

9. Civil War in America's Churches - Part 2

Tess Lambert, 20.06.2020

Youtube Video

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Dgx_95x33gg

[00:00:06.140]

We began with this compare and contrast. I just want to take us back a step and introduce one article that we will post later on the media broadcast. We went back to this early history to show how these issues of the United States began really at their very founding. Particularly when you want to mark 1619 and the significant year that it was. It's not a subject that it was agitated so widely in the press last year. It isn't just the introduction of slavery.

[00:00:41.830]

It's also that this first representative government placed a Sunday law on that colony and introduced through law this church and state union. Then we see how that was through the American Revolution and the writing of the Constitution that church and state were separated. Not only was it announced that all men are created equal, which if that is properly put into place would mean the abolishing of slavery, also it is marked that church and state must separate. If that was put into place, then you would see disestablishment. The states started removing certain denominations as their state nominated denominations. And that was a work particularly done by Thomas Jefferson. Which was why from the very beginning of our studies a month ago, we labored over Thomas Jefferson.

[00:01:41.940]

It was 1798. The election between Thomas Jefferson and John Adams. I want us to come back to this chart we made yesterday. We have the religious and the political individuals who were described as, not by us because it's a strange term to use, but as ninja sheep. Part of this underground dominionist movement infiltrating not just American politics but what they refer to as the Seven Mountains.

[00:02:19.700]

I want to add one name to that. And that is in this political arena, Sam Brownback.

[00:02:30.950]

And he becomes particularly significant because of what area of the US. Government he heads. With a tiebreaking vote cast by Vice President Mike Pence, he's already on our list. The Senate confirmed a longtime religious right figurehead and outgoing and unpopular Kansas Governor Sam Brownback to be the US. Ambassador at large for International religious Freedom on Wednesday.

[00:03:01.980]

So Sam Brownback was appointed as the US. Ambassador for International Religious Freedom. And this is early 2018. So when it says Wednesday, it's going back a couple of years. Christian figures like Reverend Johnny Moore, who served on the President's Evangelical Outreach Board during Trump's campaign, praised Brownback as a consistent, vocal, competent and impassioned advocate for these issues. Groups like the Human Rights Campaign and Lambda Legal, on the other hand, castigated the vote. Citing Brownback's anti LGBTQ record as both a governor and a former member of Congress.

[00:03:44.280]

But less obviously and no less importantly, he's a major supporter of David Barton, the much criticized Christian nationalist historian whose deeply skewed perspective on American history has been used by a number of Republican politicians to bolster a false narrative of America as a historical Christian nation. Sam Brownback has frequently referred to Barton as one of my big heroes for his preservation of America's beautiful heritage and has appeared on Barton's Wall Builders radio show. Barton also headlines the 2013 Kansas Prayer Breakfast during Brownback's time as governor. Meanwhile, Barton is best known for a series of books including "Original Intent", "The Courts and the Constitution" and "Religion" and "The Jefferson Lies" that argues America was founded by evangelical Christians as a Christian nation and that the Founding Fathers intended for America to be run on Christian principles. The man that Donald Trump appointed to be the international representative for religious freedom counts as one of his biggest heroes for his preservation of America's beautiful heritage, David Barton.

[00:05:05.600]

And what does David Barton do to US history? He destroys the literal. The literal that must be made to understand the spiritual. Particularly the person they have to destroy, is Thomas Jefferson.

[00:05:19.330]

It's Thomas Jefferson that refused while in office to announce Thanksgiving because Thanksgiving has links to Protestantism. That was the extent to which he separated it. It was Thomas Jefferson who wanted the fact that he had a Protestant denomination removed as a state sponsored denomination of Virginia inscribed on his epitaph. It's Thomas Jefferson who helped author particularly paved the way for the First Amendment. They have to take down Thomas Jefferson. And David Barton has been quite successful in doing that, despite how widely he is discredited as a historian.

[00:06:04.630]

Barton has been cited and praised by conservative lawmakers and politicians, from Ted Cruz, who is on our board, to Michelle Bachmann. You'll hear her name come up quite frequently, when we discuss the issues of church and state.

[00:06:35.600]

Sam Brownback referred to Barton as providing the philosophical underpinning for a lot of the Republican effort in the country today. That's an incredible statement from the man appointed to lead international

relations on the separation of church and state. He's saying that David Barton has provided the philosophical underpinning for a lot of the Republican Party efforts in the United States. Many political figures, including Ted Cruz and Roy Moore, have embraced a form of Christian nationalism or dominionism based on the idea that the American government should run on Christian principles. Again, they say that church and state are not institutionally separated, but not influentially separated.

[00:07:27.580]

In that article we'll post later on the media broadcast. As we discussed Thomas Jefferson and what he was doing in 1798, we need to keep in mind what was said about what is happening today and what has been happening, particularly within the Republican Party.

[00:07:57.050]

As Brownback's political prominence has expanded over the past several years, Barton's work has been regularly championed by the Christian and broader political right. In 2010, Glenn Beck then called him the most important man in America for his work as a historian. In 2011, TV news pundit and former politician Mike Huckabee told attendees at a Rediscovering God in America conference that all Americans should be forced to listen to David Barton at gunpoint.

[00:08:33.050]

There you get your freedom of religion. I don't want us to lose, as we talk about this history, how it relates to what's happening today within the Republican Party. Then we moved on to discussing the early 1800s of how this Protestant split between socially conservative and socially liberal developed and further divided over the issue of slavery. Charles Finney the role that he had, his religious views, led him to promote social reforms. But there's also one interesting element, and that is the link between the abolitionist movement and the first feminist movement. There was an interesting book.

[00:09:37.020]

I haven't got it here. But you also find in other sources. It's quite easy to evidence, that the abolitionist movement directly led to the first feminist movement. Because what the abolitionist movement was teaching was that all men are created equal and the rights of freedom and education. And once you start teaching those principles, they very easily start branching into other areas. And a particular one it started branching into was the equal rights of women and the education of women. That's why, when Oberlin College is formed in Ohio it doesn't discriminate on race or gender. I believe it was one of the first colleges in the United States to accept both black people and women. And this college was led by Charles Finney.

[00:10:40.180]

He was a vocal proponent of antislavery and also the equal education for women.

[00:10:51.980]

You find this split over Protestantism, and they stood on both sides of this great social divide. I want to remind us, while we're on the subject of something else. And this hasn't been taught here, it was labored on at some detail in a school in Portugal.

[00:11:15.960]

When you start to see what happened in the early 1800s, you have the abolitionist movement.

[00:11:32.710]

It's particularly the abolishment of slavery. That movement begins and what automatically follows. Feminism.

[00:11:47.550]

And this is all happening in the history of the 1800s. What's going to lead after feminism? You also have the introduction of some LGBT groups. Then the social consequences of stating people's position or their sexual preferences still led to such discrimination that people still hid in society. But it did start to come out in the 1800s. There was a first stirring.

[00:12:22.130]

You had this through the 1800s. Many people didn't accept the abolition of slaves, the race issue, because it was so evident that it was leading to another issue, and that was feminism.

[00:12:38.930]

If you freed the slaves, what would that do to the women in America? Who then would want to get an education? Even Charles Finney they didn't think this through very well. They thought that they could just give women an education and that somehow that wouldn't impact a society. The problem is that if you look worldwide.

[00:12:59.170]

They can document. When you educate women in a third world country, what happens? What happens to the birth rate? It goes down. Why? Because they're not just educated. They then start moving into the work environment.

[00:13:17.150]

They start pursuing careers. They start having less children. They start moving outside of the home. Even these liberals, they didn't like that trend either, but they didn't realize that what the consequences of education would be. What starts as abolition is going to lead to other people saying, I should be given equal rights under the state, I should be able to have education.

[00:13:50.700]

And we spoke of this at quite some length in Portugal. Because we didn't go to the 1800s. We went to the late 1900s. And this isn't the only two times you see this distinct sequence of steps. 1900s, you have the civil rights movement.

[00:14:13.880]

And that was for what subject? Race.

[00:14:23.100]

And it led directly to second wave feminism, gender. These movements followed one after another. You had the abolition movement, then you had feminism in the early 1800s with this introduction of more formal education for women. And then the first stirrings of homosexuals starting to speak out, to be recognized in society without the persecution. 1900, you have the civil rights movement, you have second wave feminism. And then what came? Stonewall. LGBT. 1969.

[00:15:13.890]

You have in the 1800s and 1900s, there is this sequence of steps. From race issues. And I mean, to make it broader than race. It also relates to immigration to other minority groups. And then how that leads onto equality for gender, and then how that leads onto equality for LGBT. And we can see that externally, how that sequence of steps has happened to where people finally need to recognize that when the constitution says a separation of church and state, that means no enforcement of a person's perception of Christian morality.

[00:15:58.810]

And it means that the state also cannot discriminate all men are created equal, all. Regardless of color, sexual preference, and if you want to use that word men, the way it should be interpreted, everyone, male and female. You see that in the 1800s, and you see that in the 1900s. And this is where I want to divert a little. Because I have a little bit of a problem. And it's hard to say this to a zoom meeting and a camera, but I have a real problem in this movement right now. Being on Facebook. It's a little like being part of a company and watching what people are saying regarding that company and representing that company on Facebook. It's never really a good idea to see what everyone is putting out there.

[00:16:53.700]

I don't really do anything on Facebook. I'm on Facebook so for the purpose that people can contact me. There's some other reasons to actually be there. But as I check it over the last months, I start to see that we have a real problem in this movement. There's a crisis going through this movement what I don't think people are recognizing. And I want to give a couple of examples of what is concerning me so much right now inside this movement. One that I probably would not be so concerned about if I didn't have access to Facebook and what people in this movement are posting.

[00:17:37.730]

When I presented in October 2018, I stood up before a movement of sexists. Some racism, 99% sexist movement, and I still handled myself in a way that was respectful even to those who I knew was openly sexist. I could have stood up and I could have called everyone out. I could have handled myself in a way that was disrespectful to those people who disrespected me, but I didn't. Because I'm an ambassador to someone else. I don't get to represent my own cause, my own concerns, my own hurts. Every single one of us is an ambassador.

[00:18:18.010]

And what is concerning me right now is a couple of issues. First of all is the language that people in this movement are using to represent those who have different beliefs to themselves. Clinton lost the election for a number of reasons. She lost the election because of Vladimir Putin. She lost the election because of Steve Bannon.

[00:18:38.500]

She lost the election because of sexism in society. But she also lost the election when she stood up and called a large number of the US population deplorables. Deplorables means someone who deserves censure and contempt. Contempt means the feeling that a person or a thing is beneath consideration, worthless or deserving of scorn.

[00:19:07.580]

The problem I see that's happening inside this movement is we have come out of conservative Adventism, which is essentially conservative Protestantism, which particularly showed itself through Future for America. We saw the ugliness of the way they used methodology and the way they behaved. What this message was designed to do was not for me to stand up and express to priests, levite or nethinim that they disgusted me because I saw their sexism. It was not for me to engage on social media attacking people. It was for me, as an ambassador, to present the truth.

[00:19:50.500]

And then people took it and some people left it. But instead, what I see happening. Is instead of that message changing people, all that is is redirecting the bad behavior, the anger that was already there. We aren't to take the FFA mindset and redirect it to another group of people. What Hillary Clinton did is she lost that election because she called a large group of the American population who didn't agree with her, beneath consideration, worthless and deserving of scorn. And in that respect, her failure is her own fault.

[00:20:31.050]

I know that this message calls for cutting words sometimes when we see racism and sexism. And I know as much as anyone that it hurts. Many women in this movement know that it hurts. Many women have worked in this movement for years under that oppressive system and know that it hurts. But we stand as ambassadors, and we don't engage on public fighting, either to other priests or in front of other Levites or in front of worldly people that misrepresents the kingdom that we belong to.

[00:21:08.250]

This message as it takes us through these issues, it wasn't to get stuck on the subject of race. It was like a stepping stone. It takes you from race, it takes you to gender, and then it takes you to LGBT. People who are currently suffering the death penalty in African nations where American fundamental Protestants have influenced the law to bring about the death penalty for this group of people that should have rights under the Constitution to not have Protestant morality enforced upon them. It's a stepping stone that is designed to change us, is designed to change the heart and to bring about a level of empathy and love and respect to every human being, not just human beings that agree with us. When we look at how this message is supposed to change us, what it isn't meant to do is have us stuck on one issue and then redirect that same harsh behavior towards those who disagree with us.

[00:22:24.590]

I do not support the calling of Donald Trump an idiot. I don't support the language that is being used by some in this movement against the religious right, however evil and wrong their actions are, however racist and sexist, that does not justify this movement misrepresenting the Kingdom of God.

[00:22:51.680]

Let's not make Hillary Clinton's mistake. The left is still making these mistakes. We are not part of the left. We are the Kingdom of God. We have no home in Trump's kingdom.

[00:23:03.860]

We have no home in Hillary Clinton's kingdom. We are our own kingdom. And if we understand that, we understand who we are ambassadors of. We do not represent Donald Trump. We do not represent Hillary Clinton.

[00:23:18.080]

To take that FFA mindset, that harsh mindset that demeans other people, however righteous we feel our cause is, and direct it to those who disagree with us, misrepresents the kingdom of God. I'll give you another conspiracy theory that we can put on our chart of conspiracy theories. It's one I saw a lot the last couple of weeks.

[00:23:49.990]

Trump walks down a ramp. He walks down this ramp quite gingerly. I don't know how that word is going to be translated into different languages. He has trouble walking down this ramp. Why is it that Trump has trouble walking down a ramp?

[00:24:09.870]

He said it's slippery. Obama walked up this ramp fine. Forget that Donald Trump is 74. He walks gingerly down a ramp. Why is it he has trouble walking down this ramp? Could it be that he's dying and they won't tell us?

[00:24:25.760]

That is the characteristic of a conspiracy theory. And yet even the people that I follow and respect on the left stream media are using this methodology more and more and feeling justified. Remember what happened in this time period of the 1840s, what happened? Originally the north was strong. The north knew what was right.

[00:24:49.810]

But then as the south started to act more and more aggressively, the north felt justified in copying the same patterns of behavior. That is what I see happening externally. We understand that the leaders of the Nethinims is to transition very soon from that left wing media, from those branches to this movement. And there's a reason. There's a reason that leadership is going to change.

[00:25:20.660]

We know for the world, we know who plows them. We know their early rain, their latter rain, and their harvest. But in here, there's a leadership change. And whoever led them in this history of their ploughing and their early rain does not lead them in this history. Now this leadership of the world becomes this movement.

[00:25:48.940]

Why can't those streams lead them into this history? Those streams can no longer lead them because those streams aren't safe to follow. We need to watch carefully. Not every post that we see is trustworthy. The reason it is not is because they take on the mindset of what Donald Trump is doing.

[00:26:12.810]

When Donald Trump said in 2016, look at Hillary Clinton's shake, ignoring she just had a cold drink of water, maybe, could it be that she's having seizures and she's about to die? And we all knew that was a conspiracy theory. It was manipulation. It was wrong to act that way, to interpret that way. And yet they're following the same pattern now in representing Donald Trump.

[00:26:43.610]

I'm not saying that the two sides are equal, but what the far right has done has become more and more acceptable for the left to participate in as they now feel angry and justified. That's happening with left stream media. It's happening within this movement, and it should not. We represent a different kingdom.

[00:27:09.830]

The design of this message, whether it was starting here with race to gender, to LGBT, was to create empathy. It was to change the heart. And it shouldn't stay fixed on just one group. You think about the Rohingya refugees, the people that are suffering worldwide, the women, the Shia women in the areas that were under the control of ISIS, they're now known as the fainting women. If one of those women was

under the control of ISIS because of what she suffered, if I was one of those women and I suffered abuse at the hands of ISIS, it was to such an extent that if I was being abused, I saw anything around me that smelt like a particular thing or there was a particular color.

[00:28:03.500]

There's a massive issue in the Middle East that they are now known as the fainting women. They just pass out, walk down the street, see the color green, associate the color green to what happened to you under ISIS, they just faint on the street. Such is the level of trauma in those areas. We should be learning to see as God sees, which means that there is no such thing as a deplorable. I don't care if they're a far right racist.

[00:28:31.660]

I don't care if they're in this movement, if they left this movement, if they hated me because I was a woman. There's no such thing as a deplorable.

[00:28:42.300]

And one other point, while we're on this subject. Where to move up this transition, race was the first step. Because unless you understand equality on race, you cannot understand equality or accept equality when it comes to gender. And yet, I see on Facebook there are men in this movement supporting the protests, supporting even the looting, quoting Malcolm X, quoting Martin Luther King, Jr. And then the next day, they're making sexist jokes about the behavior of women. What's their problem?

[00:29:23.180]

This should have been easy. This is not so easy. And to quote Martin Luther King and say that you believe in the protests is not passing the test. If those men and women who are posting on Facebook genuinely believe in equality on race, in the systemic racism that has occurred in the United States, in how deep set that is, and the extensive suffering that has caused, and in the extent that the United States is required to go to fix it, including reparations, then their correct behavior would not be to engage in protests. Correct their own hearts, and then turn to their wives, their sisters, and their daughters and correct their own behavior and pay the reparations that are due. And I know in this movement, in most cases, that is not happening. It is not acceptable to not understand and apply the universal principles of equality.

[00:30:38.560]

I still know that as I speak and as I teach, I can speak about race and find universal agreement. I still know the discomfort that occurs when I speak about gender. And I know that in many of the families of those who are protesting or wanting to protest that equality on gender, reparations, correct treatment of wives, sisters, and daughters is not happening. It's not passing the test. It has to change the heart.

[00:31:09.990]

But in the meantime, those that oppose us inside and outside the movement are not deplorables. We should observe how we speak, how we treat them, even down to the President of the United States, however much I disagree with him.

[00:31:27.610]

Coming back to our study. We find these two issues the abolitionist movement of slavery connected with the feminist movement as it rose up in the early 1800s. We find Protestantism on both sides of that subject.

[00:31:51.240]

We find in 1844 that it has split Protestantism to such an extent that it is torn into two separate churches. That's why you would have Northern Baptists and Southern Baptists.

[00:32:08.000]

And it continues for some of them, even to this day.

[00:32:15.130]

We spoke about Sam Brownback and his role as America's ambassador for religious freedom.

[00:32:33.650]

What we want to do when we continue next week is look at how this term religious freedom has been used from 1798 forward. And following in sequence from the first example to the second example to the third. We're first dealing with this issue of slavery. Quoting the Washington Post: this is the Washington Post. "Discriminating in the name of religion, segregationists and slaveholders did it too". I'll finish on this article.

[00:33:10.330]

In the 19th century, slaveholders and their sympathizers defended slavery by pointing to its presence in the Bible as evidence that it fit within God's plan for social order. They also interpreted biblical stories like those about Cain and Abel and the supposed curse of Ham as proof that God had made black Americans to be slaves.

[00:33:33.910]

They thundered that abolitionists were distorting the Bible and threatening the Christian social order of the south. Such extremists, they argued, had no right to impose their own distorted and dangerous orthodoxy on everyone else. Proslavery leaders employed the language of religious freedom because this principle carried significant cultural value. In so doing, they solidified or even forged their own view of slavery as a central religious concern. It took the civil war to shatter the notion, shared by many white northerners and southerners alike, that religious freedom was a reason to avoid antislavery action.

[00:34:17.900]

After the war and the years of Reconstruction ended, white southerners and the northerners who wanted to reestablish social and economic ties with them updated these older proslavery ideologies to support an emerging Jim Crow regime of racial segregation. Preachers, politicians and pundits developed a segregationist folk theology that defended the reconstituted southern racial order as divinely ordained. God had created the races separate and did not intend them to mix. Through the civil rights period and beyond, this theology enabled segregationist appeals to religious freedom and shaped a distinctive white racial Christianity in the process. Much like their proslavery predecessors, 20th century segregationists argued that the civil rights movement was trying to impose an alien, antichristian, communist ideology that would destroy the Christian racial order of the south.

[00:35:21.200]

Daniel Rick Berg, a former New deal staffer, warned in 1948 that the proposed federal Fair Employment practices act was communist inspired and would destroy the individual freedoms of association and religion. Such legislation, he wrote, would force associations that many Americans found repulsive. Not because of any narrow prejudice associations between black and white. Not because of narrow prejudice, but because of profound religious convictions. Religious freedom was an all American value, and these Americans, white Christian Americans, should not be forced to violate their conscientious convictions. This argument that is, first of all, proslavery in this history is being argued in defense of religious freedom.

[00:36:17.210]

Those from north and south who were for slavery defended it by saying it was their religious freedom to practice slavery, as it was a religious belief that they had from their literal to literal interpretation of Old Testament and New Testament scriptures. That continued, as this article says. It's a more extensive article. It's a good article. It'll be posted on the media broadcast.

[00:36:46.660]

This article continues to show how that was spread through the civil rights movement and continues even today. I want us to see that the argument for slavery was based on the argument of religious freedom.

[00:37:05.350]

We'll stop now. Because this is a nice place to break. When we come back next week, we want to look in depth and there's some really good articles on what actually happened in the 1870s and 1880s that led up to this Sunday Law push and how it impacted the Jewish community particularly. We're going to take a closer look at the arguments for that Sunday Law. And then continue in demonstrating how they're still at work today. How we can combine these two histories to have a correct understanding of what is happening in the United States today.

[00:37:45.660]

Remember, we are in the history of the increase of knowledge of the Sunday Law. Our dispensation for the 144,000 is from 2001 to the increase of knowledge of 2019, to the formalization of 2021. We have a

lot more to understand about what this way mark looks like and the history that's going to tell us is 1850 and 1888. We'll continue our investigation of that next week. If you'll kneel with me and closing prayer.

[00:38:22.230]

Dear Father in heaven, thank you, Lord, for our blessings. Thank you. How you have led this movement. We can see from the very beginning, Lord, you are leading out of people to do a specific work. We are to go to the world and tell them the true nature of the King and the true nature of the kingdom.

[00:38:42.700]

Lord, even in our good intentions, may we not misrepresent what that kingdom looks like. I pray, Lord, that you'll guide all those who are struggling right now. It is a difficult time for so many reasons, for so many people. I pray, Lord, that as a movement you will guide us through it that will honor you and respect you and be ambassadors for you in this time period. That we will not run before we are sent. We know, Lord, we are not yet tasked with taking this message to the world.

[00:39:17.190]

It is not our mandate, not even to take it back to the Church. I pray, Lord, that you'll prepare us. If we were ready to do that work. You'd have us doing it, but we are clearly not. Pray, Lord, you'll help us in this endeavor. Thank you.

[00:39:32.040]

In Jesus name. Amen.