

# 3. Protestantism Divided

---

Tess Lambert, 23.05.2020

## Youtube Video

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Z3WGEBXqc8E>

**[00:00:06.070]**

Heavenly Father, thank you for this day That you bless us to receive. Thank you for the sunshine here where we are. I pray that you please pour out your Holy Spirit upon us. Bless us to understand your methodology, your leading, your guiding, your understanding. That we may think and have the mind of Christ. May this make effectual change in us, Father, that we may serve and be slaves for you. We are praying these things in Jesus name. Amen.

**[00:00:29.780]**

Like last Sabbath, we are both recording and this is also our Zoom Sabbath Fellowship. If you notice that the camera is set a little far from the board, it's for the benefit of the recording.

**[00:00:47.500]**

That's why there will be a bit of a mixed dynamic. This is the third week where I've presented on the Zoom classes, and the first week was not recorded. Some of you who weren't then joining us on the first week or haven't seen their recordings online because that first week wasn't recorded, much of where we go after today's review will be new to you. But for those who were here in the first week, I just want to explain what we've done. In week one, we covered a lot of material and we did it very quickly.

**[00:01:36.070]**

We just had a fast, quick review of a lot of material. And then what we've done in the two weeks after that, last week and this week, we went back over that same material much more slowly. This was week one.

**[00:01:56.270]**

Then in week two, we took the first part of this and we expanded it. We took the first part and we expanded it in week two.

**[00:02:11.010]**

And then what we will do today is we will review last week, but then we're going to take the second part and review and expand that as well. We covered everything, probably the main stepping stones in the first week that wasn't recorded and then in last week and this week, we're going over the same material, but much more comprehensively and more slowly. I just want to explain for those who are here in the first

week, some of the quotes that I read today. If we can get that far, we might not get that far. We will already be familiar to you.

**[00:02:55.100]**

It may be articles that you actually heard two weeks ago. I just wanted to explain that.

**[00:03:06.730]**

But I want to go on a little detour at the first part of today's class and discuss something that seems entirely disconnected. And it is in some ways disconnected, but when it comes to this subject of parables and literal and spiritual and conspiracy theories, when it comes to these subjects, you really can't separate them. Everything is connected. This is not largely disconnected from where we're heading, what we're trying to understand. But it is some foundational knowledge I think we should all have. I want to give just a historical study, just ten minutes, it shouldn't be very long, into what has occurred within Islam over the last decades.

**[00:04:04.630]**

This is a major subject. It's very complicated. I don't want to give a complicated history, I just want to give a simple review of what's happened over the last, particularly 40 years. And this will seem disconnected, but it will tie into our study either at the end of today, most likely next week.

**[00:04:32.410]**

You'll see perhaps just in a small way that this helps us. If we're going to understand modern Islam, what has happened with Islam, you have to go back to the turning point. The turning point was 1979. Externally, that's just public knowledge. It's not something peculiar to this movement. They know their turning point was 1979. There were major events in 1979. One of them was the Iranian revolution. I want to discuss two countries. You have Iran and Saudi Arabia.

**[00:05:34.400]**

Before 1979 Iran is ruled by the Shah. People start to protest his rule. He is quite a dictator. There starts to be civil unrest. And that civil unrest is really hijacked by a radical Islamic movement led by a man known as Khomeini. Khomeini sees himself as the spiritual leader of an Islamic government.

**[00:06:10.150]**

And when the Shah is forced out of Iran, he flees, he Abdicates. Khomeini comes in, and he takes control of Iran. And he introduces Sharia law. Iran goes from quite a progressive country, but with a dictator. Progressive is in that there is a certain amount of religious tolerance, there are freedoms. By progressive, I mean they have a separated church and state, even though they might have a dictator, church and state are quite separated. And in the 1979 Iranian Revolution, that new government, it's a church run government.

**[00:06:55.430]**

That's why you have it led by clerics and the Sharia law is then introduced. In 1979, Iran becomes a combination of church and state. Now, some of you are aware that there are two particular branches of Islam Shia and Sunni. Iran is Shia.

**[00:07:24.630]**

This is a church state union where the church is in control. And it's the Shia branch of Islam. Now, I want to go down to Saudi Arabia. Saudi Arabia is run by their royal family from generation to generation, and they're known as the House of Saud. The house of Saud.

**[00:07:48.670]**

And they are Sunni. Not just Sunni, it's a branch of Sunni known as Wahhabism.

**[00:08:05.110]**

Even for Sunni, they are a very puritanical sect of Sunniism. Saudi Arabia contains two holy sites for a Muslim Mecca and Medina. These are the two holy sites where you would want to go on pilgrimage. The Saudi royal family, the house of Saud, they have to justify that their family have the right to not just be the state rulers of Saudi Arabia, but they have to justify that they have the spiritual mandate to control the holy sites of Islam. This state royal family has to justify their spiritual right to control these holy sites. And what that caused this royal family to do is to go into union with Sunni clerics. They formed their own church state union with radical clerics, knowing that these radical clerics would justify that royal family's right to rule the holy sites of Islam. You have a church state relationship in Iran that's run by the church.

**[00:09:31.620]**

It's Shia. You have a church state union in Saudi Arabia that also controlled by the church, but it's a radical form of Sunniism. And the reason that Saudi Arabia went into this church state relationship is because they're not just political rulership, but their spiritual rulership of these ancient sites was being questioned and threatened by others. Saudi Arabia, it finds these clerics, these prominent religious leaders, who are going to justify Saudi Arabia's right to rule. And those clerics that they go into union with are extremely radical in their viewpoint.

**[00:10:30.810]**

This is something we'll see that starts to come more and more out of control. In the same history, particularly in 1979. In 1979 another sect of Islam comes in, takes over Mecca, and lays siege to the whole site. Hundreds of people held hostage. It's a huge event. And the Saudi royal family, their spiritual right to rule that territory is under threat.

**[00:10:57.980]**

This escalates the tension. That attack also occurs in 1979. And over here, you have this other country, Afghanistan. And we all know what was happening in Afghanistan.

**[00:11:18.790]**

There was a civil war, but it was a proxy war between the Soviet Union and the United States. You have this war in Afghanistan. And we know that the United States was involved in that civil war. They spent approximately \$8 billion in Afghanistan to manipulate it to their own end. Saudi Arabia matched the United States with about \$8 billion.

**[00:11:46.400]**

The United States spent about 8 billion. Saudi Arabia spent about \$8 billion in Afghanistan as well. They were just as interested in Afghanistan because what Saudi Arabia needed to do was they needed to export their version of Islam, a version of Islam that was not extremely popular through much of the Islamic world. Wahhabism was not even a majority version of Islam. But it had to become seen as the majority version of Islam to justify the Saudi royal family and their rulership. So they can't go straight into Afghanistan. The country is a mess.

**[00:12:27.990]**

It's destroyed in civil war. Instead, there's this country that borders it, and that is Pakistan.

**[00:12:38.990]**

Pakistan was quite progressive. I think it was the first woman in the world that was elected to a type of Congress was in Pakistan. They were really quite progressive when it came to many of these modern issues, until there was an overthrow. And again, this all happened in the same history. And this dictator took control of Pakistan and introduced Sharia law. And we'll just summarize his name as Zia. I'm going to make Pakistan bigger, because we have quite a bit to add here.

**[00:13:21.510]**

Zia was a dictator. And again, just like in the other countries, what's happening in the Islamic world is this combination of church and state hitting country by country by country. He introduces Sharia Law. The people do not want him in power. The people of Pakistan do not want him.

**[00:13:43.430]**

But he has two important allies. Because geopolitically, he's useful to the United States and to Saudi Arabia. The United States and Saudi Arabia hold him in power. The people don't want him. This geopolitical agenda of the United States destroys Pakistan. It's a very sad story.

**[00:14:11.910]**

It really destroys the idea of America as being a country that exports democracy. Because the people of Pakistan back then, before more Indoctrination occurred, they could have overthrown him. They wanted to overthrow him, but they're forced under his rule. The reason the United States wants Zia in power is

because he supports their agenda in Afghanistan. And Pakistan borders Afghanistan. It becomes important to have an ally in the region.

**[00:14:43.460]**

They'd rather support him than risk having a new government that might support the Soviet Union. They'll hold this dictator in power and he destroys the country. There's this town in Pakistan, Peshawar. It's this city just across the border from Afghanistan. Peshawar becomes an extremely important place.

**[00:15:11.590]**

This is where the headquarters of the leaders of the Mujahideen who'd fled into exile from Afghanistan, they all had to Peshawar. Hundreds of thousands of refugees from Afghanistan all head to Peshawar. Saudi Arabia sees an opportunity. What they're going to do is they're going to give massive discounts to all flights from Saudi Arabia to Peshawar, and they're going to send through to this town, both fighters to support the war in Afghanistan, they're going to send fighters. But they're also going to send Muslim clerics, radical Muslim clerics, to export their version of Islam.

**[00:15:57.110]**

And remember, for them, this is not just about this isn't just wanting to convert people, this is to justify their state rule. They'll send all these radical clerics to Peshawar. And then they're going to create hundreds of schools along the Afghanistan Pakistan border. Hundreds of Islamic schools run by the most radical Islamic clerics to indoctrinate the Mujahideen fighters. To indoctrinate the refugees.

**[00:16:30.760]**

The children of the fighters. The children of the refugees. And even the local Pakistan population. Which were not Wahhabi Sunnis. And indoctrinate them with radical Sunni Wahhabism.

**[00:16:45.790]**

And these radical clerics, they do a very good job. The students of these schools created and funded by Saudi Arabia along the Pakistan Afghanistan border later become the leaders of the Taliban. The leaders of many of those organizations, particularly the Taliban. Saudi Arabia built hundreds of religious seminaries along that Afghanistan border.

**[00:17:18.220]**

These seminaries had to favor the fundamentalist school of thought that was closest to Saudi puritanism. This indoctrination caused this radicalization of the area. And some of the graduates became the founders of the Taliban. Out of these schools also would rise Al Qaeda. One fellow moved to Peshawar early on.

**[00:17:46.430]**

He was one of the early ones. His name is Abdullah Yusef Azam. He is known as the father of global jihad. This fellow, he's a Sunni Islamic scholar. He preached both defensive and offensive jihad by Muslims to support the Mujahideen in battle against the Soviet Union.

**[00:18:08.710]**

He moves to Peshawar and then he sends for a friend of his. Come and join me. And those two men worked together for years, up until this father of global jihad, Azam, he's assassinated in 1989. But he calls to his friend and says, come join me in Pakistan. We have a work to do.

**[00:18:27.260]**

And that friend he calls Osama bin Laden. You have Abdullah Yusef Azam and Osama bin Laden and they become the co-creators of Al Qaeda. To skip ahead some. Out of Peshawar come the Taliban and Al Qaeda. And it's not just these, it's the whole radicalization of Islam across the region. These are two types of movements that grow out of that radicalization.

**[00:19:07.670]**

But this has all been purposefully, intentionally, both encouraged and funded, orchestrated through Saudi Arabia, by Saudi Arabia. If we skip some years, we come down to 911. We come down to 2001, September 11, and you have this attack on the United States. There's 19 terrorists associated with the attack on the United States. 19 known terrorists that performed that attack, orchestrated and performed. Of those 19 terrorists, one is from Egypt, one is from Lebanon, two are from the United Arab Emirates, and 15 are from Saudi Arabia. Why? The problem with what Saudi Arabia has done, and in some degree still continues to do, is to justify their own rule over Mecca and Medina. They went into a church state relationship to justify themselves. They were forced to fund and encourage the most radical of clerics, even when their own people didn't originally hold to that radical viewpoint.

**[00:20:41.270]**

And they had to export this radical version of Islam. The problem with that is they tend to lose control of their own projects. If you were to imagine Saudi Arabia, that royal family is much like a Donald Trump. They hold to a version of Islam and they support a version of Islam that's extremely puritanistic fundamentalist.

**[00:21:10.730]**

But they themselves, the royal family themselves, aren't all that moral. Much the same way you see Donald Trump today. For example, they like sport. And a real fundamentalist Muslim would not support any form of sport. It's a sin. But they like their sport.

**[00:21:34.420]**

They will refuse to outlaw their sport. They will arrest and imprison clerics who speak against their favorite sport. The royal family themselves, like Donald Trump, aren't that moral. But they've been forced to go

into union with radical Islam. But as those like Al Qaeda, and particularly ISIS, is that organization can recognize that we don't like the Shia faith, we don't like the west, but we also don't like the Saudi royal family. They lose control of their own projects. And so I'm not suggesting that the Saudi Arabian government themselves, the leaders, orchestrated the 911 attacks, but they did create the environment.

**[00:22:35.750]**

Is it okay? They created the environment by which that happened.

**[00:22:43.790]**

What happened within Saudi Arabia is directly responsible.

**[00:22:51.390]**

The exact same thing similarly happened with ISIS. You have these two sides. You have the Shia sect of Islam, and the Sunni sect of Islam. If we could just give a parable to make this easier to conceptualize. Iran is a church state government.

**[00:23:14.610]**

If we were to bring that to Christianity and away from Islam. Shiism is a lot like Catholicism. So this would be Catholic.

**[00:23:29.410]**

And the way they like Catholicism is that Shia's really like their history. They like their shrines. If there is a tomb that belongs to the father in law of the Prophet Muhammad, a Shia will restore that tomb, they will decorate it, and then they will go to that tomb and worship at it, honor the father in law of Mohammed. They like their relics. Sunni's are more like Protestants.

**[00:24:06.320]**

The Shia sect has more in line with Catholicism. The Sunni sect has more in line with Protestantism. And the Sunnis, they see the Shias as idolaters. Because they believe that those Shia's, when they honor these shrines and they decorate the tombs, and they travel to the tombs to offer their prayers. They see that as idolatry, as creating idol worship. These Sunnis see these Shias as just all idolatas.

**[00:24:38.750]**

And these Shias get angry at their Sunnis because the Sunnis keep destroying their cultural sites. So, for example, why the house of Saud has rulership of Mecca and Medina. They keep it nice enough, they make it into a tourist attraction. But there's a lot about those cultural sites that they've also destroyed. Because they see it as idolatry to keep holding up the tombs of the Prophet Muhammad's family, et cetera. They will destroy some of those cultural sites.

**[00:25:13.590]**

They won't try to preserve them. These two sects of Islam can really fight over these cultural sites. It makes it for much more of a tense argument.

**[00:25:30.170]**

What was ISIS doing that was upsetting everyone globally? They travel around their portion of the Middle East, and what did they do? They'd bring in equipment, they'd bring in bombs. And they would just decimate cultural sites. Cultural sites that have existed for thousands of years, going back to the days of Babylon, they would decimate. They would take the historians, the archaeologists who worked at that site, who preserved those sites, and they'd publicly execute them.

**[00:26:03.980]**

They made a big point of destroying any type of history or culture that had been preserved across the Middle East, and they destroyed thousands of years of these ancient sites that had been preserved. The reason they did that is ISIS belongs to the Sunni sect. And those cultural sites are seen as either being used for idolatry or encouraging idolatry. So out of this work of Saudi Arabia came Al Qaeda, came the Taliban, came ISIS, and the 911 attacks. This isn't something that could have come from Iran.

**[00:26:53.930]**

Iran is also radical. If you want to see what a Shia terrorist organization looks like. Hezbollah. Some of you may be familiar with Hezbollah in Lebanon, they are Shia. But the other radical terrorist organizations come from this Sunni sect. And that's why, as close as the United States is with Saudi Arabia, because of geopolitical interests against Iraq, against the Soviet Union, because of oil, for various reasons, they're close with Saudi Arabia, many of which comes up either down to power or money.

**[00:27:36.970]**

This is where radical Islam has come from in the way that it threatens the west today. Even though Iran also subscribes to Sharia law.

**[00:27:54.910]**

I want us to have a basic overview of how this developed, since 1979. It's a revolution, really, two revolutions. A revolution in Iran that's obvious and easy to see. But there's also a revolution occurred in Saudi Arabia that was much more obscure. And it was the combination of church and state that happened in Saudi Arabia and was then exported across the Middle East that gave a rise to the Taliban, al Qaeda, ISIS, etc.

**[00:28:31.150]**

And I just find it interesting that it's so popular in the west to look at Iran as the threat and they don't realize their threat for the last 40 years has largely come from here. So much like people are looking to the Catholic world and they're forgetting the Protestant world, where their threat actually came from. And



that was nowhere more obvious than at 911, where 15 of those 19 terrorists were Saudi Arabian. The alleged Saudi (state) role in the September 11 attacks gained a new attention after two former US senators, co chairman of the Congressional inquiry into the 911 attacks, told CBS in April of 2016 that the redacted 28 pages of the Congressional inquiries report refer to evidence of Saudi Arabia's substantial involvement in the execution of the 911 attacks.

**[00:29:35.460]**

There's still many open questions about how much certain government officials in Saudi Arabia knew and how much funding and encouragement they gave to that initiative. But much of that has been redacted and also held back to preserve this alliance between the United States and Saudi Arabia. The house of Saud needed to justify their rule to engage in these projects, but they are in regular danger of losing control of them because of their own immorality, if I can put it that way.

**[00:30:26.820]**

It becomes important to know these histories. Because when someone was to throw out a quote, for example someone like Walter Veith. Walter Veith was to throw out a quote and say, Islam cannot be responsible for 911, and I'll tell you why. I traveled from the north to the south and from the south to the north of Syria before their civil war, and it was a backward, ignorant country. They can't be responsible for the 911 attacks. When Walter Veith makes such a statement, which he did in 2018, what's the first thing you should question?

**[00:31:08.570]**

First thing that comes to my attention is that regardless of how he thinks or what his personal morality is, the statement is racist. It's just that the words, the message is racist. Regardless of the man. To say that Syria was too backwards and ignorant, that is my paraphrase of his statement. He says it in a much more harder to identify fashion.

**[00:31:38.190]**

But there's a problem with that. He's identifying Syria. He traveled through Syria and said, in essence, it's too backward, it's too ignorant, they could never orchestrate and fund something like 911. Therefore, it cannot have come from radical Islam.

**[00:31:53.740]**

Syria, where do they fit on this board? Is Syria predominantly Sunni or Shia? Is Assad Sunni or Shia? Assad is Shia. The whole house of Assad has been Shia.

**[00:32:09.180]**

It's a Shia country. In their civil war, who's going to support Assad? Who's going to support the rebels? Iran will support Assad.

**[00:32:27.850]**

Iran will support Assad, and Saudi Arabia will support the rebels. Because Iran is supporting another Shia country, and Iran is united to Russia, which is also another ally of Assad in Syria. They work together. The United States is allied to Saudi Arabia. They'll support the rebels. Again, it's still over the same sectarian rift within Islam. So, no, the 911 attacks were never going to come from Syria anyway. It's a Shia stronghold, and Shiism is directly opposed to Sunni ism. Sunni ism is where you find al Qaeda and Saudi Arabia. And 15 of the 19 terrorists, not one of those terrorists was even Syrian.

**[00:33:32.680]**

Their money did not come from Syria. They were never funded by Assad. There is no connection between 911 and Iran or Syria. The statement itself is just, on the most basic level, ignorant of the Middle East.

**[00:33:52.060]**

We're going to come back later on, towards the end of our presentations. Probably, definitely by now it will be next week. Looking at some of the viewpoints of Walter Veith. Just a couple, because it becomes so overwhelming. I just want us to have a little bit of a view of the history itself. So just how many layers of wrong there are in the statements that he makes.

**[00:34:19.970]**

But to see the wrong, we need to have just a basic overview over what happened here. And who does Walter Veith say was responsible for the 911 attacks? Back in that quote in 2018, which will come back to, he starts to say sarcastically about how people will say, oh, it wasn't Islam, it was the Zionists. And then Walter Veith will say, well, it's not really the Jews. It's the Jews that are controlled by the Papacy.

**[00:34:55.590]**

So underneath all that, if I can cut out the noise, he's saying it was the Jews. It still was the Jews. And there's someone who would agree with him. In 2002, the Interior Minister of Saudi Arabia said it was impossible that 15 Saudis could have participated in 911. He said it was a Zionist conspiracy, quoting him. We still ask ourselves, who has benefited from 911?

**[00:35:23.190]**

I think it is the Jews, the antagonists. Saudi Arabia is certainly happy for that viewpoint, that it was the Jews that were responsible for 911. But there's absolutely no evidence for that. It's a deflection of their own responsibility for that attack.

**[00:35:42.110]**

This was a bit of a diversion from our study. To just have an overview of what's happened in the Middle East over the last 40 years. It's a big subject. We just wanted to break down the two branches of Islam, Shia, Sunni. They have become church and state unions in two countries in the Middle East, that have

engulfed the rest of the Middle East in proxy wars ever since. Destroyed vast areas of the Middle East outside their own countries, from Lebanon to Syria to Pakistan. One is Shia.

**[00:36:19.910]**

One is Sunni. Wahhabism. Both quite radical, both believe in Sharia law. Saudi Arabia saw an opportunity, with the Afghanistan civil war, with the United States backing, to become involved in that war, to export their radical version of Islam through their clerics, through hundreds of church schools along the Pakistan Afghanistan border, to recruit and indoctrinate both the Mujahideen fighters and the refugees and the children of those.

**[00:36:58.250]**

And it all particularly centered around this one town of Peshawar. And into Peshawar come two leaders who unite, Asam the father of modern jihad, who calls across to Peshawar his friend Osama bin Laden. And they united become the two co founders of al Qaeda. Azam is assassinated in 1989. By that stage, he'd already fallen out with Osama bin Laden because Osama bin Laden wanted to take this new movement and he wanted to expand it. And then wanted it more kept within Pakistan, Afghanistan. He didn't see the benefit of this international expansion.

**[00:37:40.660]**

They came to an early disagreement. But Azam is assassinated and Osama bin Laden takes Al Qaeda international.

**[00:37:50.130]**

From that fomenting of radical Islam, there is a radical transformation across many countries in the Middle East. Right from Egypt to all across the Middle East. And much of it has happened because Saudi Arabia can tend to lose control of their projects. It also back in here in Peshawar in this history, you'll also find other men who became the founders and the leaders of what became known as ISIS. There's many more players than Osama bin Laden.

**[00:38:24.190]**

Out of that same petridish came ISIS and those other separate terrorist organizations that slowly morphed and developed into ISIS. But this was a Saudi Arabian project. A union of church and state. We described it as Catholic versus Protestant. And if you had gone back into the Middle Ages, you would have seen a very similar dynamic, where you would have a Catholic church state union and a Protestant church state union, and they're going to fight for the expansion of their influence throughout Europe. That's what's happened in the Middle East.

**[00:39:01.680]**

And that is why the Middle East is in the mess it is today. It's not because they're just violent people. It's not because it's just a violent religion. You could say the exact same thing of Christianity in the 1260. You would have seen the same thing.

**[00:39:17.080]**

It was the same thing. All that the Middle East has is that same church state mess now that we had in the 1260. These two opposing sides, both in church state unions. And they are going to continue to attack each other, punch each other through their different proxies across the Middle East, outside their own national borders. And Iran is by no means bearing the majority of the guilt for that, much falls on Saudi Arabia. And again, it's not because they necessarily just believe in Sharia law, any more than Donald Trump is a really good Protestant.

**[00:39:58.900]**

This has become politically necessary for them to do. It's political necessity. If we can just have an overview of what happened there. The minute you hear a quote by someone like Walter Veith, you can immediately see the vast gaping holes in his arguments. The minute he says terrorism couldn't come from the Middle East because I went to Syria and it was really backwards, you can see the layers of the problems. Syria is Shia.

**[00:40:28.260]**

It does not subscribe to the ideology held by Al Qaeda, Oosama bin Laden or ISIS. Which is why ISIS goes into a new territory, the first thing they're going to do is round up and slaughter every Shia they can find. It's convert or we will kill you. They kill more Muslims than they've ever killed nonmuslims, because they will kill anyone who is an idolater or a Shiite.

**[00:41:04.750]**

And before people like Walter Veith want to make that sound racist, they should look back into the 1260 and see Christianity did the exact same thing.

**[00:41:20.930]**

It's the inevitable danger of any church state union.

**[00:41:30.930]**

We'll come back to our subject.

**[00:41:34.950]**

We'll remind ourselves of that next week when we just come back to that one quote by Walter Veith. When he then goes into Zionism, the Rothschild and the Illuminati.

**[00:41:57.730]**

We can review it next week. I just wanted us not so much to talk about Walter Veith, but to just see the steps that Islam has taken over the last 40 years in the Middle East. The church state issues they're facing.

**[00:42:15.710]**

Many of you are now familiar with the names Yamar Khashoggi, the journalist that Saudi Arabia had killed a couple of years ago. And this you can place at the very top of the Saudi Arabian government. That journalist Jamal Khashoggi. In the late 1970s, early 1980s history, he traveled to that town of Peshawar and he interviewed Osama bin Laden. When you talk about Jamal Khashoggi and the reason that Saudi Arabia had him killed, he knows that history. He knows the guilt that that royal family bears. What they actually did and exported, the radical Islam that they've exported.

**[00:43:00.320]**

His mistake was that he would speak about it. Here's someone that interviewed Osama bin Laden back in that beginning history. If you see Khashoggi's history, what he knows, what he was able to speak about, you'll understand why the house of Saud wanted him dead, why they had him assassinated.

**[00:43:27.450]**

Coming back to our subject of last week, we'll put Islam, all of that to one side for a moment. Last week we spoke about ancient Israel and modern Israel. We'll review that and then we'll continue on. We've seen that we can compare and contrast ancient Israel. That was the Jewish nation.

**[00:43:51.370]**

They were to spread the knowledge of God through the known world. And this was in anticipation of Christ's first advent. Then we have modern Israel, that's Adventism. They also had the instructions to spread the knowledge of God through the world. And that was anticipation of Christ's second advent.

**[00:44:13.700]**

In the last 6000 years, you have these two peoples that God has raised up to do a specific work, ancient Israel and modern Israel, Jewish nation Adventism. What we were doing is, we were comparing and contrasting these two. Classic rules of parable teaching. As we do this, there's quite a few neat points that brother Brendan discussed this morning. If you were there for that class, particularly when we talk about parables and as we begin with the history of Egypt. So that class before there were some good points in there that will already be in your minds.

**[00:45:01.270]**

But we compared and contrast ancient and modern and we worked through the history of the ancient. We see that the beginning of this ancient history was at the end of a time prophecy, the 400 years time prophecy that Israel was to spend in Egypt.

**[00:45:25.070]**

And we find they have been in darkness, in captivity, and they lost the Sabbath. We brought that down to modern Israel. 1260 years. We're also seeing that modern Israel begins at the end of the time prophecy. We'll speak about the 1260. It was 1260 years of darkness, of captivity. And God's people had lost the Sabbath. In ancient Israel, God is going to draw his people out from the nations around them, particularly from Egypt. There's darkness, there's captivity. They lost sight of the Sabbath. God will raise up a messenger.

**[00:46:40.750]**

This is Moses. Modern Israel, he raised up a messenger, that was Miller. To lead his people out of Egypt, to lead his people out of apostate Protestantism.

**[00:47:02.550]**

They're going to be let out. They're going to be given the writings through the prophet. So for ancient Israel, that continued to be Moses. So Moses was both the messenger and the prophet. And he's going to re-institute the Sabbath.

**[00:47:33.290]**

We're let out of apostate Protestantism. By 1844, there is a prophet.

**[00:47:47.770]**

They've been let out of apostate Protestantism. There's a prophet. This is Ellen White.

**[00:47:57.230]**

She will have a Sabbath vision and they will re-institute the Sabbath.

**[00:48:15.750]**

And Brother Brenden spoke this morning about parable teaching. When we understand the rules of parable teaching, we understand that we are to compare and to contrast. I just want us to think about that for a moment. With a parable, we are to compare and contrast. What are the comparisons between ancient and modern Israel?

**[00:48:50.430]**

We've already listed some. What I want to suggest is that the comparison between the two things usually when you come to a parable, the comparison you make is in the structure. You can see darkness, captivity, the loss of the Sabbath, the raising up of a messenger, a leader. There's going to be a coming out. Here, they're going to come out of Egypt. Here, they're going to come out of apostate Protestantism.

**[00:49:30.230]**

A prophet will be given the writings of Moses. He will re-institute the Sabbath, which he was told directly from God to do. Ellen White, she becomes a prophet. She has her Sabbath vision and the Sabbath is re-introduced.

**[00:49:50.850]**

They came out of Egypt. They were to go into the promised land. They could have done a work immediately. There didn't need to be a long delay. And we're going to go back and see the mistakes they made in that history.

**[00:50:04.930]**

Just reviewing, because we already spoke of them last week. So we know that they made these fundamental mistakes. So coming back to Egypt. They come out of Egypt and they're in the wilderness, and what do they do? Apostasy. The history of the golden calf.

**[00:50:27.330]**

So just to give the structure again, there's a failure. There's a failure in the wilderness as they come out of Egypt, because of their failures throughout this history, we'll discuss two of them. They go into captivity to Babylon. They come out of Babylon seemingly cured of idolatry, and we'll discuss the failures in that history. And then they go into captivity to Rome.

**[00:50:56.400]**

The issues that they face is there repeating failures. Failure, failure. And finally, at the end, success. The alpha history is one of failure. The Omega history is one of success. It's the exact same pattern we see with modern Israel.

**[00:51:27.090]**

We've already identified, we did last week in the quotes from Evangelism, that Christ should have come back by 1868. And Brother Brenden spoke this morning that Christ could not return until after 1798. Sometime between 1798 and 1868, in those 70 years, Christ should have been able to return. He couldn't. It was delayed.

**[00:51:58.490]**

This was the alpha history. Failure.

**[00:52:09.050]**

He should have returned by 1868. Within that 70 years. Then we have the history of 1888. Again. The third angel's message was crying. Sunday laws were already in the United States.

**[00:52:23.380]**

Everything had been set up. God's people just needed to be ready for it. They weren't. It was a history of failure. We know that we are in the Omega history, the history of success.

**[00:52:38.320]**

When we see ancient and modern Israel, we take them as a parable. We compare and contrast them. What we can compare is the structure. The structure is the same for ancient as it is for modern. You have the darkness, the messenger, the coming out, the prophet, the Sabbath, and also the histories of apostasy. Failure, failure, success.

**[00:53:03.470]**

But what are the contrasts? What are the contrasts between ancient and modern?

**[00:53:16.110]**

We've spoken about the comparisons. I want us to think about the contrasts. Because a parable always has contrasts. They are never identical. You can see that all through Christ's parables. Shepherd and sheep. It's just the easiest one.

**[00:53:31.820]**

We always mention. There's nothing about your physical structure that looks like a sheep. There are comparisons, but there's many contrasts. What is a contrast between ancient Israel and modern Israel?

**[00:53:51.690]**

The contrast, I think, is most crucial to see is ancient Israel is a theocracy.

**[00:54:01.990]**

It's a combination of church and state.

**[00:54:10.010]**

Ancient Israel is a theocracy.

**[00:54:19.470]**

Is modern Israel a theocracy?

**[00:54:23.970]**

Modern Israel is a separation of church and state. It's God's people, it's a church. And you find that there has been a wall placed between the church and the state.



**[00:54:46.090]**

And this one seemingly small issue, the fact that we have to contrast as well as compare, is where much of Protestantism has fallen. This is their main stumbling block. Because many people, they can look to the word of God and they can make a comparison that's quite easy to do. Ancient Israel. Modern Israel. Glorious land. Glorious land. And then in the United States, in the south, in the 1850s and 60s. What are they going to say? Ancient glorious land, slavery. Modern glorious land, slavery. They can compare, but they cannot contrast. Because they don't know how to use parables.

**[00:55:29.470]**

Our ability to contrast is often what also makes our message special, because it prevents us from making those mistakes and enables us to explain much of what Protestantism and Adventism either misinterpret or they choose to ignore. More often within Adventism than not, they just choose to ignore everything that they can't explain or don't want to talk about. This ability to contrast is important. And the greatest contrast we need to be aware of between ancient and modern is that one is a theocracy and one is a separation of church and state.

**[00:56:19.970]**

This starts to become particularly relevant when you define the glorious land. That's where it could confuse some people. Because here when you have church and state, you have the church, God's people. And the state rules the glorious land. When you separate the two, you have to be careful how you understand the glorious land. The glorious land being the United States. And if you are not able to contrast ancient and modern Israel, what will you do?

**[00:56:54.890]**

You'll end up trying to enforce a theocracy in the United States, a church and state union. Which is exactly what Protestantism has battled with over the last 300 years.

**[00:57:16.120]**

We will come back to that when we review 1798, Jedidiah Morse and how he viewed the United States. Coming back to ancient Israel. They had three opportunities to do God's work. When they came out of Egypt, when they came out of Babylon, and then when they were to be led out of Rome. The third looking different to what they had anticipated. I just want to come back to this idolatry at Sinai, this golden calf.

**[00:58:00.170]**

I'm going to read from Patriarchs and Prophets 315.1.

**[00:58:12.940]**

It's the whole chapter. It's chapter 28: Idolatry in Sinai. I'll start at paragraph one, but I'm going to paraphrase through the whole chapter.

**[00:58:22.590]**

It's talking about Moses in Sinai and the idolatry of the people in his absence. While Moses was absent, it was a time of waiting and suspense for Israel. Accustomed as they had been in Egypt to material representations of deity, it had been hard for them to trust in an invisible being. And they had come to rely upon Moses to sustain their faith. Now he was taken from them. Day after day, week after week passed, and still he did not return.

**[00:58:56.730]**

Notwithstanding the cloud was still in view, it seemed to many in the camp that their leader had deserted them, or that he had been consumed by the devouring fire. Paragraph three. Feeling their helplessness in the absence of their leader, they returned to their old superstitions. Among the objects regarded by the Egyptians as symbols of deity was the ox or the calf. We spoke last week that this ox or calf is the Apis bull.

**[00:59:33.610]**

It was suggested of those who had practiced this form of idolatry in Egypt that a calf was now made and worshiped. The people desired some image to represent God and to go before them in the place of Moses. This ox or calf that they have made, what was it made to represent? Who were they replacing? God and Moses.

**[01:00:02.770]**

This calf was not just a replacement of God. It was a replacement of their leader. It was a replacement of Moses. You have to imagine their position. They've been let out of Egypt.

**[01:00:16.670]**

Pharaoh has attempted to take them back. He's been destroyed. But now they're sitting in the wilderness. They have no leader, they have no king, they have no general. And there are still many enemies around them. They are afraid.

**[01:00:31.160]**

And in this fear, they return to the idolatry of Egypt and particularly the Apis bull. And I want us to think about why they chose the Apis Bull. When the people come to Aaron, they say to Aaron, make us gods which shall go before us. For as for this Moses, the man that brought us up out of the land of Egypt, we don't know what has become of him. They're saying to Aaron, you have to make us a god, because we don't know what happened to Moses.

**[01:01:06.480]**

They're replacing Moses. We read last week about the Apis Bull. What it represented in Egypt, that it was linked to the king. They were both supposedly living gods who commanded nearly equal reverence. Both

became Osiris in the afterlife. The bull was chosen, because it symbolized everything that you would want in a king. The courageous heart, the great strength, the fighting spirit.

**[01:01:37.730]**

So Apis came to be considered a manifestation of an earthly king. A king, or a pharaoh. His title was the strong bull of the mother Hathor. Hathor was their goddess, which they assumed gave birth in some fashion to all of their other deities. Hathor was the mother goddess, and their common title for an Egyptian king was the strong bull from this goddess mother.

**[01:02:14.570]**

And then we spoke about how the king would be depicted with a bovine tail on one side and then on the other side this picture as a bull breaking down the walls of a city. What they're looking for when they build this golden calf is a replacement for Moses. It's a replacement for a king. Someone with a courageous heart who will go forth for them conquering. And the reason is that they don't know what's happened to Moses. They need a king, not just a god, but a king.

**[01:02:56.990]**

This is a cry for a king. And it's their consistent theme throughout the entire time as their history as god's people. We then went to first Samuel. The people gathered themselves to Samuel at Ramah. We looked at the word Ramah. If you were to go to Ezekiel 16: 24, 25, 31 and 39, it'll give you five instances of where this word that means Ramah is translated as the "high places of idolatry".

**[01:03:34.670]**

This is idol worship. When they go to Samuel and they say: Give us a king. They want a king who will be like the Apis Bull. It is the fighting spirit, the courageous heart, the great strength. And they receive a king. Then when the kingdom splits, they build a golden calf, and they put it in both north and south.

**[01:04:01.610]**

They continue to hold on to that imagery.

**[01:04:06.150]**

God sends them into captivity to Babylon. It's meant to cure them. They come out of Babylon, and they've been cured of what? They've been cured of the image. The image, but not the characteristics associated with it.

**[01:04:21.670]**

Now they won't build an Apis Bull. Now they're good conservative, Pharisees. But what type of deliverer are they looking for? They're looking for someone who will come as the Apis Bull. They're looking for a deliverer who is both like Pharaoh. He's a deity and he's also a conquering ruler.

**[01:04:44.380]**

They're looking for the combination of a deity and a conquering ruler. And we read in Signs of the Times, May 8, 1893, paragraph nine. A quote from last week. They could not recognize Christ because he did not fit with their preconceived opinions. He came in too much humiliation with no conquering army. They didn't receive their combination of deity and conquering king.

**[01:05:13.740]**

And when they didn't see the conquering king, they rejected Christ. Ellen White finishes that quote by saying, let us take a lesson from the mistake of the Jewish people and not be found committing a similar error. We need to think about what similar error Adventism could make today, because you know that I'm making the argument that we did exactly that. Ancient Israel. Modern Israel.

**[01:05:40.160]**

You come down to here and they're looking for a king, a conqueror, courageous.

**[01:05:59.910]**

And what was the other one?

**[01:06:05.650]**

Fighting spirit.

**[01:06:11.690]**

Conqueror, courageous heart, fighting spirit. That's what they're looking for.

**[01:06:19.230]**

You have this interesting dynamic, the Pharisees. Not just the pharisees. Much of the Jewish nation. I did particularly pick on the Conservatives last week. We should remember also that the others had a similar viewpoint.

**[01:06:35.610]**

They believe that they are special. They believe that they're different to all the other nations. A good Pharisee would say, we are special. We are not the same as Egypt, we are not the same as Babylon. We're not the same as Rome.

**[01:06:51.550]**

If you were to think about these three, Egypt, Babylon, Rome. What did Egypt have? Egypt had a pharaoh. And the pharaoh, he was both deity and he was a conquering king.

**[01:07:28.090]**

If you were to go to Babylon, what did they have?

**[01:07:33.950]**

They had a king. He was both god, and he was also this conqueror.

**[01:07:45.630]**

When you came to Rome. Rome had their Caesar.

**[01:07:55.150]**

He was a god, he was deified, but he was also this conqueror. To be a leader in Egypt, Babylon or Rome, you expect to not only have the properties of the deity, but also this conquering spirit, this courageous heart, this fighting spirit. This is what was expected to be a leader in a pagan nation. Courageous heart, great strength and fighting spirit. And they became united. This concept of what the leader should be. And over here is Israel and they're looking judgmentally at all of these nations, and they're saying: we're nothing like them. We are the special people, the chosen of God, the covenant, the covenant people, we have the Sabbath.

**[01:09:05.340]**

They're all idolatists. But what's their problem? They may have let go of the form of the idol, but the characteristics of the idol they're still imbibed. They may have let go of these ancient nations in their open idolatry, but they've kept the exact same mindset. When Christ is to come, what do they want?

**[01:09:31.490]**

They receive Christ. And he's God, but they can't recognize that he's God because he is not coming with a conquering army.

**[01:09:47.050]**

They don't see this fighting spirit. He's just being nice to the Romans, healing their servants. They don't see this manifestation of courage. And because they don't see these things this side, they cannot accept Christ as God. While believing that they are so special and different to the pagan nations around them, they were actually the exact same with the exact same mindset, even with their feelings of superiority and separation from them. And the fact that as we define idolatry, you have to have the form of an idol, you have to have a bull or whatever that idol looks like, but then you need to have the characteristics of that idol, it's character, it's personality. You have to have a story for that idol.

**[01:10:50.390]**

Both of them combined become idolatry. Coming out of Babylon, they took away the form. But they kept the mindset of the nations around them that they were meant to separate from. It's the problem they had

from the time they left Egypt all up until 70 AD. It was not a problem, it was not a different problem all the way along their journey. It was the exact same issue.

**[01:11:18.660]**

Which is why God kept laboring with them throughout their lifespan as his people, to tear them away from these pagan nations, from the idolatry of the mindset that caused them to desire a king, both at Sinai, at Ramah, and later at the first advent of Christ. And what we find is, while believing that they are separated from and distinct from the nations around them, they were actually in the exact same condition. They had the exact same mindset.

**[01:12:11.070]**

We'll just touch on a couple of points. We'll remind everyone here that the cure for this mindset was parable teaching. In both its comparisons and its contrasts. Christ came and he taught in parables to reteach them both of the nature of the kingdom and of the nature of the king. If you don't understand the nature of the kingdom, you won't understand the nature of the king. This is their understanding of what the nature of the kingdom should be like. And if they think the kingdom should look like that, they think the king should look like that.

**[01:12:50.770]**

Christ is going to use parables to try and tear them from that understanding.

**[01:12:58.710]**

He gets so far in that. But for the nation as a whole, as an institution, they reject it and the institution is swept away. I just want to remind us that when he uses those parables, they're not parables that you find in the writings of the prophet Moses, of their prophet. Because of that, he is often attacked by the Pharisees as destroying the writings of the prophet. He will use the model of agriculture, for example, or a familiar story about a wedding dowry.

**[01:13:32.670]**

Those are the parables he'll use because he uses what's familiar to the people. I just want to make the point that for many people living today, they're more familiar with the history of World War II than they are familiar with the methods of agriculture. It doesn't become strange that God would teach us through parables like the history of world wars. And again, this movement comes under attack for putting weight of prophetic evidence in these parables that you don't find in the writings of Ellen White. People feel that is somehow wrong. If Christ went back here and used the dowry system, which is the lost coin, or the traditional Jewish marriage, or the model of agriculture, none of which you find in any of the writings of the Old Testament, and he uses them as a foundation of the parable teaching that will cure his people, why would it surprise us that down in our time you might find God use what's familiar and easily accessible to us?

**[01:14:39.970]**

World wars, for example. We're not using the writings of Ellen White to discuss the world wars and create a parable. But we're following in the exact same pattern that Christ laid out in the history of ancient Israel.

**[01:14:59.990]**

Again, we find them in idolatry. And this idolatry isn't a lack of morality, it isn't the length of their skirts, it isn't their adornment. I want to be careful when we start talking about conservatism and liberalism. The danger is that those terms can become hijacked. And there are many people who misunderstand what we mean when we say conservative and liberal.

**[01:15:28.580]**

What I'm particularly interested in is not the moral conservatism, it's the social conservatism. People can wear makeup and be socially conservative. Look at a woman on Fox News, for example, or a man for that matter. They care what they look like, male and female on Fox News. They're both in makeup, but they're socially conservative.

**[01:15:55.790]**

That becomes important when we bring it to Adventism as well. This social conservatism. The whole pattern, the comparisons, we brought that down to modern Israel. I want to review what we touched on in modern Israel. God drew people out of the pagan nations around them. They were to be special. His Covenant people.

**[01:16:27.570]**

God drew advantage out of the apostate Protestant churches around them and they were to be his special covenant people. They reintroduced the Sabbath. They reintroduced the Sabbath. They're given the writings of the prophet. They're given the writings of the prophet.

**[01:16:43.660]**

They were drawn out of pagan nations, states. They were drawn out of apostate Protestant churches. We wanted to have a look at what was happening in Apostate Protestantism. Because this becomes important. Early 1700s you have this first great religious awakening. And in this first great religious awakening, protestantism really comes under quite a crisis.

**[01:17:15.130]**

You have a growing liberal movement in Protestantism, particularly after the American Revolution. That wants to take the principles of the American Revolution of freedom of thought and bring that into their religious experience. And then you have this old conservative branch of Protestantism that is seeing their influence under attack. We looked at these two branches within Protestantism.

**[01:17:52.130]**

You have one that's quite liberal and the second that's quite conservative.

**[01:18:03.130]**

This conservative branch we found was headed by a man known as Jedidiah Morse.

**[01:18:18.710]**

I'll give us a brief summary of what was our conclusions on that. Around the late 1700s into the 1790s, there was an enormous popular interest aroused in the books of Daniel and Revelation. The conservative clergy was led by Jedidiah Morse, and they believed that the decay of public virtue, of morality, the rise of liberal faith and the politics in America posed the greatest threat to their power to control the people. They became particularly centered around what became Yale University in Connecticut or Yale College. I think that's the same area.

**[01:19:03.430]**

And Timothy Dwight, the president of Yale College, became a crucial ally of Jedidiah Morse. Quoting this Timothy Dwight, he said in 1789, the new constitution of the United States, however indispensable, as a purely negative system of restraint, will neither restore order nor establish justice unless the constitution is accompanied and supported by morality among all the people.

**[01:19:38.830]**

Dwight advocated a public role for the clergy as society's moral monitors. Then they spoke about this new republic, this United States, now freed from Britain as being Israel freed from Egypt. Bringing you back to what we discussed about parable teaching. What do you have to do with a parable? You have to compare and contrast.

**[01:20:04.400]**

And what can they not do? What are they not doing? They are not contrasting. They cannot see the differences, the contrast between the ancient glorious land and the modern glorious land. And this is the first mistake, or one of the key mistakes that really underlies their whole warped thinking about the United States.

**[01:20:29.950]**

If there is no contrast, an ancient Israel with a theocracy, what must modern Israel be? They are interpreting that as the United States. It must be a theocracy. Ancient Israel, they seemed to be blessed by God or cursed by God, depending on their morality, and their keeping of their Jewish Sabbath. So for a Protestant in the United States, there's this new republic.

**[01:20:58.070]**

What do they fear? That their political success as a nation, just like ancient Israel, depends on their morality and their keeping to the law of God and their Sunday Sabbath. This is the thinking that leads them all the way to start pushing for Sunday laws. Because they fear that if they do not keep the law of



God, God will judge the nation. And they're taking that from this literalistic interpretation of the Bible where they are comparing, but they are unable to contrast.

**[01:21:38.510]**

New Englanders knew that their perilous experiment, this new Republican nation now in the wilderness, depended on nothing but their own individual morality. This new society did not mirror the virtue the clergy wanted to see and this caused them to fear for the political safety of the nation. And we understood that these two branches of Protestantism it's this branch, the conservatives, that are fearful for the moral standing of the people that is doing this comparison without the contrast. And they are supporting one politician at this point. He's the President of the United States, John Adams.

**[01:22:28.050]**

This liberal branch, and I will discuss who heads them in a moment. And I know it's more complicated. You have various schools of thought within both, but they were largely supportive of Thomas Jefferson.

**[01:22:54.370]**

There was quite a few crises. In 1798, there was a risk that would go to war with France. He's also afraid for his own political standing. He declares a day of fasting. We read his public announcement of that declaration. It's extremely religious language. Everyone was to repent of their offenses against the most high God, etc.

**[01:23:21.860]**

Quoting John Adams, he said that the national fast recommended by me turned me out of office. He blames his declaration of a national day of fasting with his loss in the next election. The reason for that is people are becoming less tolerant of this religious speech from someone in political office. In 1798, we also saw the Alien and Sedition Acts that John Adams passed to shore up his own government. He believed in a strong executive government.

**[01:24:01.090]**

He was accused for much of his political life of believing in America as needing some type of monarchical system and that they should have a system of government that passed from child to child. A hereditary government. He strongly refuted those claims, but there was an awful lot of smoke. In 1798, he passed the Alien and Sedition Acts. There was to be no protesting his government. Immigrants were not allowed to vote until they had been in the country for 14 years before they were considered citizens.

**[01:24:43.640]**

There became no freedom for the press. Lawmakers who went against his government were imprisoned all under this Alien and Sedition Acts. Particularly the part of Sedition which prohibited public opposition to his government. So between his obvious favor for the church. He was quite a strong Protestant and his attacks on the press, he became less and less popular.

**[01:25:19.250]**

And he's also someone that is described as being extremely paranoid and vainglorious. He wanted to be famous. He wanted to be remembered for the Founding Fathers, to be as one of the Founding Fathers. And he was extremely paranoid. The president before him was George Washington.

**[01:25:37.130]**

The President after him was Thomas Jefferson. And he knew that they would end up more famous than him, more remembered. He was paranoid about his standing and his legacy and his fame. It reminds you of someone in office today. He actually died on the 4 July within hours of Thomas Jefferson. They were sworn enemies during this period, but they reconciled in the years after. They died on the same day, John Adams and Thomas Jefferson.

**[01:26:10.150]**

And John Adams last words before he died was, Thomas Jefferson still lives. That's the extent of his paranoia. He's dying. He's about to die. And he knows Thomas Jefferson hasn't died yet.

**[01:26:24.470]**

And the problem was he was actually wrong. Thomas Jefferson died a few hours before him, but he didn't know that. He was extremely competitive as far as his reputation and fame went. But he was also quite socially conservative in the areas of immigration, in the areas of freedom of the press, and in the areas of church and state. He has three particular areas that he's not well remembered for church and state, immigration and freedom of the press.

**[01:27:10.090]**

One official actually called him some bad names and John Adams had him arrested and thrown in prison for that. This restrictions on freedom of the press were very unpopular. And that's why he only ever held one term as President.

**[01:27:37.370]**

But he was supported by the conservative clergy because of his strong conservative Protestant connections and beliefs. Jedidiah Morse is going to attack this side, this side of Thomas Jefferson and the liberal side, by saying they're all in union, they're all controlled by the Bavarian Illuminati. And this was the introduction of the so called Illuminati threat teaching into the United States. And he does that in 1798.

**[01:28:08.850]**

I want to remind you of his sermons in 1798 where he said, our laws, we have laws in the United States against immorality, particularly those about swearing, profanation, debauchery, gaming and Sabbath breaking, but they're a dead letter. We're not enforcing them as we should be. He is already teaching that the government of the United States must enforce morality, including Sunday, for the preservation of the

United States. And he's saying that our greatest threat is coming from the Illuminati. Thomas Jefferson. And then he says, there are two particular states harboring the Illuminati, Virginia and New York.

**[01:28:58.520]**

Virginia, the home state of Thomas Jefferson new York, the home state of Alexander Hamilton, who'd become an enemy of John Adams. These two branches within Protestantism are supporting two different political branches of the day. William Bentley became the poster child of the liberal branch.

**[01:29:36.710]**

We discussed these two sides. John Adams, he has major issues with church and state, immigration and freedom of the press. Thomas Jefferson had many faults, but I want us to just see how he went with one of them. He was extremely anti clerical. He believed that the clergy should have no political power within the United States.

**[01:30:00.930]**

Quoting Thomas Jefferson: in every age, the priest has been hostile to liberty. They have perverted the purest religion ever preached to man into mystery and jargon. Jefferson once supported banning clergy from public office, but later relented. In 1777, he drafted the Virginia Statute for religious freedom. Ratified in 1786.

**[01:30:25.460]**

It made compelling attendance or contributions to any state sanctioned religious establishments illegal and declared that men shall be free to profess their opinions in matters of religion. That statute is one of only three accomplishments Thomas Jefferson chose to have inscribed in the epitaph of his gravestone. Early in 1802 Jefferson wrote to the Danbury Connecticut Baptist Association that religion is a matter which lies solely between man and his God. He interpreted the First Amendment as having built, "a wall of separation between church and state". This made Thomas Jefferson extremely unpopular with the conservative clergy.

**[01:31:12.430]**

He did not believe that they should have any political power. John Adams did not share those same views. It's particularly from Thomas Jefferson that we have that interpretation of the war between church and state.

**[01:31:29.190]**

He himself was known to disparage religion in private, and he was not a very good Protestant. He was more of a deist. They found many opportunities to attack him. And that's why Jedidiah Morse referred to him as King Ahaz. And John Adams being the wise Hezekiah.

**[01:32:05.650]**

This conservative branch, what characterized them? They believed in the enforcement of morality.

**[01:32:19.590]**

They believed in a more monarchical type of government. A strong executive branch.

**[01:32:41.350]**

They believed in a literal to literal biblical interpretation that is parable teaching with all of the comparisons but with none of the contrasts.

**[01:32:57.880]**

It's literal to literal. It's all compare and no contrast.

**[01:33:11.110]**

And they justified their position by conspiracy theories. Introducing fear that all of those united against them, from the liberal Protestant to the Thomas Jeffersons to the Alexander Hamilton's, who was not part of Thomas Jefferson's school of thought, that they were all united behind the scenes by this deep state illuminati that was a tool of Satan to destroy the United States. Liberals tended to oppose this school of thought in each one of these issues, despite knowing they have their own quirks and problems. If we were to follow Protestantism through this history, we would find that you have that same consistent issue. Looking at 1844. And in Portugal we spoke about the 1844 presidential election. And you had these two political parties.

**[01:34:24.290]**

Polk and Clay. You have two sides here. You have Polk and you have Clay.

**[01:34:34.950]**

They're the two running for government. And the issue that you have then is the same thing. Protestants are also still split, so this conservative branch is supporting Clay. I think it was Polk. Just going to check that.

**[01:35:01.090]**

I get the two confused.

**[01:35:07.730]**

Democrat James K. Polk defeated Whig Henry Clay. This was won by the Democrat, which then was the south, the conservative south. And this was Polk defeating Clay. And Polk was this school of thought.

**[01:35:26.190]**

And what he used and subscribes to was in 1845, finally defined as Manifest Destiny. And that's saying the same thing as they're arguing down here. Ancient glorious land, modern glorious land, ancient Israel, modern Israel. The United States has a special destiny, just as ancient Israel did. That gives them ownership and right over the whole North American continent. Just as Israel was given ownership of Canaan.

**[01:36:04.930]**

It's the same school of thought. You come down into the Civil War history in the 1850s, you're going to have the same issue. You have two sides, north and south. What I want us to see is when we talk about Protestantism, there's two branches. It was like that then, it's like that now. Many Protestants opposed slavery.

**[01:36:41.300]**

Slavery was the issue of the 40s, 50s and the 60s. It's never stopped being the issue to some extent. But that was the test of the United States. And not every Protestant was for slavery. Some of them were of the liberal school of thought. For all of their problems, they knew that they didn't just take slavery from ancient Israel and bring it into modern, but the conservative school of thought as it morphed in the south, as they believe in this literal to literal comparison with no contrast.

**[01:37:19.330]**

Their justification for slavery is ancient Israel had slaves. Ancient glorious land had slaves. Modern glorious land must have slaves. They're using the Bible to justify that as well.

**[01:37:38.330]**

You come down to the 1888 history. Did every Protestant believe in that Sunday laws should be enforced by the government? No. Again, you have a split within Protestantism. This has nothing to do with Adventism.

**[01:37:55.610]**

This is just within apostate Protestantism, their own split. I want to quote here from A.T. Jones. This is 1889.

**[01:38:12.020]**

So, you know, it's just a year after 1888 CGRAS 103. And we'll read through a few paragraphs, one, two and three.

**[01:38:37.650]**

He's going back and discussing ancient Israel. Nehemiah was ruling in a true theocracy, a government of God. The law of God was the law of the land, and God's will was made known by the written word and by

the prophets. Therefore, this is in the middle of an argument, so I'm just trying not to go through the whole of the argument. He's referring to a couple of these people trying to enforce Sunday.

**[01:39:07.150]**

Dr. Mendeville's argument is just upon this claim of the establishment of a theocracy. He's saying that these people try to enforce Sunday, and they're doing it because they believe in a theocracy. With this idea, the view of Dr. Krafts agrees precisely. Dr. Krafts is general secretary for the National Sunday Law Union. He claims, as it is expressed in his own words, quoting Dr. Krafts "The preachers are the successors of the prophets".

**[01:39:44.850]**

He's quoting from Christian Statesman, July 5, 1888. There's this general Secretary of the National Sunday Law Union saying the preachers are the successes of the prophets. Going back to A.T. Jones: now put these things together. The government of Israel was a theocracy. The will of God was made known to the ruler by the prophets.

**[01:40:07.900]**

The ruler compelled the officers of the law to prevent the ungodly from selling goods on the Sabbath. This government, the United States, is to be made a theocracy. The preachers are the successes of the prophets, and they, the preachers are to compel the officers of the law to prevent all selling of goods and all manner of work on Sunday. This shows conclusively that these preachers intend to take the supremacy into their hands, officially declare the will of God, and compel all men to conform to it. And this deduction is made certain by their own words.

**[01:40:51.560]**

They have the same problem in 1888. The same problem is the issue of a theocracy, of going from literal to literal.

**[01:41:07.150]**

It's all compare and it's no contrast. And it's all to be enforced by a strong monarch style of government. You need a strong leader if you're going to enforce morality through law. Because can people decide for themselves in ancient Israel whether they wanted to do right or wrong? No. It had to be enforced.

**[01:41:35.840]**

And to enforce it, you need a strong ruler. This same school of thought is exactly what has continued all from the very beginning, from 1798 through the 1840s, the 1850s, and all through the 1880s with the Sunday Law movement. And it's all built on this literal to literal interpretation. In other words, they cannot practice dispensationalism. And when they see ancient Israel, it's a theocracy.

**[01:42:08.270]**

The ruler knows what to do because the prophet tells him what to do and how to enforce the morality. Now you have the president. The president must know what to do because the preacher is the successor of the prophet. And the preacher will tell the president what morality to enforce and how to enforce it. And that must be enforced through the law.

**[01:42:36.050]**

We're out of time. What we'll do next week is we want to see what this school of thought has turned into. Because there's two sides of Protestantism down here. Not every Protestant believes in this school of thought. Not every Protestant, in fact, many of them opposed slavery. Many Protestants opposed the enforcement of morality through their government.

**[01:43:00.760]**

Many Protestants today are similarly divided and we have to decide where the threats come from. The problem is that practically all of Adventism is looking in the wrong direction.

**[01:43:16.170]**

If we were to think of it as standing on a train track. And here's your good conservative SDA, and he's looking in this direction for the threat.

**[01:43:40.890]**

He's looking to his left. And what is he saying his threat is? It's all those Protestants who are doing what? They're all coming into union, they're all happy clappy, they're all ordaining women, they're ordaining gay clergy, they're encouraging the breakdown of morality and standards. And they're looking this way to say all those liberal Catholics and what they're about to do, thinking they're going to work with the UN and the globalists and the Papacy, and somehow they're going to bring about the Sunday Law. The problem is they're looking in the wrong direction.

**[01:44:23.850]**

And if you stand here long enough, looking towards the left when the train comes, what's going to happen to you?

**[01:44:36.950]**

It's just going to be too late for Adventism. We can see that for ancient Israel. We can see that for modern Israel.

**[01:44:51.030]**

We can see that for ancient Israel. We can see that for modern Israel. We're still looking to in the wrong direction. So just in summary, as we close. We've done a compare and contrast with ancient Israel and modern Israel. All the comparisons, all the structure, failure, failure, success. Then we've also made the all important contrast, theocracy, separation of church and state.

**[01:45:18.570]**

Then we came to modern Israel. We saw the issues within Protestantism at that time centered around the 1800 election in 1798. It's heating up because it's already known that there's two contenders. The incumbent President John Adams. His greatest threat, Thomas Jefferson.

**[01:45:40.250]**

Supported by different branches of Protestantism, we looked at what kind of mindset some are composed of this conservative branch. We very briefly referred us back to the 1844 election, how they had the same mindset of what the United States was meant to be. Essentially, you could summarize it up as a Christian nation. We went to the 1888 history and we saw the same thing, this literal to literal type of interpretation that requires some type of strong monarch government. Next week we'll come closer to our own.

**[01:46:22.040]**

We'll look at what happened in the 60s and 70s. And today the two sides of Protestantism, where our threat comes from, and why we're exactly like our threat. If you kneel with me, we'll close in prayer.

**[01:46:34.590]**

Dear Father in Heaven, thank you for our blessings. Lord, we know that we live in a major time in earth history as we watch everything close. Lord, I pray that you will lead us and guide us. We have so much to learn from.

**[01:46:49.720]**

But Lord, we are looking at the same book and the same history as millions of other people who are drawing different conclusions. May we understand how to interpret correctly? Lord, there must be truth at the end of time. We know that it must be through your parable teaching. But we also know from ancient Israel how small the number are who truly accept and hold to what those parables taught.

**[01:47:13.770]**

I pray that each one of us might be among that number. May we not be afraid or intimidated by the smallness seeing ancient Israel also the extent of destruction. But I pray, Lord, that we'll be encouraged as we see the evidence and the lines and what they can illustrate for us. I put all these things into Your care and keeping. I pray, Lord, that you will bless this Sabbath day, not just for us here, but across the world, as others enter into this day or about to enter into Your Sabbath day, that they might have a blessed time and continued fellowship with others of the movement.

**[01:47:53.940]**

I pray for our brethren in Fiji, Lord, as they also spend this Sabbath day, many of them also still isolated all across in Sydney, up the north coast and across Australia and New Zealand. Lord, as everyone bowed the knee to you, I pray that you'll be with them in a special way. That they won't feel alone or discouraged



at this time. I pray that we will have a strong faith in Your leading and how you have led us. I pray this in Jesus name, Amen.