

[00:00:05.350] - Graeme

Dear Lord, thank you for the hours of the Sabbath that are dawning upon us. Thank you for Your love and Your mercy over all of your people here, people in the movement and worldwide. We ask that you'll pour out Your Holy Spirit upon us as we start our Vespers study. As we continue to look for prophetic reasons, how we change our mindset through Your guidance and direction. We ask that will please have greater knowledge and understanding of the traps and the snares that lay ahead of us. That we may rightfully discern, continue to change and grow in your likeness. We pray for our movement all around the world and we ask that you bless us here. In Jesus name we pray. Amen.

[00:00:53.990] - Tess

Amen. So we'll start with a little mini review. This is where our journey took us, but we've moved on quite a bit from then. We've moved on to the other side of the board just because we ran out of room. But we're still discussing this switch, this bottom half of the board that has the political scale of left wing to right wing. So we're still covering this subject. But because we ran out of room, we've switched the board. Left wing, its predominant ethos is equality. Right wing, its governing ethos is freedom. As a movement, we were about here. You placed us here, Rachel, and I agreed with you. No one has disagreed with you. Everyone seems confident that this is where we were. Since 2018 we had to move from about here on the political spectrum, to somewhere in this area of the political spectrum. We didn't do that because of news articles or my personal bias. We did that because of a prophetic message. And we condensed that prophetic message into roughly four key points, or parts, that from 2018 was summarized, as two streams of information. What we were saying was externally, one stream, a second stream.

[00:02:44.090] - Tess

One is good and one is bad, one is good and one is evil. And we also had a discussion on how that is a very simplistic terminology and the problems with seeing something simply. We know it's not good versus evil. It's not that simple. And we're going to demonstrate that once we get into the left wing. But right now what we were saying, we moved from here to here, because of a prophetic message. What does that even mean? Unless we can define what the right wing stands for and what the left wing stands for, we have no concept of the significance of that change in our political leaning. So we began to define right wing and left wing. And when we did that, we saw that the fundamental ethos of right wing is freedom and of left wing is equality. That is very clearly typified in the 2016 election. You have Clinton versus Trump, you have really equality versus freedom. And it's hard for some in the movement to see that Donald Trump stood for freedom, or that the right wing stands for freedom, because we see them as like this persecuting political party now.

[00:04:17.260] - Tess

But I want us to see the nuance. I want us to swim past the media spotlight on neo-Nazis, and get down to what they actually believe in. Because we disagreed with Neonazi in 2017 and every year before it. What do we disagree with? We didn't start from 2018 to say we have a problem with Nazis. That's not what happened. We had a more fundamental disagreement with right wing ideology. So this is the

discussion of freedom versus equality. We defined freedom as the condition. I say we defined it, but we went to a dictionary. Freedom is the condition or right of being able to or allowed to say, do, think, etc. Whatever you want to, without being control or limited. So whatever you want to do, say think, you're allowed to do that. So a lot of people on both the centre and the right wing disagree with hate crimes. So I want to slip that in there for a second. How is it when someone kills, murders an African American man, they are charged by the court for murder. They are charged with murder, they receive a life sentence, no parole. But then they are charged with a hate crime and that same murderer now is going to get another sentence, possibly another life sentence, because when he murdered this man, he did so from a mental position of racial hatred.

[00:06:19.590] - Tess

So someone on the right side of the political spectrum, they'll say, Now I'm not racist, but when you charge someone, convict someone of a hate crime, they're already convicted of murder. They're already serving a life sentence. Now you're going to convict them of having hatred. What you are convicting someone of is a thought. Does that make sense? Can we see that charging someone with a hate crime is giving them in this case, possibly a lie sentence for a thought. They're charged with two things, murder and conducting a hate crime. Life sentence, life sentence. Murder is an action. Hate is a thought. Two real life sentences. So someone on the right wing will say not a racist, but hate crimes. You're convicting someone for a thought. And we believe in the freedom to think any way you want to think. Even if we don't like the way this person is thinking, obviously it's awful they're thinking this racist person had in their mind. But you're still giving someone a sentence of years or a full life term for a thought. So that will very much agitate someone on the right wing, someone who will say they're not racist, who possibly isn't racist, but still sees that as a dangerous precedent for freedom.

[00:08:04.210] - Tess

Now, obviously, I disagree with that. I don't believe that that is inaccurate portrayal, but I want to demonstrate how fine some of that logic is about freedom, especially when we start getting into hate crimes and these finer elements because they are convicting someone for a thought. If people have a problem after I've said that with why we as a movement and the left wing believe that it's acceptable to charge someone with a hate crime, then we can explain why I think that person is wrong that I described. But otherwise I'll just move on. Just explaining Freedom versus Equality. Freedom the freedom to be able to do, say, think, including hate thoughts without being controlled or limited. Equality is a situation in which men and women, people of different races, religions, etc, are all treated fairly and have the same opportunities. So if you have thought more about those definitions, I hope they're starting to get more established as they individually are. But also the differences between freedom and equality. It's easy for people to throw the word freedom into all kinds of situations, but we need to see the difference. And then we went to the American Bar Association, which because of their profession, has to see the difference between two such loaded terms.

[00:09:52.580] - Tess

And they described how all antidiscrimination statutes pose a tension between equality and liberty. So over and over again, you have, rightwing freedom and left wing equality, coming into conflict. Someone in the right wing will also believe in equality to a certain extent. Someone in the left wing will believe in freedom to a certain extent. America, because it is the glorious land was founded on principles of freedom and equality. They're both good. But when they come into tension, one has to give way. The right wing says equality has to give way to freedom, because freedom is all important. Even when people do say or think things that we don't like, left wing says freedom needs to give way to equality. That it's equality that needs to matter. Let me see if he's online. I don't see him online. When we were trying to define right wing and left wing, Greg made a comment about left wing government is large because they need more representation. They want more representation from different communities. Left wing government might have five people. Right wing government might have three because left wing believe in big government and right wing believe in small government.

[00:11:41.190] - Tess

And Greg said that the reason that one government is big and one is small is because the left wing says we want more representation from minorities, from different groups of people. And I did challenge him on that. I think he was right, but I wanted to get to the fundamental point and it wasn't quite going deep enough. I don't think you were quite going to where we wanted to, Greg, but you weren't wrong. But I said all this big government could all be white men, and this could be a trans person, a gay person, and an immigrant. Even though it is partly about representation, that's not the underlying division between the two. The reason this needs a big government is because they do want that representation. That's where he's right. But all those people need something to do. You have people who are part of right wing government from minority communities, but they do not believe that their side of government has a responsibility to promote equality even within their own communities. It's about what the government's job function is. Left wing government is big because they have a lot to do. Equality takes a lot of effort to oversee, to monitor, and then to enforce.

[00:13:24.250] - Tess

Freedom doesn't take that much effort. It doesn't take that much effort because you are leaving it up to individuals, to corporations, etc. To do, say, think, employee, however, whoever, whatever they want to. We discussed why freedom means so much to Adventists. That is a key part of why Adventism finds itself right wing. How they fear the Sunday law and how they perceive the Sunday law threat to be. They believe that their freedom is imminently under attack. So they're very sensitive to freedom, especially religious freedom. We got pulled away from that in 2018, and we need to clearly be able to understand why we've been dealing with the ramifications of that political pool ever since. I want to keep this before us because it's a neat illustration whenever we need to conceptualise the difference between freedom and equality. You have a business owner. Everything belongs to him. It's his own time, his own talent, his own business, his own money. And the Supreme Court had to decide whether or not his freedom to discriminate should or is more important or less important than someone's right to not be discriminated against, more important or less important than someone else's equality in society.

[00:15:13.470] - Tess

And that is the court case that our quote came from. This is the issue that we find the culture war centred on today. So we gave a couple of examples. We went to Australian politics. We saw that when you moved towards the right wing, the further you went into the right wing the more you saw freedom advertised, and the notion that everyone's freedoms are under attack weaponized. Then we went to the trucker protests in Canada and just gave a second witness for that. Then we also started to go back into history. We didn't do a whole lot on that. But we started to discuss freedom versus equality in the context of slavery, in the context of Millerite history. And we didn't do that to a great extent. But through 1888 and the civil rights movement, we are going to go back to the civil rights movement, going back to slavery. I shared two articles on the Vespers Forum. I wanted to stop now. That's pretty much our review, where we've come from, where we've gotten to, and then just bringing up those articles. Does anyone have any thoughts or questions or quotes that have been kept from last week or that have arisen during the week or while you read the articles.

[00:16:47.270] - Tess

This is our break between our review and when we move on.

[00:17:06.880] - Raymond

I had a question, as we were reviewing just now. When we say small and big government, what exactly do we mean by that? Because the number of people in Congress doesn't change. So are we talking about, like, passing more laws? Are we talking about having more civil servants? Or. Maybe I forgot if we define it.

[00:17:41.230] - Tess

I'm going to leave that for now and I'm going to task you with defining that for us next week. So why you have a project. Is that okay?

[00:17:50.710] - Raymond

Two weeks, right?

[00:17:52.930] - Tess

Two weeks time. Two weeks time. Come back in just a short before or early on in the study, you'll explain to us the difference between big government and small government in relation to size and job function. Is that okay? Great. So put that one back, handballed that one back. No other hands up. So I'll move on. Oh, Josephine, I'll take you and then we'll move on.

[00:18:28.590] - Josephine

Did I get this right? In the Civil War, the north was fighting for equality, the south was fighting for freedom. And then there's a switch. Is there a switch today? That they switch sides or something like that.

[00:18:55.490] - Josephine

Freedom and equality switch side? Or did I get it all wrong?

[00:19:03.290] - Tess

When you talk about the switch, do you mean the political parties, particularly the Democrat Party? Or do you mean the freedom and equality itself?

[00:19:16.490] - Josephine

No, the parties.

[00:19:19.470] - Tess

The parties?

[00:19:20.810] - Josephine

Yes.

[00:19:22.950] - Tess

Yes, there was a switch. I think there's a good article that I can send you or if someone has it, they can send you after we finish. That explains the switch that occurred between the north and the south, because the Democrats were the party of the south. They were the party that was fighting for freedom and small government against a large government dictatorial, Abraham Lincoln and those Northern States. So there was a switch between the ethos of the Democrat Party and that of the Northern party, which was forming as the Republican. So if it's okay, we'll send you something after Vespers that explains the political switch.

[00:20:15.040] - Josephine

Yes, thank you. Lovely.

[00:20:17.430] - Tess

I think it's a short little video, but it does a really neat job. So we went from here and then we started to complicate it a little, because we talked about the Republican Party. So the Republican Party stands for freedom, and yet we often see them oppose things that we would consider to be freedom. So I've drawn up little boxes up here and I'll put people in these boxes. An Islamic woman, a trans man and a lesbian. So the Republican Party says they stand for freedom and yet they're going to treat all these people

differently. So they'll say this white man, he wants to own a gun. I don't know where they get that from the Bible or their own history. But they would say that's his God given right, it's his freedom. He has to own a gun. This woman wants equal pay or the right to an abortion. They will say, no. This Islamic woman wants to be allowed into the country the same way anyone else would be allowed into the country. Going back to Donald Trump's ban from majority Muslim countries.

[00:22:35.730] - Tess

She might just want to get a visa alongside someone from, say, Sweden. So they're going to treat her differently. A trans man wants to have gender affirming surgery. Does that affect this woman or this woman or this man? No, that's his body. You would think that that is his right. But they will oppose his right to surgery. The lesbian woman wants to get married. They'll also oppose her right to get married. So when they see freedom, it's this freedom. If I put down here Republican, it is freedom that they're going to combine it with morality. So we began to discuss the right wing spectrum. And we complicated it a little and said, if you go online and you look at political spectrums, they'll do the following. You have left wing, right wing, but then you have this lion down the middle. And they will call that authoritarianism and libertarian. Authoritarian and libertarian. Authoritarian believes in more control. Libertarian believes in more liberty. And then they will say that there is left wing authoritarian, right wing authoritarian, left wing libertarian, and right wing libertarian. I'm really not interested in discussing the authoritarian side. I suppose to give away my position a little.

[00:24:46.590] - Tess

I think it's nonsense. But I want to explain what libertarianism is because it is the third biggest political party in the United States and it has an incredibly profound impact on everything that we're discussing. So Republican Party will say freedom and morality. The Libertarian Party will say just freedom. So I want to try and sell libertarianism to you. I'll do my best. And then I'll ask you if I've sold it. A libertarian will say that all of these people, each person should have the absolute liberty to say, eat, smoke, buy, sell, learn, do whatever they want to with whomever they want to. As long as this person doesn't hurt, harm this person. This person doesn't harm another person. And when they talk about harm, they're not talking about feelings or thoughts. They're talking about material physical harm. Live and let live. So we did go into this last week, but I wanted to review it a little because we've said a lot of things last week. Reading from their website, other political parties prioritise the right to some, but not others. Libertarians value the right of all people to live in whatever manner they choose, so long as they do not forcibly interfere with the equal right of others to live in whatever manner they choose.

[00:26:35.650] - Tess

So this woman has the freedom, the right to live anyway, by whatever religion, in whatever manner she likes to. This trans man has the same. This lesbian woman has the same. She can do whatever she wants with whoever she wants, including marry them. So we listed some and you all helped me with this, so I won't ask you again. You already contributed. But a libertarian position in many respects is very progressive. In social respects, it is quite progressive. Gay marriage, they'll support. Not all of these are

necessarily progressive. They'll support prostitution. Do whatever you want with your own body, as long as you're not physically harming with a strict definition of harm someone else. Gun rights, decriminalising drugs, no to the war on drugs. They want to. I'll list some of the things, protect freedom of religion, association, speech. They talk about asset forfeiture laws which fully agree with their position. Asset forfeiture is a big problem. Demilitarised law enforcement agencies. I'm not sure if they would like that summarised as defund the police, but it is similar. Demilitarised law enforcement, because what do the police have to enforce if they're not caring what guns or weapons people are carrying, what drugs they're carrying or taking, what they're saying, what they're selling, what do the police have to do?

[00:28:50.520] - Tess

They don't have that much to do after that. So they can be disarmed to a certain degree, very much against government surveillance. So you can imagine what they think of the Patriot Act, which as you would expect, was the position the movement had. And when I came in 2018, I said the Patriot Act actually isn't that bad, and we discussed that through 2019. But if you remember going back before 2019, it was like the greatest, most awful thing that happened in 2001 through the government was the Patriot Act. A lot of bad things were done with it, but the principles behind it and a lot of it actually a positive thing. You can see why I'm saying in 2019 the Patriot Act isn't that bad, whereas FFA just saw it as awful. It's because it is also connected with right wing. Protect internet freedom and Privacy. I'll keep that. I will put in Privacy. That's connected with ending surveillance and their view on the Patriot Act, etc. They say those who haven't been convicted of a violent crime so nonviolent offences should have all their rights to vote back. We would agree with that.

[00:30:24.230] - Tess

Right now if someone is charged with possessing drugs, they can lose their right to vote. And with the war on drugs and the racial motivation behind that, that has done an incredible amount of harm to minority communities and their voting rights. So there is much in what they're saying that is progressive. So it's just liberty without government enforced morality. And if you hear them speak, it's all about being passive. It's all about changing society through education and bottom up pressure. So if a company has bad Practises, say a company is not very good with health and safety. The government should not come in and force health and safety regulations. Instead, it's the workers who will tell the company we are not going to work for you unless you give us appropriate amounts of safety. So they also have an issue with, say, health and safety regulation, everything like that. All these regulations on individuals and businesses need scrapping. And then where society goes wrong, where society is racist, where corporations are greedy, societal pressure will bring around that change. Societal pressure and education. So they're not advocating for a racist society. They're advocating for a society built on absolute liberty that can then change through education and societal pressure, not forced government intervention.

[00:32:24.770] - Tess

Who's bought in? Have I sold it? I heard lips move. So if you have raise your hand. Does anyone? Ray, sign me up. Molly? Molly, are you there?

[00:33:03.050] - Moly

Yes, I agree.

[00:33:12.650] - Tess

It sounds good?

[00:33:22.040] - Moly

As you said. All these things that has been said, is all progressive.

[00:33:29.290] - Tess

Gun rights. Everyone gets a gun. Is that progressive?

[00:33:35.350] - Moly

No, I mean the idea that has been discussed and says it's progressive.

[00:33:41.590] - Tess

Do you think the mindset behind it is progressive?

[00:33:44.800] - Moly

Yeah.

[00:33:45.510] - Tess

Okay, now I sold it. I want to dash it for you. Is that okay?

[00:33:52.190] - Moly

Yeah.

[00:33:53.930] - Tess

Okay. It sounds beautiful. And when you go to their websites, when you hear them speak, it is beautiful. I'm not sure if you've heard about something called nonviolent communication. If you were to go to a particular advocate of it, Tim Mullen. He's a Canadian libertarian podcaster, blogger, activist, and politician. He was the leader of the Libertarian Party of Canada from 2014 to August of 2021. So leader of the Canadian Libertarian Party for a seven year stint. He in one of his podcasts will explain how nonviolent communication is a libertarian principle because it's in line with libertarian and their objective principles. You want to change someone through nonviolent communication, through no force, through

little to no judgement, just seeing their needs working around their needs, educating, et cetera. So if you've heard about nonviolent communication, which has been huge in this movement over the last couple of years, people have tried to sell that to me and I've dashed their hopes. It's because nonviolent communication is connected to a libertarian principle. And the people that are buying into nonviolent communication are buying into not a prophetic message, but a political position that I would suggest is as opposite to this movement as you're going to get.

[00:35:34.710] - Tess

So you have left wing equality, you have the Democrat Party, left wing, equality. Moving centrist, trying to balance the two with a bit more emphasis on freedom. Republican, freedom over equality, with some morality. You're going to go further into this right wing and it's more and more liberty. So I asked last week, what's the problem with left wing libertarianism? Why is this model broken? Who wants to answer that for me? What's wrong with this, Catherine?

[00:36:23.870] - Catherine

Because they're prioritizing freedom over quality.

[00:36:31.050] - Tess

So this side says freedom over equality. This side is meant to say a quality over freedom or equality over liberty. So how does this work?

[00:36:46.690] - Catherine

I don't think it does.

[00:36:46.690] - Tess

It doesn't. So if you see a political spectrum online and it does this know that that is not reality. Did you have anything else to say, Catherine? No.

[00:37:05.630] - Tess

Brandan.

[00:37:10.410] - Brendan

Yeah. I was going to say exactly what Catherine said. It can't work. You've got equality and liberty clashing. It just doesn't make sense. It can't work. You got to priorities one over the other. So it's a binary decision. You can't mix the two.

[00:37:31.710] - Tess

You can't have a left wing political party prioritising freedom over equality. It doesn't work. Did you have anything else to say, Brendan?

[00:37:47.530] - Brendan

No, that's all. I agree with Catherine.

[00:37:52.510] - Tess

Catherine, you put your hand up again.

[00:37:54.740] - Catherine

Yeah. I thought perhaps the confusion is because it sort of sound a bit progressive and maybe that's why people think the left wing just delve too deep into it. And just take it.

[00:38:10.250] - Tess

Yes. It's what Molly said. This is progressive, isn't it? It's a progressive ideology, but it can't be because they prioritize liberty over equality and they make that sound beautiful. They think that that in practise would be beautiful. And as a theory, it sounds that way. I want us to get below the theory. Josephine.

[00:38:40.170] - Josephine

I think I had the same idea as others, but I was going to describe it in a slightly different way. What they're promoting, the libertarian, would take them to the right side instead of to the left.

[00:39:01.470] - Tess

Yes. So you're seeing that that's going to pull them towards this side, but they would still disagree in many points with Republicanism. That's why they are a third political party. They disagree with so much that's traditionally Republican that they do form a third political party. And we're talking about the social in all of this. There is the economic they have a very defined economic model. I think Steve Bannon probably tore apart their model most clearly, but they also disagree very strongly when it comes to economics as well. Brandon, was that your hand again or did I lost track?

[00:40:00.690] - Brendan

Yeah. Is it almost like by sheer coincidence that a lot of the libertarian outcomes in some of these things? It's almost like Ramsay theory. It just appears to line up with things on the left, even though the ideology is completely opposed. It just happens to agree in some instances by chance. I'm not sure whether using Ramsay theory is the correct way of saying it, but it's almost like. It's probably a bad way of saying it.

[00:40:44.730] - Tess

I knew that inequality was wrong all my life, knew it was wrong, never taught it until the message started to developing in 2016. And then from 2016 to 2019, including in 2018. I never spelled out that equality was wrong. So you have here about 18 months. We get to the beginning of 2020. I said headship is dead. Equality must exist between men and women. We say that at, I'm going to say, November 9, because that's the waymark that's connected without event. We say equality. But that is after a long time of knowing that, first of all, it's morally wrong and then a long time of seeing that the message is also saying that it's wrong. But I couldn't present it until the Eden to Eden model came together, which did not come together until about a month before the German camp meeting. So you have a long period of waiting to be able to say that there should be a quality between men and women. We're waiting on the prophetic message. As soon as this hits, what do people start saying in the movement? Mostly those who have now left, they start saying here that gay marriage is acceptable in the movement, in the Kingdom of God.

[00:42:29.140] - Tess

And from here to 2021, which is a little bit over 18 months, some people are saying gay marriage is fine. Why aren't the leaders saying this? And people are feeling let down? Because I'm not teaching that gay marriage is acceptable in the Kingdom of God. The issue that happened here is that those who didn't change their political position just embraced their own version of freedom. They never gave up freedom for equality. They just became more encompassed with freedom and more especially when it comes to external, more connected with freedom than they ever had been before. So when we teach Eden to Eden, we teach equality. They say freedom. They say gay marriage is fine. And they think they're supporting a left wing position. And they're not. They supported gay marriage through the principle of freedom, not equality. And the reason that they were able to preach gay marriage in the beginning months of 2020 is they were approaching that subject, LGBT subject from the position of freedom. And we had to wait as leadership 18 months past then until we could approach the same issue from the platform of equality. And that takes time. Elder Jeff knew, we knew that we would end up supporting LGBT people in this movement just the same way I knew that headship was wrong well before the German camp meeting.

[00:44:07.340] - Tess

But it had to be taught not from freedom. It had to be taught from equality. So I'm only saying that because of what you said, Brandon, that you think that there is progressivism in this. It depends on the approach. Because when someone here, an employee doesn't want to Bake a cake for a homosexual couple, the libertarians will side with which side? They will support their right to get married. But you'll find the Republican Party here, you'll find the Democrat Party here, and you'll find the Libertarian Party here with a stronger position than the Republican Party. So it looks progressive. Just saying that you support gay marriage is not necessarily a left wing ideology. Do you have anything else to say, Brandon, before we move on.

[00:45:16.470] - Brendan

No, thank you. That was wonderful. Really appreciate it. Thank you.

[00:45:26.170] - Tess

Lynn.

[00:45:29.350] - Lynn

Hi. I was going to just make a comment. Sort of ask a question with regard to the right. You've got the Republicans, the conservative Christian right, and then you compare that to the libertarian right. It seems to me we said before that the right wing focuses on their morality freedom. Like it's freedom within confines of their idea of morality. So it's limited in that framework, if you like. Whereas the libertarian broadens that perspective and doesn't really confine it with morality, other than in the broad terms of as long as you're not doing any physical harm to another person. You can see how it is very extreme right, but broader and larger and encompassing far more. And I guess the confusion comes in like when there seems like there's a similarity. But really, when you look at the overall what they're standing for, it's really just a very extreme right position. It's almost as far as you could go.

[00:47:04.330] - Tess

Let me know when you're done, because I don't want to interrupt you.

[00:47:06.880] - Lynn

I'm done.

[00:47:08.350] - Tess

Sorry. I know there's some other hands, and if you have a question, please raise them again and we'll come back. But I want to build on what you said, Lynn, about that, about it being a more extreme position. The Daily Beast put out an article a few years ago that caused a bit of a storm and made a lot of libertarians very unhappy, but their position is actually fairly easy to defend. I want to quote a little bit from the Daily Beast article. It's titled The Insidious Libertarian to Altright Pipeline. They say libertarianism has an alright problem. Many prominent leaders of the alright or the far, radical, dangerous right wing. Many prominent leaders of that community have at some point identified as libertarian. I am curious as to why, and then it starts to name them. Milo Yanopoulos has built himself and has been billed by others as libertarian. About a year ago he came clean about that. Then they list more. Milo Yiannopoulos, Tim Gionet, Gavin McInnes, Augustus Invictus, Stefan Molyneux, Richard Spencer. It is also true that many of today's far riders are disaffected Conservatives. However, there are many more Conservatives in this country than there are libertarians.

[00:48:43.170] - Tess

So you have a massive amount of Conservatives, small amount of libertarians. Then why are so many of the leaders coming through the libertarian pipeline disproportionately to the conservative pipeline? It suggests a disproportionate number of today's prominent alt riders began as libertarians, not Conservatives. Jeffrey A. Tucker, content director for the Libertarian Foundation for Economic Education,

lists five differences between the alright and libertarians. So they differ on points. And yet it seems observably true that libertarianism is disproportionately a gateway to the far right. Again, the question is why? So we want to discuss why. Why does the far right come more through this than through Conservatives? When we started teaching in 2018, 2019 about the problems with right wing and we're talking about Christianity, we've said since then that we're in a postchristian world. Who we're trying to get through is FFA and everyone who surrounds them. And then as we move forward in our timeline through to Adventists. So we are talking to conservative Christians. So what we are saying is being set in a bubble. Therefore, we're going to highlight the connection between Mary Stewart Ralph and Walter Veith. We're going to talk about Christianity, we're going to talk about the evangelicals supporting Donald Trump.

[00:50:27.850] - Tess

We're going to talk about Jerry Foul. Well, but we need to know that we have been saying that over the last few years because we are speaking to a Christian bubble still. And if you expand that out and look at the United States as it is, it's not an accurate picture of where the real threat truly comes from. Certain amount of it, yes. But elderly Republican moral Conservatives in Congress, on the Supreme Court, that's a problem. But even that is in a bubble. And this is why I think what Rachel Port on Gamergate is so important, because that starts to dismantle the bubble so we can see the bigger picture of what's going on. I don't think that this needs to complicate or be that complicated. I'm hoping that people don't feel overwhelmed. I think it can be simple. But we are living in a post Christian world. The United States is not a Christian country anymore. It's not heading that way. Whoever wins whatever elections come next, it's not heading back into Christianity. And the threat is not just elderly Conservatives that are losing power and what this article is saying and others like it.

[00:51:58.300] - Tess

When you look at the far right, when you look at something like January 6, there's a reason you don't have a priest. January 6, you have a shaman. That's not a Christian symbol, and he's not elderly. So coming back to libertarianism, this looks like progressive. So Molly, how would a libertarian handle the Civil Rights Act of 1964? I shouldn't be asking you that. I'm sorry. You didn't tell me that you weren't communicating. Graeme, how would a libertarian handle the Civil Rights Act of 1964?

[00:52:48.270] - Graeme

Guessing that would be positive. That would be for it.

[00:52:53.050] - Tess

So they'd be positive. The Civil Rights Act.

[00:52:57.620] - Graeme

Yes.

[00:53:02.330] - Tess

Going to say you're right, on part of it. But if you go to title four of the Civil Rights Act. Sorry Molly, I didn't know you were participating. I'll ask you next time. If you go to title 2 of the Civil Rights Act. It says you have the right to fall an equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and accommodations of any place of public accommodation. You cannot be treated differently by any place of public accommodation because of your race, colour, religion or national origin. So I come to a Huffington Post article. I might share this one with you after Vespers in full, because I think it's good to read. It's titled Why Libertarians and Rand Paul are Wrong about the Civil Rights Act. Do we all know who Rand Paul is? Shake your head. Okay, I'm going to share screen because you might know his face and not his name. And it always helps, I think, to be able to connect someone's face and name just so we know who we're talking about. The people know this man? If you've ever watched the problematic John Stewart from his Daily Show days, Rand Paul would come up.

[00:55:05.490] - Tess

In a lot of those contexts, Rand Paul would come up. He is a Republican, but his history is predominantly libertarian and his father was a libertarian politician. So he is more libertarian than anything else. This article is from 2010. Following his Tea Party insurgency. Following his Tea Party insurgency Senate primary victory over the establishment Republican candidate in Kentucky, Rand Paul created ways when Rachel Maddow forced him uncomfortably to admit his opposition to parts of the Civil Rights Act. To many in the civil rights community and to the political centre, this comes as a shock. It shouldn't be. It shouldn't come as a shock. I'm not quoting now. It shouldn't come as a shock because Rand Paul is predominantly libertarian. And libertarians have major issues with the Civil Rights Act. For years, libertarians oppose government interference with private business, whether that means opposition to environmental regulations. I want to say, no environmental regulation was also part of their platform. That seriously starts to conflict with freedom of individuals and businesses. For years, they opposed government interference, whether that means opposition to environmental regulation, Labour laws, or antidiscrimination. The son of libertarian presidential candidate Ron Paul. It's not surprising that Rand Paul also believes in those same things.

[00:57:08.170] - Tess

So they're saying that even though Rand Paul is Republican, he has libertarian roots. His father ran for President as a libertarian candidate. So even as a Republican, he has that leaning. Rand Paul has made it clear that he's not in favour of repealing the Civil Rights Act. He supports the vast majority of it. So what's the problem? The problem is through different parts of it. But it's especially with title two. And this is where libertarians come into conflict with civil rights. You have the right to fall and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and accommodations of any place of public accommodation. So if I own a hotel, it's my business, it's my money, it's my time, it's my facility. And I say I only want white people staying at my hotel. The Civil Rights Act says I am not allowed to do that. But the Civil Rights Act is about freedom or equality. Is the Civil Rights Act predominantly freedom or equality. I

know that someone said last week if they went back and read articles on the civil rights movement, all they see is freedom, freedom, freedom. And I said it depends on the articles you read and also how you sift them, because I don't see that. It's the Civil Rights Act predominantly or led by the principle of freedom or the principle of equality.

[00:59:06.770] - Tess

Catherine.

[00:59:09.770] - Catherine

It's equality takes priority.

[00:59:21.090] - Catherine

It's equality because...

[00:59:24.130] - Catherine

Yeah, you can especially see that in title 2. Where it's got to do with the accommodation. So the equality takes precedence over the freedom of the hotel owner.

[00:59:37.510] - Tess

Yes. Those running any form of public accommodation, and they make accommodation a very broad term. By the way. Did you have anything else to add?

[00:59:54.050] - Catherine

No, that's all.

[00:59:57.570] - Tess

Brandon, was that what you were going to say?

[01:00:05.650] - Brendan

Yes, I agree with Catherine.

[01:00:12.650] - Tess

Molly, you say a quality, if you could raise your hand, it would help us. But you've said a quality like the others, and I would agree.

[01:00:22.130] - Moly

Yeah, in a sense, that it's for everybody is broad. There's no boundary like it's equal for everyone.

[01:00:42.070] - Tess

No, it means that individuals do not have the freedom to discriminate against an African American, even when that conflicts with someone's freedom. The right of, and it covered more groups, but the right of a black person to equality trumps that of the freedom of anyone who has a business school, all of those things. So a Republican today will not so openly oppose the Civil Rights Act. They just let it all slide, expanding it, they will have complaints. But a libertarian, if you push them on it, still has serious problems with the Civil Rights Act. Quoting again, libertarians did not grow out of this view. After the civil rights movement won, they just became more quiet. Rand Paul said he would have opposed the Civil Rights Act because of the property rights element, that while he liked the Civil Rights Act, where it prohibited the government from discrimination, the Civil Rights Act didn't just prohibit the government from discriminating. The Civil Rights Act prohibited this person from discriminating against a black person, an African American, or also, if they allow it to be expanded against other minorities as well, that's what they opposed. So a libertarian agrees the government shouldn't discriminate.

[01:02:39.280] - Tess

The government shouldn't even be big enough to make it able to discriminate. But everyone should have the freedom to discriminate, because their freedom to discriminate Trump's anyone's right to equality. Quoting Rand Paul, I don't like the idea of telling private business owners I abhor racism. I think it's a terrible business decision to exclude anybody from your restaurant. But at the same time, I do believe in private ownership. I'm going to call that private freedom. In the Carto Symposium in 2010, they debated the 1964 Civil Rights Act because four libertarians, apparently it's still up for debate. And a panel of four white men, surely just a coincidence, tried to figure out whether a prohibiting discrimination was bad that could perhaps be justified by how bad Jim Crow itself was, or B rehibiting discrimination was never justified under any circumstances. Jeffrey Muran, an economist at Harvard who is rather alarmingly director of undergraduate studies for his Department, was unequivocal. His fellow panellists had trotted out arguments about historical context and social norms to defend a position that seems anathematical to everything libertarians believe in. That's quoting him. I continuing quoting him: libertarians should not only oppose Title 2 of the Civil Rights Act, they should shout that opposition from the highest rooftop.

[01:04:21.660] - Tess

Title 2 is a bald face assault on a principle that libertarians hold dear, that private property is private. This means libertarians should be incredibly suspicious of Title 2 and insist on an overwhelming case before violating this principle. No such case exists. If the law turns restaurants into public accommodations, then restaurants become places where the law can impose public health concerns, where customers have rights. And he goes on and on. So some libertarians try to soften their position by saying, let's consider how bad Jim Crow was. So the 1964 Civil Rights Act was necessary, but they still are very uncomfortable with it. And the most outspoken, like this individual, are violently opposed to any part of the Civil Rights Act that steps beyond pure government. So if Jerry Farewell wants to open a private school that is

segregated, what would a libertarian have to believe in? And reminding you, Rand Paul hates racism, hates it, but freedom Trump's equality. So Rand Paul, what would be his position on Jerry Farewell segregated school? He would allow gay marriage and he would allow segregation. I'm going to not answer any hands because I think they're the ones I've already gone to.

[01:06:10.170] - Tess

So if I've missed you, please raise it again. I'm explaining what happens with libertarianism in practise. Libertarianism and the right to discriminate. The fact that in allowing freedom or liberty, they allow many things that a progressive would support. And yet it also puts them into a position where, more than anyone else, more than any mainstream Republican, they become violently opposed to any form of civil rights that interferes with someone's freedom or right to be racist, to be sexist, to be homophobic, to discriminate, because freedom and liberty always has to Trump equality. Even when we don't like what people do, say or think. Any thoughts or questions? Brandon, was that your hand again?

[01:07:23.070] - Brendan

Yes. As you're explaining that, it's hard not to trace the libertarian mentality all the way back to the 1860's.

[01:07:44.470] - Brendan

It's more of that mindset that was fighting for people's property rights, being slaves. They were the ones that, I mean, I could be wrong, but it's just hard not to see that they were the really motivated and enthusiastic ones that were fighting for those property rights, for those Southern slaveholders. Whether a slave owners themselves, I don't think it mattered. And it just appears they were the ones that were the enthusiastic fighters. Is that right? Is that the origins of where all this came from. Obviously, it goes back further, but it's hard not to go back there and think of it through those eyes. Now, is that correct?

[01:08:41.750] - Tess

I think libertarianism has developed a little bit more since then because they would believe that you're not allowed to kill or beat another human being. If you planted today's libertarian back into 1860, they would oppose slavery. But if you saw libertarianism as it existed in American culture in 1860, where it didn't seem wrong for that spectrum of society to see human beings as property, then, yes, freedom being their governing principle, people as property. Today, they would oppose that. Back then, if you saw libertarianism, then absolute freedom. You don't want to own a slave. Don't own a slave if you want to. No one else has the right to interfere. It becomes much more stark in today's concept when we bring it into the subject of gender, though, because the idea of ownership when it comes to gender, and then how that interconnects with marriage and relationships and culture, even Indigenous cultures all across the world, then the concept of owning a human being all of a sudden feels right and normal to the vast majority of this Earth's population. Does that make sense? Brandon, I'm not sure if I've answered your question.

[01:10:25.800] - Brendan

Yes. Thank you. No, that's great. And thank you for bringing it back to gender, because that's exactly right. Thank you.

[01:10:36.550] - Tess

We're going to talk more about libertarianism and gender. That's why I directed it there, because as you might imagine, when we talk about this pipeline between libertarianism and the alright, we're going to talk about the Proud Boys. They're not the proud white men or the proud white people. They're the proud men for a reason. So 2014 Gamergate. Gender. Going to come into conflict. Josephine.

[01:11:14.370] - Josephine

My question is taking us back a little bit to that line right behind you about the marriage, the gay marriage and the people that were supporting the gay marriage from the position of freedom. And you taught it from the position of equality. So you can both believe in gay marriage, but the motives are different? The position is different. Why did they leave? Couldn't they switch? Was it too painful to switch?

[01:12:13.210] - Tess

The issue from 2018 to now has always been the same. It's always been, the movement is here. Who will shift? Many people in the movement still haven't. That's why people think I use aggressive communication techniques at camp meetings, or on the Media Broadcast. Because people aren't switching. And it's life and death. So it is possible. But when it comes to... There was a fight in Australia in the movement in, I think it was 2018, but it was earlier in 2018. There was a fight about gay marriage because that's when gay marriage was about to be legalised in Australia, and it caused a fight in the members in Australia where one part of the members said, we need to stop gay marriage being legalized politically. And other members within the movement in Australia said, what right do we have to force through the government your moral conviction? This is like the Sunday law. If they want to be married, they should be allowed to get married. This is early 2018, if I have the time. Right. And the side that said that, through the Australian government, gay marriage should be legalized are the people who are still in the movement today.

[01:13:51.600] - Tess

We've always recognised that the government should not enforce their version of morality on the people. So we supported gay marriage. The discussion, the issue is about the Kingdom of God and what isn't sin. When it came to approaching it from that direction. Just like headship, just like we did with Eden to Eden, just like I waited 18 months to do when it came to gender, we had to approach it from equality. It was only a quality that was going to someone said it was 2017. So even before 2018, but when it was going to be viewed at as sin, we needed to approach it from equality. Because, yes, you can believe in gay marriage because you believe in freedom. But the issue if we bring this internally was if we're going to switch and become left wing, if we're going to see the battle of Ipsus and say Clinton, then we needed to defend a person's right to be married by an elder of this movement into the Kingdom of God. That wasn't just okay, to day that that made God happy. That had to be done from a position of equality. Does that make sense?

[01:15:21.890] - Tess

Josephine?

[01:15:24.090] - Josephine

Yes, thank you.

[01:15:30.670] - Tess

I have one more quote on libertarianism. This is from CurrentAffairs.org and it's titled Why Libertarians Oppose Civil Rights. They just mentioned a couple of things. From a legal perspective, discrimination should be permitted in any society that honours freedom of associations. So if you're a society that honours freedom, then discrimination should be permitted. This is a libertarian argument. We should condemn people who practise discrimination even as we insist on their legal right to do so. This is another way of saying I will disagree with what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it. Your freedom of speech. I will defend to the death even if I don't like what's coming out of your mouth. So condemn people who practise discrimination, but they have a legal right to discriminate. So society, according to Rand Paul, should condemn a school that segregates black and white students. But we should insist on the legal right of this school to do that. This is the problem with libertarianism. So I'm going to we're going to have to close. I'm going to take a few thoughts or questions if we have them. But I want to give a couple of thoughts before we close.

[01:17:04.040] - Tess

Just to add to this a little. I named a few, about seven, far right leaders today who have all travelled through the libertarian pipeline. One of them I named was Gavin McInnes. He founded the Proud Boys. He identifies as libertarian. I want to talk about their chairman, Enrique Tarrio. He was also director of Florida's branch of Latinos for Trump. He is Afrocuban by heritage. Enrico Tarrio, Chairman of the Proud Boys and I want to quote him, you might have seen him in the news this last couple of weeks. He was charged a while ago, that was also in the news, for stealing and burning a Black Lives Matter flag. This was January 4. Last year. Two days before January 6, he stole a Black Lives Matter flag from a historically black Church and burnt it. I want to remind you he's not white. Why does he feel the way he does in regard to his views on extremist groups and ideologies? Tarrio has been quoted as saying, I denounce white supremacy, I denounce antisemitism, I denounce racism, I denounce fascism, I denounce communism, and any other ism that is prejudiced towards people because of their race, religion, culture, or tone of skin.

[01:18:42.740] - Tess

In regard to his own ethnicity, he has said, I'm pretty Brown, I'm Cuban. There's nothing white supremacist about me. When he was charged with taking and burning this Black Lives Matter flag, he was convicted because the judge said his attempts to show remorse were not very convincing or genuine. But he apologized profusely in court and insists to this day he's sorry for having taken and burnt the Black Lives Matter flag, because he took and destroyed someone's private property and that conflicted with his

libertarian beliefs. So he's libertarian. You don't take someone's private property and burn them. That Church has the freedom to fly any flag they like. According to him, he thinks that a white Church should be able to fly a Confederate flag. So he should think that this historically black Church should be able to fly a Black Lives Matter flag. He felt angry. He stole it and he burnt it. He knows that was wrong, not because of equality, but because it conflicted with libertarianism. If you look him up and I suggest you do so, you'll get a better picture of what the Proud Boys stand for. And again, like 2014, you see the context of racism and nationalism.

[01:20:11.210] - Tess

But he is their chairman and none of the people under him have a problem with having a non white chairman, they are not the proud white people. They are the Proud Boys for a reason. And we need to see the significance of this in the context of Gamergate, in the context of a post christian world. I said last week that I would share an article and I didn't because I thought it would be better after we discussed libertarianism a little bit more. It's a long article. It's by Vox and it's titled The Internet is Full of Men Who Hate Feminism. Here's what they're like in person and someone. Emmett Ranson has gone and spoken to some of the men, not the main leaders, but some of the lower key men involved in Gamergate. It came out mid 2015 just in that post Gamergate context. So I'd like you to read this article and then I would like you to highlight the specific paragraphs that you think are most important. You're going to find the word libertarian encased in those paragraphs. So that is something I think would really help us if you did that over the next two weeks.

[01:21:35.910] - Tess

Rachel.

[01:21:38.690] - Speaker 9

Sorry. Elder Tess.

[01:21:39.950] - Rachel

What was the Cuban man's name? I couldn't quite make out the name. If you could spell it.

[01:21:47.030] - Tess

Enrique Tario. I've Typed it into the... I'll write it on the board. He's just one of a significant number. Many of them have renounced libertarianism to some degree, but the pipeline is still visible. And what they tend to renounce is not the social beliefs of libertarianism. When they turn from libertarianism to Republicanism, that's often more to do with economics. That's why you still see Republican leading people like Enrique Tario, who has now been charged for his involvement in January 6 supporting Trump. You find Rand Paul a Republican, but they have been heavily impacted by libertarian thinking, perhaps not in a lasting way by the economic model. I would probably send you to... I named him before. What was his name? The scary fellow. They agree that they all seem to agree. Sorry?

[01:23:08.710] - Moly

Bannon.

[01:23:10.150] - Tess

Steve Bannon. Steve Bannon will tell you what he thinks about the libertarian economic model. Lots of other people will. Former libertarians will. It doesn't work. But what they hold on to is the social beliefs of libertarianism. So I'll send that article out, if you could read that while we have two weeks away, and then we're going to continue to talk about the article. I think there's some key parts in that article that are significant. We'll come back to libertarianism and to the right wing and close that off. When we come back, is there any final thought or question? Probably not a question, but does anyone have anything they want to say? And then we'll close. I know I started speaking a little fast, but I hope that some of that makes sense. If it over the next couple of weeks stops making sense, please let me know and we might do what we did a few weeks ago when we come back together again and have more time for discussion, especially at the beginning, to make sure that what's behind me, makes sense. And we'll do that. Lynn, I've missed your voice tonight. Would you mind closing for us?

[01:25:04.370] - Lynn

Dear God in heaven, we come before you again. We give thanks and praise to you. We thank you for the privilege of being able to have these meetings. We thank you for the blessings. We ask that you will please help us to understand better. Please help us to be more clear on these important issues. And we pray for all those who perhaps have not been able to join us tonight and we ask that they'll be able to watch the recordings. We thank you again for all your blessings and we ask for a restful night's sleep as well as we continue to go through this Sabbath day. And again ask for a blessing on the meetings tomorrow as well. We pray all this in Jesus name. Amen.