

8. Civil War in America's Churches - Part 1

Tess Lambert, 20.06.2020

Youtube Video

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uJUp2_aOyU4

[00:00:19.290]

Amen. Hello, everyone. Happy Sabbath. I did say last week that we're moving on to a different subject, but that's not going to look quite the same. We are going to revise again.

[00:00:35.290]

My intention is to go back over the history that we've already been going over for the last month. And each time that we go over this history, it becomes a little more detailed for us. I've tried to make the argument in the past that when we look at these dispensations, beginning and end of ancient Israel, beginning and end of modern Israel, that God is opening them up in a specific order. We understood our history, particularly the events relating to the close of probation for the first group called, the nature of that close of probation, the shaking that occurred before. We have understood a lot based on understanding the end of ancient Israel.

[00:01:29.880]

While we have these particularly four key histories, Alpha and Omega of ancient Alpha and Omega of modern. Each one of those histories is properly opening up in a particular order. We know those reform lines were given to us as a movement in 1989, but they have not been properly laid out and explained. For many of them that's not yet done. It's not yet done for the Alpha history of ancient Israel and it isn't yet done for our own Alpha history, the beginning of modern Israel. We've spent a lot of time the last month covering the end of ancient Israel, the history of John the Baptist, Christ and the early church, the history of Christ's first advent to explain our history now and the experiences that we have been through.

[00:02:21.970]

But what is now needing to open up the next step is to understand more properly our Alpha history, the beginning of modern Israel. This time period of Millerite history, both what happened inside the movement and what happened outside the movement, are extremely important for us to understand. It is part of the opening light for this dispensation. Each time we go over this history, it is with a particular agenda. And I want to do that again.

[00:02:56.340]

But we're going to add in more details than what we have previously looked at. So for about a month now, we've been comparing ancient and modern. As we revise, I particularly want to look at the 1844 history, 1888, but also what's happening externally in the United States. We compared and contrasted ancient

and modern. We saw ancient, it comes out of pagan nations. Modern, it comes out of Protestant churches.

[00:03:30.120]

You can compare the two. You also need to contrast the rules of parable teaching. You compare and you contrast. And when you contrast, you see that while we came out of Protestant churches, that it looked different to the coming out of Egypt, because there has been this separation between church and state. We didn't come out of a nation, we came out of a church. Coming back to the history of ancient Israel.

[00:04:03.860]

They came out of pagan nations, but we observed how they held on to the idolatry of Egypt, of those pagan nations, even through until the end of the 490 years, when they were finally cut off.

[00:04:22.760]

I want to reinforce that point. If you go to the Old Testament scriptures and you see what was said to Israel in the history of Solomon. I'm going to paraphrase a couple of quotes quickly. What God said to Solomon. He said, if you turn away, if you forsake my statutes and my commandments, which I have set before you, and shall go and serve other gods and worship them, then will I pluck them up by the roots out of my land which I have given them. And this house which I've sanctified for my name will I cast out of my sight.

[00:04:59.350]

And I will make it to be a proverb and a by word among all nations. And this house which is high shall be an astonishment to everyone that passeth by it. So that he shall say, why hath the Lord done thus unto this land and unto this house? And it shall be answered, because they forsook the Lord God of their fathers, which brought them out of the land of Egypt and laid hold on other gods and worshipped them and served them. Therefore has he brought all this evil upon them. We can see that fulfilled in the captivity to Babylon in that destruction of Jerusalem. But it's fulfilled again in 70 AD.

[00:05:39.510]

And why is Israel in 70 AD again destroyed and in captivity? It's because they were on the wrong side of the blessings and the curses. That only happened when Israel laid hold of other gods and worshiped them. The problem is, is that it's difficult to see in the time period of John the Baptist in Christ that they're doing that. Because they look like good people, because you don't see this golden calf sitting in Jerusalem. It's hard to identify that they are in this idolatry.

[00:06:16.690]

Ellen White, speaking about the Jewish nation in *The Signs of the Times*, May 23, 1900, paragraph 5. Five and continuing. I want to take a few excerpts from this.

[00:06:39.940]

Considering the children of Israel, not for others but for themselves, did they minister. God created them to live in a world where unselfish service must be performed. But in the place of doing this, they grasped everything for themselves. The eye is so large that they cannot see anything else. They are not in touch with suffering humanity.

[00:07:04.690]

Christ came to show them the way of life, but they were determined to walk in their own selfish way, and the Lord gave them up as joined to their idols. They have this problem with their idols and idolatry. And because you don't see a golden calf in this history, it's hard for us to imagine that the issue that they faced was the issue of idolatry.

[00:07:35.950]

You can go back to Leviticus 26. Ye shall make you no idols nor graven images, neither rear you up a standing image, neither shall ye set up any images stone in your land to bow down unto it. For I am the Lord your God. Ye shall keep my Sabbath and reverence my sanctuary. I am the Lord. If ye walk in my statutes, and then starts the blessings. There's two paths before the nation of Israel, before the people of God. You either keep the Sabbath, reverence the sanctuary, do not set up any idols or graven images or images of stone, no idle worship.

[00:08:20.570]

If you do that, you're blessed. If you don't keep the Sabbath, if you don't reverence the sanctuary, if you practice idolatry, then you'll be the cursed. You will lose your king, you'll be trodden down by a pagan nation, god will pass you by. When they at the end of the 490 years choose that second course, it's because they have done these things. It appears they're keeping the Sabbath, it appears they've put away idolatry, that they're reverencing the sanctuary, but in reality they're not. You can't see this by literal to literal interpretation.

[00:08:57.980]

It's not literal golden calf here, and literal golden calf idolatry here. But the same idolatry that led to the creation of the Apis Bull is still there, not in the image, but in the mindset in the worldview of the people of Israel. This is running so deep. But when you have, as we lay out their history with its fractals, the first group called, they come up to the cross, which we line up with 2019. This is the first group, it's the disciples that were trained to go back to the church and then warn the world. At this way mark of the cross.

[00:09:43.600]

Soon after the way mark of the cross, when Christ is resurrected and he comes back to the disciples, the disciples approach him and say, now are you going to set up your kingdom, and you are going to overthrow the Romans. Even in the history of their harvest, even in the history after their clothes of probation, the disciples are still misunderstanding the king, the kingdom and the external events. The

idolatry runs so deep it is that hard to remove and yet we still find them in this mess, down in this history and it actually isn't until they go through the harvest that they find that Christ has to reteach them what he'd already taught them.

[00:10:41.580]

That has a lot of implications for where we are today. The messages of our last dispensation are being retaught. Because they have not been properly understood or they have at the very least are still failing to be implemented in large parts of this movement.

[00:11:06.800]

You have idolatry as they come out of Egypt and then in the history of captivity, to Rome, they are still in idolatry. They've kept hold of the Apis Bull. That says a lot about Adventism. It doesn't look like you would expect idolatry to look. Adventists don't need to start keeping the Sabbath. The Jews didn't start Sunday worship or start reverencing a pagan God or the sun God.

[00:11:37.850]

They didn't have to bow down to the sun God to still take in that idolatry. It showed itself in how they perceived God's kingdom on earth.

[00:11:53.180]

Coming back to this history of the beginning of modern Israel. I want to expand on this view a little and go back in time to where America was founded as colonies. If we can call this the Millerite history.

[00:12:21.790]

It began in 1798 and it was to go for 65 years, until 1863. When we would have expected, based on the 2520, the Second Advent. If they had been faithful. That is the extent of Millerite history. And in this history, you have 1850, which we identify as the history of the Sunday Law for that dispensation. We're stuck with that term of Sunday Law because of how it's been integrated into Adventism through the Great Controversy. But you have to think, if Christ was meant to come back in 1863, we, at the very least, know that Ellen White is saying by early 1870 that Christ should have returned. If Christ is meant to have returned by that period of time, what has to have happened to America in that 65 years?

[00:13:28.610]

In 1798, the United States rises up as a lamb like beast and it has how many horns? Two horns. It has the horn of Protestantism and the horn of Republicanism. So by 1863, what had to happen to the horns of that lamblike beast? They had to be broken.

[00:13:52.320]

The Protestant horn? No, both horns have to be broken before the Second Advent. So going back into that history, as we investigate it. We should expect to see both horns broken. Now, we know that history

was a history of failure. We know that it didn't wrap up. The way that God had intended it to if his people were faithful.

[00:14:18.610]

But if that history had been complete and they had been faithful and he had returned, you would have expected to see a broken Protestant horn, which we already are familiar with in that history. You also need to see a broken Republican horn before 1863. Both need to be identifiable in our Alpha history. But I want to go a little farther back.

[00:14:48.640]

I want to go back to the year 1619.

[00:14:56.660]

This is a year before the Mayflower pilgrims arrived in the United States. It's very early in their history of the colony. But I want us to take us back to 1619 and what happened this year. It was a major subject last year being the 400 year anniversary. Two momentous events happened in Britain's fledgling colony Virginia. The New World's first democratic assembly convened and an English privateer brought kidnapped Africans to sell as slaves. Such were the conflicted origins of modern America. In the newly built church at Jamestown, Virginia, the General Assembly, the first gathering of a representative governing body in America, came together. A few weeks later, a battered privateer entered the Chesapeake Bay, carrying the first African slaves to land on mainland English America. Within a few weeks, there's two momentous events that define the founding of America.

[00:16:01.530]

First, the first democratic beginning of government. Second, the introduction of British slavery to America.

[00:16:15.640]

In 1619, you have these two issues happening within a few weeks of time. I want us to think about that first government, that first representative government that formed in 1619. We're going to put the issue of the slavery subject to one side for a moment and we'll come back to that. One of the difficulties with this history is that we're weaving different threads together at the same time. We're marking these two events, putting slavery to one side.

[00:16:46.380]

I want us to think about this representative government. Following instructions from the Virginia Company of London, the colony's financial backers, the meeting's principal purpose was to introduce laws for the happy, guiding and governing of the people. The assembly sat as a single body and was made up of the Governor, Sir George Yidley, his four councillors and 22 bourgeois, chosen by the free white male inhabitants of every town, corporation and large plantation throughout the colony. The representatives who gathered for the initial meeting of the first representative assembly in the New World, dealt

extensively with the subject of religion. The very first order of business for this group of leading Virginians was a prayer.

[00:17:39.640]

Later in this session, legislation was passed relating to religious expression that makes clear the extensive ties between church and state in the early years of settlements. According to historian Perry Miller, the assembly enacted a series of religious laws that are a match for anything to be found in Puritan societies. I want to quote one of the laws enacted at the 1619 beginning of democratic government. One of the laws as written: all persons whatsoever upon Sabbath days shall frequent divine service and sermons, both for noon and afternoon, and all such as bear arms shall bring their pieces, swords, powder and shot. And everyone that shall transgress this law shall forfeit three shillings a time to the use of the church, all lawful and necessary impediments accepted.

[00:18:39.450]

If a river floods and you can't cross it and you can't get to church, that's an exception. But if a servant in this case shall willfully neglect his master's command to attend church, he shall suffer bodily punishment. At the very beginning of democratic government in the United States, there is a clear union between church and state. And a law of that union that particularly interests us is the law enforcing Sunday observance. And punishment by a fine for all who do not attend church. Punishment with bodily in action for any servants.

[00:19:28.690]

Any heresy could lead to the most severe sentence banishment being forced to leave the colony. A banished individual, banished for heresy, called returning to the settlement could be put to death. Another major crime was blasphemy. They could be sentenced to a whipping to the pillary, which is essentially the type of stocks, have a hole made in their tongue with a red hot iron, or stand for a period of time on the gallows with a rope around their neck. Other laws punished colonists for not properly observing the Sabbath.

[00:20:01.390]

Sunday observed as a day of rest and worship, skipping religious services. Some colonial laws even banned traveling on Sundays. Various forms of these Sunday Law laws existed in all colonies. So right back at the very beginning, the United States has two problems. From the very forming of this representative government. They have Sunday Law and slavery.

[00:20:34.500]

We talk about the 1850 Fugitive Slave Act. That Fugitive Slave Act was already put in place in 1793. 1793, the first Fugitive Slave Law was enacted by Congress. Requiring all states, including those states that forbid slavery, to forcibly return slaves who have escaped from other states to their original owners. The law stated that no person held the service of labor in one state under the laws thereof escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such labor or service,

but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due. This was all in place in 1793, but it wasn't enforced.

[00:21:40.780]

You already have slavery, not slavery itself, but prior to 1798, the Fugitive Slave Act. You already have Sunday Laws in every colony in the United States. This church state union began to change in the history of the American Revolution. It was part of this wave of freedom.

[00:22:05.290]

In 1776, none of the American state governments observed the separation of church and state. On the contrary, all 13 states either had established state churches or required their office holders to profess a certain faith. Every single one of the 13 states that existed by 1776 required officeholders to profess a certain Protestant faith, and they had enforced state churches. A state would say, our state church is the Methodist Church or the Presbyterian Church.

[00:22:45.940]

Over the six decades after 1776, however, that changed. Massachusetts stopped supporting an official religious denomination in 1833. It was the final state to do so. Is 1833 a significant way mark for this movement. Yes. In 1833, the final of those 13 states stopped supporting an official religious denomination.

[00:23:12.640]

Historians call that gradual process disestablishment. You can start to see why Ellen White said that in 1798, the United States was rising to power. When we think about Acts 27. In Acts 27 we're paralleling two institutions. We're paralleling the United States as an institution and also Seventh-day Adventism as an institution.

[00:23:44.410]

And we do that through Acts 27. These two institutions, and what we see is that they both rise up in 1798. This is the rising up of the United States as an institution and the rising up of Seventh-day Adventism. We parallel them through Acts 27.

[00:24:12.150]

When Seventh-day Adventism is raised up as a movement in 1798, what problem do we have? We have many problems. We're a mess. We are keeping Sunday. We don't understand prophecy.

[00:24:27.730]

William Miller is still a teenager. He's yet to become a deist, let alone start studying. Adventism has all of these problems in 1798. We don't know who we're about to become. When we think of us as a separate institution. The United States is much the same.

[00:24:48.220]

Both institutions begin in 1798. With all of these problems. Neither of them are okay. Neither of them have their identity figured out. We're going to go through an increase of knowledge by which we're going to learn about the second Advent.

[00:25:05.380]

We're going to learn about the Sabbath. We're going to learn about the 2300 days, the 1260, the nature of man, all of those different subjects. But it begins here. Adventism begins here, and then we have this progressive increase of knowledge. The same happens for the United States.

[00:25:28.690]

Even though it had begun as colonies decades before and had then, through a revolution, become free prior to 1798, it still comes into the history of 1798 with all of this baggage. In brief. Seventh-day Adventism, raced up in 1798, has baggage. It has to learn and unlearn. The United States in 1798 has Baggage.

[00:25:59.920]

It has to learn and unlearn. What it has to unlearn is the union of church and state.

[00:26:09.110]

What he has to learn is to separate the two. It also has to unlearn the legacy practice of slavery while we go through an increase of knowledge, learning and unlearning, so were they to go through the same increase of knowledge. Which is why in 1833, you see the last state disestablished. The term they use for the disestablishment, the removing of religious organizations from state establishments.

[00:26:47.960]

A large part of this work was done by Thomas Jefferson and James Madison, who we've been covering in detail. I'm quoting, Many political leaders, including Thomas Jefferson and James Madison, favored disestablishment, because they saw the relationship between church and state as a tool of oppression. Jefferson proposed a statute for religious freedom in the Virginia State Assembly in 1779. So Jefferson has already in 1779 proposed in Virginia this separation of church and state. But his bill failed in the overwhelmingly Anglican legislature.

[00:27:28.710]

The Anglican church had so much power within the state government of Virginia that his attempts to remove this Protestant denomination as the state recognized religion failed. Madison proposed it again in 1785. And it defeated a rival bill that would have given equal revenue to all Protestant churches. Instead, they decided that Virginia would not use public money to support religion. Jefferson wrote, the religion then, of every man must be left to the conviction and conscience of every man, and it is the right of every man to exercise it, as these may dictate.

[00:28:18.640]

Quoting A.T. Jones. This is September 13, 1894.

[00:28:28.840]

I'm really doing this for one sentence.

[00:28:34.540]

AMS 282.3

[00:28:43.090]

A.T. Jones wrote: the framers of the Constitution understood that separation of church and state and liberty of conscience was the result of the Reformation. Someone asked me a question recently, and I forget who did. I apologize for that. But if they are watching or they watch the videos. Someone asked me a question recently that I didn't answer. And that was: how do we recognize as a movement that the founders of the Constitution separated church and state because of what they experienced in the 1260, and what the Protestant denominations had suffered under the persecution of the church state Union?

[00:29:33.340]

This is a good quote to answer that question. A.T. Jones is saying that the framers of the Constitution understood the separation and that liberty of conscience was the result of the Reformation. Madison and Jefferson, the champions of a separation of church and state in the Constitutional Convention, which framed the Constitution, said, and he quotes them. I wanted to note, first of all that A.T. Jones is making the point that they separated church and state because they recognized what had happened in the 1260 years. That was to answer someone's question. The other point that I wanted us to consider was that he describes Madison and Jefferson as the champions of a separation of church and state.

[00:30:19.930]

And this becomes important when we think about the way that they are handled by the Christian right today. If you go back into history that holds true.

[00:30:35.710]

He's going to quote Jefferson from what he presented to that Virginia assembly. He says, in a struggle which resulted in disestablishing the church in that colony and from which struggle they came to the National Convention. It really began in Virginia. It was the work of Madison and Jefferson in Virginia to separate church and state that they later took to the National Convention and got written into the Bill of Rights, later on. Jefferson says, we would also humbly represent that the only proper objects of civil government are the happiness and protection of men in the present status of existence.

[00:31:16.510]

Cutting part of his letter out. To illustrate and confirm these assertions we beg leave to observe that, to judge for ourselves and to engage in the exercise of religion, agreeably to the dictates of our own consciences is an unalienable right, which upon the principles on which the Gospel was first propagated, and the Reformation from popery carried on can never be transferred to another. In Madison and Jefferson's own words, they're recognizing that it is an inalienable right to choose our own religious beliefs and practices. And they recognize that this was a cause behind the Reformation, and that they can give an example of why this is necessary, the separation of church and state, because what happened in the 1260 under Popery. That's to answer someone's question. I hope that is helpful to those that have been considering that and the references on the board.

[00:32:26.980]

This action in Virginia by Thomas Jefferson and Madison was the forerunner to the First Amendment protections for religious freedom. Before he died, Thomas Jefferson left instructions of three things that he wanted inscribed on his grave's epitaph. He wished to be remembered for three things: one of them being the Virginia Statute of Religious Freedom. It wasn't even about the First Amendment. He wanted to be remembered for what he did in Virginia, one of the three things he wished to have inscribed. After he was elected president in 1800.

[00:33:04.480]

In 1901, the Danbury Baptist Association sent him a letter expressing their concern that in their state of Connecticut, their state constitution did not explicitly protect religious liberty.

[00:33:24.500]

In replying, early 1 January 1802, Thomas Jefferson says the following: believing with you that religion is a matter which lies solely between man and his God, that he owes account to none other for his faith or his worship, that the legislative powers of government reach actions only and not opinions. I contemplate with sovereign reverence that act of the whole American people which declared that their legislature would make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, thus building a wall of separation between church and state. It's from his letter in 1802 to the Danbury Baptist Association that we were given the phrase "wall of separation between church and state". He gave us those visuals. When you think about Thomas Jefferson, along with Madison, he more than others, he particularly was the person who brought forward the First Amendment and promoted this separation of church and state in America, which is why the fundamentalist Protestant conservatives of that era did not want him president.

[00:34:41.320]

He's actually also the only president in US history who has not, from the office of president, proclaimed the day of Thanksgiving. You see all of them. You see Obama up, pardoning the turkey. There's all of this, all of these practices around Thanksgiving. Thomas Jefferson is the only US president to never make the proclamation of Thanksgiving as a holiday while he was in office.

[00:35:11.320]

And the reason he didn't do that is, as he wrote, for him to stand in office and proclaim Thanksgiving is it was not a day fasting and prayer, as the other other administrations would offer, but it was still recognized as a religious holiday. And in that respect, as a religious holiday, he would not even sanction Thanksgiving while in office. No other us. President has ever taken that position on Thanksgiving. Straight down the line was he on this issue.

[00:35:47.550]

You don't see United States rise up as a lamb like beast, in 1619. There was nothing to lamb like about the colonies, either in their attitude towards slavery or in their attitudes towards church and state, and Sunday Laws. Both of those things, however badly they practiced them, remember, they were to have an increase of knowledge. If this had gone correctly for both for the United States as it was to go correctly for Seventh-day Adventists, they would have not separated church and state fully, they also would have abolished slavery. That would have become the nation that they were designed to be. But like Adventism, that plan was derailed.

[00:36:39.600]

We recognize that in Acts 27 when it shows that ship going off course. Already framed in the United States is a statement that all men are created equal. Black, white, doesn't matter. All men are created equal. Already enshrined is a separation of church and state. They were already there.

[00:37:05.450]

All the United States had to do was have an increase of knowledge, put into practice what they learned. As in Adventism.

[00:37:22.360]

What we want to look at through this week and probably the next, is continuing this triple application of prophecy, as we have discussed it before. But with some further details. We understand the triple application. World War I, plus World War II, equals World War III. First, woe plus second woe equals third woe. When we come to the subject of church and state in America, the Republican horn, we can see one, plus two, equals three. First, this history, the 1850 subject of slavery.

[00:38:06.590]

Second, the 1888 history, the enforcement of Sunday Laws. The first plus the second will teach us what Sunday Law looks like in our own time. You could say this a different way. You could say early writings, plus the Great Controversy, equals now. Early writings covering the first history, the sins of Babylon. Great Controversy covering the second history, Sunday Laws in the United States. Both teaching us of our own history in the final dispensation, the end of modern Israel. And you can see that these two issues that America has, church and state and slavery were all introduced in 1619, at the very beginning.

[00:39:15.010]

They had a fully functioning Sunday Law, and they had a fully functioning system of slavery. And prior to 1798, also the slave act. All that they did in this history of 1850, they take that slave act that existed before, and they say, now we're going to enforce what was already there. They're enforcing what had already existed. All that they're doing in 1888 is saying, we finally need to enforce what was already there.

[00:39:48.600]

It was already in place. What had happened in the early 1800s was that those laws, were not being enforced, but they were on the books, largely. Coming back to this first history over slavery. 1798, you have Adventism raised up as a denominated people. It happens in the history of the Second Great Awakening. And it particularly happens in the early 1800s. In this history when slavery is beginning to be debated widely through Protestantism.

[00:40:29.030]

It was a major subject of the Second Great Awakening. And we'll discuss one of their leading ministers, Charles Finney, who was involved in that.

[00:40:43.050]

There's a lot of issues that happen between 1798 and 1850. It is complex. It's more than slavery. It's also the issues of immigration, of American expansionism, other subjects that relate to how America was supposed to look as a lamb like beast. Reviewing something that we said last week. We spoke about the election of 1844.

[00:41:11.320]

As we continue to expand on the Alpha history of modern Israel, we're going to cover that history in more detail.

[00:41:23.060]

Need to start thinking about external and internal events, scatterings and gatherings through the 1798 to 1863 history. But we looked at the 1844 election, particularly the external events of 1844. And we saw that it was an election fought between Clay and Polk. Famous Kentucky Senator Henry Clay declared that the church divisions happening in 1844 were the greatest source of danger to our country. What happened in the United States was a religious civil war before there was ever a civil war between states. And that religious civil war was fought from 1844 and 1845.

[00:42:11.090]

I want us to think about one side topic when we think about this election, what happened within Protestantism. Last week we spoke about the three main Protestant religions. They were the Baptists, the

Methodists, and what was the other one? Presbyterians. These were the three largest Protestant denominations in the United States, and we spoke about how they began to split over slavery.

[00:42:52.040]

It began decades before, in fact, the Methodists, back in the early 1790s. They had actually said that they would excommunicate every slave owning member of their church. They had to pull back from that threat about six months later because it appeared it was going to split their church. They'd never actually enacted that. But the issue over slavery, the position these churches were taking over the subject of slavery, were splitting them from very early on. Quoting: long before cannons fired over Fort Sumter, civil war raged within America's churches.

[00:43:35.290]

Three of the nation's largest Protestant denominations were torn apart over slavery or related issues. The Methodist church split in 1844. The Baptists split from the history of 1840 to 1845. The Presbyterian Church began to split in 1843 and finished that split in 1844. Centuries around this history of 1844, these three largest Protestant churches of America are torn apart.

[00:44:08.690]

It sets the stage for the Civil War. Some people claim, including those of the time. There would never have been a civil War, if the churches had to stay united on these things. It had a direct cause and effect relationship. What I want us to think about is how Ellen White handles 1844. Because we went to the quote in 10MR 69.1-2. And she's going to speak about what happened in Protestantism.

[00:44:50.180]

Sorry, that's the wrong quote.

[00:44:55.790]

We're going to go to that quote in a minute.

[00:45:09.940]

We went to the Great Controversy last week. Great Controversy 389.2.

[00:45:21.860]

She says Second Angel's message of Revelation 14 was first preached in the summer of 1844, and it had a more direct application to the churches of the United States, where the warning of the judgment had been most widely proclaimed and most generally rejected, and where the declension in the churches had been most rapid. But the message of the Second Angel did not reach its complete fulfillment in 1844. The churches then in 1844, experienced a moral fall in consequence of their refusal of the light of the advent message. But that fall was not complete. She's going to go back and look at 1844, and she's writing this in the history of the Great Controversy.

[00:46:08.080]

She's taking the long view. If Christ had come back in 1863, there would be no statement that the fall was not complete. You can see how it's progressed to the 1888 Sunday Law history. But she says that they fell in 1844. That's when there was a declension in the church's, a moral fall. What is she speaking about that happened in Protestantism in 1844?

[00:46:34.390]

What she's speaking about, what it literally looks like, was this massive schism through Protestantism. If you think about the Russian Orthodox Church in the Catholic Church and how significant it is to have a schism through a church. In that year in the history of 1843 to 1845, what is happening through Protestant America is massive. The Protestant churches back there cover almost the entirety of the population. Everyone is a Protestant. And yet this massive split she never mentions, all she does is refer to it as a declension.

[00:47:17.210]

It almost sounds, in her words, like a moral fall. There's these consequences. They rejected light. She doesn't link this spiritual experience to what is actually happening with external events. I want us to begin thinking, not today, but begin thinking about why she does that.

[00:47:40.050]

And that's why I gave the quote for 10MR 69.1-2.

[00:47:48.110]

I think we know this quote. I've referenced it a number of times. When a woman visits her and speaks about the increase of crime and a particular law that was being introduced in Europe and was threatening to come to America that caused a great deal of crime, demoralization and suffering in society. The sister tells Ellen White that the only way for this law to be withstood is that women must vote. Ellen White tells her, my mind was unprepared for any such matter as women voting. You look at Ellen White's quotes through her writings about the role of women in politics, and she's very clear her mind was not prepared.

[00:48:34.180]

She couldn't handle the thought of a woman voting, but not just voting. Having opinions, voicing opinions on political matters. It's easy for us to see that view in how she speaks about home life, about how she speaks, what the focus of other women should be, that they shouldn't be trying to gain the right to vote. They should be focusing on their families or their children. What we don't, I think, conceptualize is how that actually impacts her own work and her own writings. Because when Ellen White comes to an external event, what does she never seem to do or very rarely do?

[00:49:15.410]

She very rarely gives us the political events surrounding that waymark. If you want to know about James Madison and Thomas Jefferson, if you want to know about the 1888 Sunday Laws, beyond this spiritual explanation of morality and rights and wrongs, you can't go to Ellen White. You need to go to A.T. Jones, you need to go to James White or Uriah Smith or any of the other pioneers. But she can never give you the political external events of her time.

[00:49:51.210]

When you come to 1844, it's not just the political events of the United States she doesn't give us. But this split within the churches is the political aspect of those Protestant churches. It's what they're debating in closed meetings. It's what they're coming to physical fights over at the front of their Protestant churches, out the front of their meeting places.

[00:50:21.040]

It's a political argument. Even though she will later speak about slavery and the sin of slavery, she doesn't speak about the political events of her time. If you look up Abraham Lincoln in her writings, you'll find that Lincoln is mentioned ten times. Eight of those ten times, she's talking about Lincoln, Nebraska, a place she's not relating anything to the president. Twice she's speaking about Abraham Lincoln.

[00:50:52.610]

In those passages she is making a very brief spiritual application to the fact that he's a good administrator. She's not explaining him as a politician. Because of her own time period and her own mindset, she gives us a warped view of their history. And that has been a legacy issue Adventism has had ever since.

[00:51:16.800]

When Adventism comes and looks at 1844, we think it must have rained every Sunday. They must have been really depressed on Sunday. That there's this moral fall. Maybe their numbers went down, maybe people got busy and didn't go to church as much. She can't give us the external events the same way every other male pioneer did. If you want to know about Thomas Jefferson and James Madison, where did we have to go? A.T. Jones. If you want to know about Abraham Lincoln, where do you have to go?

[00:51:51.840]

James White.

[00:51:53.050]

And these are the external events that create the external line of the entire reform line. She had to be a woman for certain reasons, but also we need to conceptualize how that impacted her writings, because in her humanity as an individual could not break out of the change that bound her in that time period. When she says that women shouldn't be getting involved in politics, she's also speaking about herself, and it impacts her writings, and it impacts how we see these way marks. If she had been a male prophet in that

time period, there would have been other consequences, but we would have had more of an explanation of these external events, I'm sure of that.

[00:52:50.130]

We wouldn't have come to 1844 and just had it described as a moral fall and then those political church decisions go by unmentioned. No other pioneer has handled history that same way. But we know in God's wisdom, she was chosen because she was what Adventism needed. We need to be aware of the consequences of that decision, though.

[00:53:19.410]

We've spoken a lot about the Protestants in the history of the Millerites, as being essentially the bad guys. The Protestants were the ones in the south defending slavery from their understanding of the Bible. But what we don't properly do is also recognize that they were the good guys on the other side. It was this split within Protestantism, and this split wasn't always neat.

[00:53:49.010]

John Quincy Adams in 1844 went before Congress and said that they needed to amend the Constitution and announce the United States was a Christian nation. And yet, if you look at other lines of history, he's the good guy. I'm not saying this split is so clear cut and simple. But there is a split between socially liberal and socially conservative that began down in the First Great Awakening, extending through 1798 into the Second, and it has continued to today. Part of this was developed into the split over slavery. It's And, because this conservative faction believes in this literal to literal interpretation. America is a Christian nation, church and state.

[00:54:37.680]

Ancient Israel had slaves. Modern Israel must have slaves.

[00:54:45.250]

I find it interesting. One of these individuals, from the north, a Presbyterian minister who was a leader in the Second Great Awakening. Charles Finney. Charles Grandison Finney. August 29, 1792, he was born until August 16, 1875. He was an American Presbyterian minister and leader in the Second Great Awakening. He was called the father of modern revivalism. He was best known as being a Flamboyant revivalist preacher during particularly the decade from 1825 to 1835 in upstate New York and Manhattan. He was an opponent of old school Presbyterian theology. The old school, the socially conservative branch.

[00:55:49.830]

Together with several other evangelical leaders, his religious views led him to promote social reforms such as antislavery and equal education for women and African Americans. From 1835, he taught at Oberlin College of Ohio, which accepted students without regard to race or sex. He served as its second

president from 1855 to 1865, during which its faculty and students were activists for abolition, the underground railroad, and universal education. You find Protestants on both the right side and the wrong side of these issues. That becomes significant when we start thinking about today and how to view our role in Protestantism. Like last week, we're going to have a momentary break, a short prayer, and we'll begin again for the sake of the translators, so they can cut this presentation in half.

[00:56:48.330]

If you're kneel with me. We're going to have a very short prayer, and then we're going to come straight back into our study.

[00:56:55.240]

Dear Father in heaven, thank you for our blessings. Thank you for the work of the translators who spend many hours taking these presentations into different languages. The difficult work they do, taking this message to all the different languages of the world. I pray, Lord, you'll continue to bless this endeavor, that people might be benefited and that the message might spread in its at the right time to those areas still untouched. I pray, Lord, you'll be with us for the remainder of our study.

[00:57:28.950]

In Jesus name. Amen.