs that manipulates history should be discarded. And we're in growing danger of that. Coming back to this split in Protestantism. In the 19th century, slavery became the most critical moral issue dividing the Baptists in the United States. It really happened through decades of compromise. At the beginning, early in their history, prior to 1798, and later into the early Second Great Awakening, baptists opposed slavery.

**[00:44:10.170]**

They never taught that slavery was biblical or not a sin. But as Baptist missionaries went into the south, they struggled to gain a foothold in the south. So by small, incremental steps they began to compromise in their message. The next generation of Baptist preachers began to accommodate themselves into southern society. Rather than challenging slavery the way that they had done at the beginning, they began to interpret certain Bible passages as if they were supporting the practice of slavery.

**[00:44:49.270]**

They began to, first of all, defend it to the north. And this really developed in something into something that was what I today would call nationalistic. The Baptists in the south are resenting the Baptists in the north saying, you need to tell all those sinners down there to stop owning slaves. Those southern Baptists who don't themselves own slaves, those ministers, they start resenting this intrusion of the north on their territory.

**[00:45:21.740]**

They start to push back against the north and saying, stay out of the south. And while you're at it, explain these verses and these passages. Maybe it isn't so bad after all. Deal with your own problems. Stop criticizing us.

**[00:45:36.130]**

There became to be this defensiveness. I'm going to call it a type of nationalism, between the north and the south. They started preaching to slaves to accept their place and obey their masters. In the two decades after the Revolution into the Second Great Awakening, the Southern Baptist preachers abandoned their pleas that the slaves be freed. This didn't happen at once. It was incremental steps of those Southern ministers, partly because of their nationalism and their resentment of Southern encroachment on their territory, began to justify slavery, excuse slavery, then more and more defend slavery, and then by the end say it was a God given mandate. In 1844, Basil Manley Sr. President of the

University of Alabama, in the south. A prominent preacher and a major planter who owned 40 slaves, drafted the Alabama resolutions and presented them to the Triennial Convention. These included the demand that slaveholders be eligible for denominational offices to which the Southern associations contributed financially.

**[00:46:55.840]**

He is saying: we Southerners support you financially, these associations. Therefore you must be willing to admit southern slave owners into denominational offices in the Baptist Church. These resolutions fail to be adopted. You can see this divide between north and south, just with the churches before it becomes a state. And it's nationalistic in its mentality.

**[00:47:22.270]**

The south is saying, we give our money to you, we support you, and yet you're not giving us our leadership positions and authority. In Georgia, the Baptists decide they're going to test the north. They're going to put a test before the north. The north claims neutrality. The north has its issues with compromising.

**[00:47:46.700]**

They say they're in this kind of neutral position. So Georgia decides to test them. And when a position opens up in the Home Missionary Society, they need a missionary. Georgia recommends a slaveholder. The Home Mission Society's board refuses to appoint him, noting that missionaries were not allowed to take servants with them. The missionaries weren't allowed to take a servant.

**[00:48:14.260]**

And if you're not allowed to take a servant, clearly you can't take a slave. They would not make a decision that had any appearance of endorsing slavery, although they do it in this roundabout fashion. Southern Baptists considered this an infringement of their right to determine their own candidates. This is a North South tension between Northern states and Southern states. In the Baptist church.

**[00:48:42.600]**

It's nationalistic in its mentality. The south is saying, we give you money. We support you financially. Over the decades before, they've more and more come to a position where they see slavery as being mandated by God because of their literal to literal interpretation. Ancient Israel had slaves.

**[00:49:04.210]**

Modern Israel has slaves. They're going to use two arguments to defend slavery. One of them is that to not support slavery and not allow us to support slavery in our own states is a violation of our freedom. And they're also going to argue it's a violation of our religious liberty. Remember, we're talking about the south here.

**[00:49:43.500]**

Their argument in defense of slavery, their argument against the north, you are violating our freedoms and you are violating our religious liberty to practice our understanding of Bible history and what God requires of us as a nation. Religious freedom and liberty. This causes the split in the Baptist church, and it's quite similar in the Methodist and Presbyterian churches. There's a few other issues at play there, too, but it all centers around the subject of slavery.

**[00:50:25.880]**

We haven't concretely presented the Millerite history in all of its lines and fractals.

**[00:50:42.750]**

I'm going to make a statement and I can prove it to you at another point in time. I'm going to say 1848 is a way mark in Millerite history. I think that might have already been taught somewhere. But 1848 is a way mark. I want to mark 1848.

**[00:51:11.080]**

We're tracking this split within Protestantism. But all of these are Protestants, the government is filled with these Protestant men, you can't really separate these two issues.

**[00:51:28.240]**

The title of the book that I was reading from is America in 1844. Religious fervor westward expansion and the presidential election that transformed the nation. It's an interesting book. It goes through the forming of the Mormon church, westward expansion, the annexation of Texas, the election, all of that history.

**[00:52:01.840]**

It's a good time to ask that question. Because coming back to that 1844 election, what was that election over? That election was over annexing Texas from Mexico. Do we all kind of remember that history? In 1844 there's a US election.

**[00:52:21.870]**

There's this divide between these two political parties. And that divide is whether or not they will annex Texas from Mexico and admit it into the Union as a state. And we discussed that in Portugal. So that election of 1844 went on the wrong side of history. It went on the wrong side of history that led to the Mexican War just after 1844, and they annexed Texas.

**[00:52:55.390]**

That whole history is absolutely crucial to that reform line, how America expanded. That's the subject of 1848 that we're about to discuss. When do we finish. Sabbath School?

**[00:53:12.190]**

1848. I'm not sure if we're familiar with a man, John C. Calhoun. I'll write his name for a moment and then erase it.

**[00:53:23.210]**

John C. Calhoun is quite legendary in that history. He's a senator from North Carolina and he becomes a spokesman in the future, a spokesman for Southern secession. He was supportive, of course, of this American expansion into Texas.

**[00:53:48.260]**

In Portugal, I had Sister Kathy draw a wonderful map of the United States. I can't do that. I'm going to have a blob. That's the United States. Somewhere over here you have Mexico.

**[00:54:04.690]**

I'm not trying to be realistic. Please don't. I'm doing blobs. You have the United States and you have Mexico. And they want to take Texas from Mexico. They decide in the 1844 election that's the path they're going to go down.

**[00:54:22.710]**

American expansion.

**[00:54:27.260]**

There was a phrase that began around that time.

**[00:54:38.210]**

What was that phrase? If someone could think of it, put it in the chat. Manifest Destiny. It was manifest destiny for the United States. Thank you.

**[00:54:51.720]**

It was the Manifest destiny of the United States to spread and take control from sea to shining sea. I want us to think about the branch that we're talking about here. We're talking about this particularly Southern, particularly social conservative supporting slavery that's also supporting the expansion of the United States. John C. Calhoun, a senator from South Carolina, is a major part of that.

**[00:55:22.240]**

I'm quoting him. He spoke in Congress January 4, 1848. At the time, US and Mexican diplomats were in the midst of negotiating a peace treaty. So 1844, the United States decides to annex Texas.



**[00:55:39.100]**

Then the following year, they go to war with Mexico. Might be 1846. I might be off there. But they go to war with Mexico. In 1848, both parties come to the table and they start to negotiate a peace treaty to determine how much of Mexico will be admitted into the Union.

**[00:56:00.940]**

Quoting Calhoun. How much of Mexico did the United States want? We have never dreamt of incorporating into our Union any but the Caucasian race, the free white race. To incorporate Mexico would be the very first instance of the kinds of incorporating an Indian race. For more than half of the Mexicans are Indians, and the other is composed chiefly of mixed tribes.

**[00:56:29.500]**

I protest against such a Union as that. Ours, sir, is the government of a white race. The great misfortunes of Spanish America are to be traced to the fatal era of placing these black races on equality with the white race. Are we to associate with ourselves as equals, companions, and fellow citizens, the Indians and mixed race of Mexico? Mr. President, I would consider such a thing fatal to our institution. We make a great mistake, sir, when we suppose that all people are capable of selfgovernment. We are anxious to force free government on all. And I see that it has been urged in a very respectable quarter that it is the mission of this country to spread civil and religious liberty over all the world and especially over this continent. It is a great mistake.

**[00:57:27.220]**

None but people advanced to a very high state of moral and intellectual improvement are capable in a civilized state of maintaining free government.

**[00:57:42.230]**

I read that to my sister earlier this morning and she responded in nonverbal communication, which I won't repeat on camera. But do we recognize what he's saying? I want us to think about the implications of that. The United States decides to take from Mexico. They could have taken more. They don't want more.

**[00:58:14.530]**

Why do they not want Mexico? Because they're not white enough. It's racism in it's beginning. It's quite interesting to me, it's like a reversal of literal to spiritual.

**[00:58:27.590]**

What do we have today? We have a literal war on the US Mexican border to keep out who? People who essentially are not white enough. It's not white and black. It's a mixed race.

**[00:58:51.440]**

It's the Southern American people as well. But this wall that Donald Trump is building, it's making the same argument as they made in 1848 when they could have had Mexico and they chose to not have Mexico. They didn't want it. They didn't want it because it was composed of Indians and mixed race people largely. And to admit more of Mexico into the Union would have meant to include those people as citizens of the United States and therefore dilute the white race.

**[00:59:24.680]**

They're going to argue against admitting more of Mexico into the Union. Which I find so interesting today when we have the same argument between the United States and Mexico and who the United States will allow through that border. It's the original border wall, except it's like we have the literal today and they had the spiritual then.

**[00:59:55.500]**

But what argument is he using to defend this racism? He says: we are anxious to force free government on all. It is the role of this country to spread civil and religious liberty. The argument they are using on behalf of this belief is freedom and religious liberty. The role of the United States, the need to protect that role.

**[01:00:30.540]**

This is two years before the north and south come to their disagreement in 1850 and then resolve it with the Fugitive Slave Act. In 1850 we have the Fugitive Slave Act.

**[01:01:02.960]**

We won't go into detail of this law, but this starts to explain why Ellen White says god's judgment was upon the north. The south is already so far gone, but the judgment is up on the north because of how they consistently compromised. The 1850 Fugitive Slave Act, remember, I think it was 1792 or 1793. It had already been in existence. It's repeated and reinforced in 1850. It's nothing new.

**[01:01:42.780]**

It was written and enacted by the north. Written by good guy who lost the 1844 election to the bad guy.

**[01:01:54.680]**

I'm going to skip that 1850, because I'm not trying to do the reform line. I'm going to come to the Civil War. 1861 to 1863. Sorry, 1861 to 1865, the history of the Civil War.

**[01:02:27.980]**

Now there is the official Civil War. The states are divided. The churches within those states had already split. Now the states themselves are going to divide. I want to discuss a concept here that can become quite a toxic subject.

**[01:02:47.390]**

I hope that I'm understood in what I want to say about this subject. What I'm going to discuss is state rights. I know people don't like to discuss the role of state rights in the Civil War. And there's a couple of reasons why people don't like to do that. First of all, I recognize that the issue of state rights is not a simple issue. The Fugitive Slave Act was passed in 1850.

**[01:03:21.240]**

How did the northern states manage to bypass that Fugitive Slave Act? They used the principles of state rights. Even though the government wanted to enforce the Fugitive Slave Act, the Northern states, for the most part, actually didn't act on it, because they were able to bypass it with their own state laws and legislatures. And this bypassing of the Northern states where they don't enforce this Fugitive Slave Act is what each one of those Southern states cite as one of their main key grievances at the beginning of the Civil War. It really upset the south that these Northern states didn't comply.

**[01:04:06.450]**

But we're talking about this time period of the Civil War, the presidency of Abraham Lincoln. Putting aside all his problems, you now have the right guy who's president. You have the good guy in. He's elected president on November 6, 1860. Southern Carolina exploded with excitement at the news. We discussed Calhoun.

**[01:04:28.880]**

He was representative of Southern Carolina. To many of the people there, Lincoln's victory was the signal that ended the state's ties to the Union. To them, it was the beginning of Southern independence. The day that Abraham Lincoln won that election South Carolina lowered their United States flags and raised their state flag in its place. They were joyful. It was the beginning of Southern independence.

**[01:04:57.530]**

It was the Southern state's attempt to secede based on the 10th Amendment argument that Lincoln's actions were designed to prevent, and this led to the Civil War. What I want to do, to explain and defend in this position of state rights is take you to the words of the states themselves. Every state in the Confederacy issued an article of secession declaring their break from the Union. Four states went further than that. Texas, Mississippi, Georgia and South Carolina.

**[01:05:33.280]**

South Carolina, Calhoun that link. All issued additional documents, usually referred to as the Declarations of Causes, which explained their decision to leave the Union. I'm going to read. I'm going to quote some of the words from these four states that wrote the declarations of secession.

**[01:05:57.680]**

I'm going to start with Georgia. The people of Georgia, having dissolved their political connection with the government of the United States of America, present to their confederates and the world the causes which have led to the separation. For the last ten years we have had numerous and serious causes of complaint against our non-slave holding confederate states with reference to the subject of African slavery.

**[01:06:31.580]**

Our northern confederates, after a full and calm hearing of all the facts, after a fair warning of our purpose not to submit to the ruler of the authors of all these wrongs and injuries, have by large majority committed the government of the United States into their hands. They're referencing back to the election of Abraham Lincoln. It's a grievance. The northern states have submitted the government into the hands of what these people see as abolitionists. The people of Georgia, after an equality, full and fair and deliberate hearing of the case, have declared with equal firmness that this government shall not rule over them.

**[01:07:16.080]**

A brief history of the rise, progress and policy of antislavery and the political organization into whose hands the administration of the federal government has been committed will fully justify the pronounced verdict of the people of Georgia. The party of Lincoln, called the Republican party under its present name and organization, is of recent origin. It is admitted to be an antislavery party. While it attracts to itself by its creed the scattered advocates of exploded political heresies, of condemned theories in political economy, the advocates of commercial restrictions, of protections, of special privileges, of waste and corruption in the administration of government, antislavery is its mission and its purpose. By antislavery it is made a power of the state.

**[01:08:08.360]**

The question of slavery was a great difficulty in the way of the formation of the Constitution. With these principles on their banners and these utterances on their lips, the majority of the people of the north demand that we shall receive as them as our rulers. Remember what we said about Protestantism, about the nationalism that began to arise between the northern and the southern branches of the Baptist denomination? You're seeing the same thing now within the state governments. And what the south is saying is that the north, by this large majority, through that election, have elected a president who is opposed to slavery.

**[01:08:57.530]**

It's an antislavery party in their mind, and he's going to violate the autonomy and the rights of the states. It is a state's rights argument that they're making.

**[01:09:14.180]**

South Carolina said this most clearly. The people of the state of South Carolina, in convention assembled on the 26th day of April 1852 declared that the frequent violations of the constitution of the United States by the federal government and its encroachment upon the reserved rights of the states fully justified this

state in then withdrawing from the federal union. So South Carolina wanted to withdraw from the Union in 1852 because of this encroachment by the Federal Government upon a state's rights. But in deference to the opinions and wishes of the other slaveholding states, she forbore at that time to exercise this right.

**[01:10:06.030]**

Since that time, these encroachments have continued to increase and further forbearance ceases to be a virtue. So right back in 1852 they're protesting the encroachment of the Federal government on states rights. In the year 1765 the portion of the British Empire embracing Great Britain undertook to make laws for the government of that portion composed of the 13 American colonies. They're going back and say you had Britain, this central government and you had 13 colonies. A struggle for the right of these colonies to govern themselves insured self government which resulted in 1776 in a declaration by the colonies, quoting the colonies: that they are and are right ought to be free and independent states and that as free and independent states they have full power to levy war.

**[01:11:02.900]**

Conclude peace. Contract alliances. Establish commerce and to do all other acts and things which independent states may have right to do. I'm going to finish this portion about states rights and then we will close our first meeting. They further sullenly declared that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of the ends for which it was established, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it and to institute a new government.

**[01:11:32.640]**

Deeming the government of Great Britain to have become destructive of these ends, they declared that the colonies are absolved from all allegiance to the British Crown and that all political connection between them and the State of Great Britain is and ought to be totally dissolved. So South Carolina is saying we are repeating the American Revolution for independence and the argument is the right of the colonies or the states to freely govern themselves. In pursuance of this declaration of Independence, each of the 13 states proceeded to exercise its separate sovereignty, adopted for itself a Constitution and appointed officers for the administration of government in all of its departments. Legislative, executive and judicial. For purposes of defense. They united their arms and their councils and in 1778 they entered into a league known as the Articles of Confederation whereby they agreed to entrust the administration of their external relations to a common agent, known as the Congress of the United States.

**[01:12:40.740]**

Expressly declaring in the first article that each state retains its sovereignty, freedom and independence. And every power, jurisdiction and right which is not by this Confederation expressly delegated to the United States in Congress assembled. Under this confederation, the War of the Revolution was carried on and on 3 September 1783 the contest ended, and a treaty was signed by Great Britain, in which she acknowledged the independence of the colonies in the following terms.

**[01:13:16.070]**

His Britannic Majesty, this is Article One acknowledges the said United States and it names the colonies, to be free, sovereign, independent states. That he treats them with them as such. And for himself, his heirs and successes relinquishes all claims to the government, propriety and territorial rights. Thus were established by the two great principles asserted by the colonies, namely, the right of a state to govern itself and the right of the people to abolish a government when it becomes destructive of the ends for which it was instituted. And concurrent with the establishment of these principles was in fact that each colony became and was recognized by the mother country, a FREE, SOVEREIGN, INDEPENDANT STATE.

**[01:14:14.630]**

In the present case, that fact is established with certainty. We assert that 14 of the states have deliberately refused for past years to fulfill their constitutional obligations, and we refer to their own statutes for the proof. For 25 years this agitation has been increasing until it has now secured to it aid the power of the common government. A sectional party has found within that article establishing the executive department, the presidency, Abraham Lincoln, the means of subverting the constitution itself. A geographical line has been drawn across the Union, and all the states north of that line have united in the election of a man to the high office of president of the United States whose opinions and purposes are hostile to slavery. The guarantee that the constitution will then no longer exist, the equal rights of the states will be lost. States rights.

**[01:15:13.910]**

The slave holding states will no longer have the power of self government or self protection, and the federal government will have become their enemy. We've quoted from Georgia and South Carolina. And what are they arguing for? They're arguing that it violates their freedom and it violates their state rights. The reason people don't like to talk about state rights is because it's usually used by those who defend the south as an excuse. They say they were defending their rights as states.

**[01:15:56.860]**

It wasn't about slavery, and they try and make the south look better in this whole argument. Then those opposed to or for equality, their reaction is it had nothing to do with state rights. It was about slavery. The truth is, it was about state rights because that was their excuse to defend slavery. The issue was slavery.

**[01:16:19.160]**

If they didn't want slavery, they would never have had a problem with Abraham Lincoln and their state rights. The issue is slavery. I'm not denying that. But their defense of that institution is going to be their independent rights of states. Short quote from Texas. It essentially says quite the same thing.

**[01:16:42.160]**

This acquiring of sufficient power in the common government is a means of destroying the institutions of Texas and the sister slave holding states. This executive branch, this government that South Carolina described as Great Britain, has acquired enough power that it's going to destroy the independence, the

institutions of Texas and the other slave holding states. In all the non-slave holding states, in violation of that good faith and comradery which should exist between entirely distinct nations, the people have formed themselves into a great sectional party. They're saying the non-slave holding states where they should exist as entirely distinct nations, have united under Abraham Lincoln. They're going to accuse the north of not defending their own state rights, informing this government. They're saying that these states should be as if they were entire distinct nations.

**[01:17:50.050]**

The people have made themselves strong enough in numbers to control the affairs of the other states, the Southern states. Based upon an unnatural feeling of hostility to these Southern states and their beneficent and patriarchal system of African slavery, proclaiming the debasing doctrine of equality of all men irrespective of race or color. That debasing doctrine of equality. A doctrine at war with nature in opposition to the experience of mankind, and in violation of the plainest revelations of divine law. The other argument they're going to argue for. Religious liberty. We have defended in prior presentations the fact that the south used the claim of religious liberty, their right to practice what they believed God had mandated slavery as an excuse for the Civil War.

**[01:18:48.390]**

They believed slavery was instituted from the beginning in ancient Israel through New Testament times. And if the United States was the glorious land, they would have institutionalized slavery. And to abolish it would be to violate their religious liberty. What I want us to see in this history, as this issue of slavery grows and develops, these two branches of Protestantism splitting first as denominations, then it heads, and the states themselves split it's over this nationalism that has developed. And what you have is the south defending all the way through this history, whether it's for Southern Baptists or whether it's South Carolina. But what is being impinged upon is their freedom and their religious liberty. And once you get to 1861, they're going to say that this core government is impinging on the rights of the states to govern themselves.

**[01:19:52.020]**

We'll close now. When we come back, I want us to we're going to keep tracking this history. We'll move beyond slavery and see how this divided Protestantism continues to develop. If you kneel with me, we'll close in prayer.

**[01:20:05.880]**

Dear Father in Heaven, thank you for our blessings.

**[01:20:09.270]**

Thank you for Your goodness towards us, Lord, for Your mercies. Lord, I see where you have led Your people in the past. We are grateful when we look back and see that our pioneers saw these issues in a correct light. In a warped light, Lord. They did not understand full equality at the end of the world. They did

not understand the return to Eden. But for their time, Lord, they accepted what you required them to accept, and that is the abolition of slavery.

**[01:20:42.380]**

I pray, Lord, that we will see these issues more deeply that we will not be content with surface treasure, but that we will look deeper to see what is actually happening. What defenses are being made to defend sin, what arguments are being made to defend nationalism? What is dividing the glorious land. Lord, as we see that, I pray that we might make correct application for our own experience. Thank you for your Sabbath day. And I pray that you will be close to to all of those, all over the world who are worshiping now, who are entering into Sabbath wherever they are. Lord, that they'll have a blessed Sabbath day.

**[01:21:25.150]**

In Jesus name I pray. Amen.