

Ignorance and Theory of Ramsey

When you consider how the United States began in 1798, we have these two political factions. One of these political factions is supported by the evangelical right. The way that evangelical right is going to weaponize conspiracy theories to bring about their political agenda, including the enforcement of Protestant morality (just one aspect of which is Sunday laws), you can see that we already have conspiracy theories baked into our bread of today's topic.

As we discuss conspiracy theories, I know that for each one of us a different conspiracy theory can be much more attractive.

So, for some people it might not be vaccinations, it might be another conspiracy theory that can be really challenging for us. For many people it's 9/11, for many people it's climate change, and I want everyone just to be aware the reason that I can speak with a degree of knowledge about these conspiracy theories is because I used to believe all of them. You know, I am not quite as young as some people might tend to think, but I was first vaccinated last year, and certainly grew up not believing in climate change because of books that I read, and many other things: 9/11, Walter Veith I was neck deep in all of that, so we've all come from something and these conspiracy theories are a major part of conservative Adventism, and what I'm trying to demonstrate is why it's such a major part of Adventism and where these conspiracy theories, the most dangerous of them, can lead us to.

So, it's not that anyone is foolish for believing in conspiracy theories, otherwise, this whole movements in trouble because none of us would have any idea how to talk about anything but we've all come from Adventism, it's baked into Adventism. And we need to start thinking about why that is so.

I found a couple of articles that give us some of the reasons behind conspiracy theories. It's actually quite an interesting study about what composes these theories, why they become so easy to believe. It's not that people are crazy, that there's actually a type of methodology behind it that's quite captivating.

So, we have previously overlaid Ancient and Modern Israel. There's a quote in the great controversy 457.2 and it's just interesting in this great controversy quote all that Ellen White is saying is that the **history of ancient Israel is a striking illustration of the past experience of the Adventist body**, and then she goes into

how the Hebrews were brought out of Egypt, their disappointment, the Red Sea. they need to trust in the guiding hand of God, despite these disappointments.

“The history of ancient Israel is a striking illustration of the past experience of the Adventist body. God led His people in the advent movement, even as He led the children of Israel from Egypt. In the great disappointment their faith was tested as was that of the Hebrews at the Red Sea. Had they still trusted to the guiding hand that had been with them in their past experience, they would have seen the salvation of God. If all who had labored unitedly in the work in 1844, had received the third angel's message and proclaimed it in the power of the Holy Spirit, the Lord would have wrought mightily with their efforts. A flood of light would have been shed upon the world. Years ago the inhabitants of the earth would have been warned, the closing work completed, and Christ would have come for the redemption of His people.

It was not the will of God that Israel should wander forty years in the wilderness; He desired to lead them directly to the land of Canaan and establish them there, a holy, happy people. But “they could not enter in because of unbelief.” Hebrews 3:19. Because of their backsliding and apostasy they perished in the desert, and others were raised up to enter the Promised Land. In like manner, it was not the will of God that the coming of Christ should be so long delayed and His people should remain so many years in this world of sin and sorrow. But unbelief separated them from God. As they refused to do the work which He had appointed them, others were raised up to proclaim the message. In mercy to the world, Jesus delays His coming, that sinners may have an opportunity to hear the warning and find in Him a shelter before the wrath of God shall be poured out.”

All that she's doing is taking this history of ancient Israel as they come out of Egypt, and she says that's a striking illustration of the past experience of the Adventist body.

So, she's here, in the 1888 history, writing the Great Controversy, and she's saying that this coming out of Egypt is a striking illustration of Adventists past experience. She is going back to this Millerite time, the disappointment, the coming out of apostate Protestantism. It's just a neat quote to show her also recognize this compare and contrast. And then in this great controversy quote again written in this 1888 history she says “if all who had labored unitedly in the work in 1844 had received the third angel's message and proclaimed it in the power of the Holy Spirit the Lord would have wrought mightily with their efforts.

A flood of light would have been shed upon the world years before 1888 the inhabitants of the earth would have been warned, the closing work completed, and Christ would have come for the redemption of his people.”

So, this is another quote to reinforce what we've been saying. The Christ could have, should have returned prior to the 1888 history. So, as we compared and contrasted, we saw ancient Israel with modern Israel you had darkness, captivity, and a loss of the Sabbath in the captivity, in Egypt in those 400 years you had the exact same experience in the 1260 years: the loss of the Sabbath, the darkness, the captivity. Ancient Israel is brought out of Egypt:

- a deliverer Moses leads them out → Miller led out a denominated people
- you had ancient Israel led out of pagan nations → modern Israel was let out of Protestant churches.

This is showing how there is both a compare, but there's also the contrast. The contrast is now you have a separation of church and state: Ancient Israel out of pagan nations, modern Israel out of Protestant churches. This is all part of all-important contrast.


After they leave Egypt, after 1844 the Sabbath is reinstated. God is gentle with how he leads us we accept one truth after another: you see that in this movement, you see that back then. But in this time period he says it's time for them to be required to keep the seventh-day Sabbath, and then you have the Prophet given: Moses in Ancient Israel wrote their law, and here in Modern Israel we have Ellen White who becomes a prophet for modern Israel.

You have a going back into the condition of Egypt that Apis bull experienced the asking for a king. This apostasy, this idolatry that they should have left behind in Egypt. In 1850 we also have the Laodicean condition, this losing of message of time etc. It was this condition of Protestantism we were meant to leave behind, this experience in Babylon they could have come out of Babylon ready to do the work. 1888 – same thing work should have could have been completed but again it was a failure on the part of God's people.

The final history, the Omega history, Rome and the history of the 144K, and this is the history of success. When ancient Israel in whatever damaged fashion, however much they weren't equipped as a nation to take part in that work the work was completed by remnant.

So, I wanted to ask, what three things did God's people of ancient Israel have wrong in this history?

What they had wrong which caused them to reject Christ is that they were wrong about the king, the kingdom, and the external events. So, they were wrong about the king, they were wrong about the kingdom, but they're also wrong about the external events. The reason they were wrong about the external events is you can't misunderstand the nature of the kingdom, and then have a correct understanding of the external events that relate to that Kingdom. So, they expected the overthrow of Rome, what they didn't expect is the destruction of Jerusalem. They don't understand the events that relate to ancient Israel they also don't understand the events that relate to the end of the glorious land. So, they misunderstand the experience of ancient Israel, they also misunderstand the events relating to the glorious land, and the glorious land is the United States.



So, we, Adventism, are in the same condition as ancient Israel. There're three areas of error don't understand the nature of the King don't understand the nature of the Kingdom and also the external events there relate to modern Israel, God's final denominated people, seventh-day Adventism.

They also don't understand correctly the external events that relate to the glorious land and what's going to happen to the glorious land which is today the United States of America. So, we have those two parts because we have to separate the glorious land because seventh-day Adventism is not a theocracy. It's just part of that contrast. So that's three areas that ancient Israel was wrong and that is also directly relates to the mistakes modern Israel is going through.

Then we spoke about the cure. **The cure for these wrongs was parable teaching, it was Christ's Parables.** We compared and contrasted ancient with modern. But we can also compare and contrast our Alpha and Omega histories – our beginning will teach us of our end. So that's why we spent so much time on 1798. You have this split within Protestantism that all particularly became evident when you have this time period of revival. So, the first Great Awakening we're beginning the Second Great Awakening and there's a split between liberal and conservative, it's been split particularly about how they relate to external events how they both view the American Revolution, the forming of the Republic, the nature of the Constitution, America as a secular or a Christian nation, the French Revolution etc.

Depending on how they view external events would split Protestantism into these two branches: liberal and conservative. I don't want to discuss the liberal branch too much because I don't think they have that much to teach us. It's the conservative branch that we can trace through this history. I want to be specific, we talk about the Pharisees, how they were into reforms, all of that. But there's a danger that people misunderstand the terms “liberal” and “conservative”. I want to be more specific today when I'm talking about liberal and conservative. If you were to look at the United States right now, and you were to go to two news sources Fox News and MSNBC. If you were to look at those two news sources Fox MSNBC, and you were to look at their female hosts, which one looks more modest? – MSNBC, the liberal branch. If you were to go and watch Rachel Maddow, she may have short hair, but she looks less provocative than the bleached blonde and short skirt FOX news female hosts. So, if you're going to make this about reforms, then it's really going to start to take us away from what I've meant from the very beginning about liberal and conservative. I'm talking about social liberalism and social conservatism. You'll find lesbian Rachel Maddow presenting for MSNBC, and she's in a neat suit doesn't have to show much skin, doesn't have to wear a lot of makeup, doesn't have to dye her hair it's FOX News that has to create that image. Even when you do see on both sides, at

the very least, they might be equally into those things: they're wearing makeup, the men are wearing makeup on Fox and on MSNBC. When I'm talking about liberal and conservative, I'm specifically talking about socially liberal and conservative. Social issues.

So, this socially conservative branch of Protestantism has some things that particularly characterized them. In 1798 and then in 1799 there were three widely publicized sermons by the Reverend Jedidiah Morse disclosing a dark conspiracy, that dark conspiracy involving both domestic critics of the John Adams presidential administration and a mysterious order of European anarchists known as the **Bavarian illuminati** by framing his suspicions in the form of a jeremiad. Jeremiad is like the book of Jeremiah. it's a long woeful, bitter lament about society's ills and immoralities, because he has framed his sermons in that way what Jedediah was, he portrayed this Illuminati conspiracy as a divine test for the United States. As a result, the conspiracy provided a rhetorical justification for the condemnation of domestic political dissent on moral grounds. So, what he is doing is finding the condemnation of any dissent against the John Adams administration. It's exactly what we see happening in Trump's America today: you can't speak against Trump's America.

So, this characterizes them [the conservative branch in 1798] – the deep state. and when I say “deep state” it's not like today, they're saying it's all those Democrats, it's the Democrats and it's also disloyal Republicans and there are different words for those within the Republican Party. But it [deep state] crosses party lines. it's a deep state that's particularly one side. but is also everyone within one's own party that is not loyal. So, we discussed the other side, the other political party was Thomas Jefferson. But then you also had Hamilton. Hamilton is in the same political party as John Adams, but he is not loyal to John Adams. So, both men were brought into this conspiracy theory that crossed party lines. That's what makes it this evil deep state. It doesn't matter what party you belong to, they're part of the Illuminati, and they all have a satanic agenda. Again, this idea that this deep state is controlled by Satan also characterized by their beliefs that America was formed as a Christian nation, built on Christian moral principles, the combination of church and state. They believe in combination of church and state even though they might phrase it differently. One of Trump's favorite pastor Ralph Drollinger serves in his administration, he says: “the institutional separation of church and state does not imply an influential separation of church and state”. So, is saying the separation of church and state just means that they are

institutionally separated: church and state; but that does not imply **influential** separation, **the church should influence the state**. So, they use this logic to justify the fact that they say “no, we believe in separation of church and state, but they're referring to an institutional separation, they believe in an influential union. That is what Jedediah Morse believed in this combination of church and state, and **it all stems from a literal-to-literal interpretation of Bible teaching**. So, literal-to-literal in ancient Israel theocracy, literal-to-literal in modern Israel theocracy.

- Ancient Israel: the morality of the nation defined its success as a political nation – you couldn't break the Sabbath in ancient Israel without the law punishing you.
- Modern Israel: as they see the United States as glorious land you shouldn't be able to break Sunday without the law punishing you.
- there should be no infidelity, no immorality, no homosexuality, nothing that they see as an attack on Christian values.

So, this is why Jedediah Morse was saying in 1798 that Christian morality needed to be enforced by law.

So, you find that at the very beginning, and remember the United States, if we follow our rules of parable teaching it will end the way it began.

So, it believes in the enforcement of morality, literal political will teach you that.

- They believe in slavery; literal too literal we'll teach you that.
- They believe in Sunday laws; literal too literal we'll teach you that.

So, it's been this one thread, this conservative thread, socially conservative Protestantism that's gone through this whole period of the last two hundred three hundred years from the forming of America with this mindset about this literal-to-literal interpretation. And that's why they keep coming back to these same things.

As we come to our time period, we could discuss segregation, and we've done that: how they responded to the civil rights movement because if you go to ancient Israel you have a separation of the races it's put in the law so on each point they're using this same methodology.

So, when we overlaid the beginning of modern Israel in the end of modern Israel we saw that it was all framed around recent events: in beginning of modern Israel you had the abolishing of the Jesuits in 1773, the American Revolution, Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and forming of a republic, the French Revolution, the ending of papal power in 1798. All these external events are creating an interest in Protestantism about Daniel and Revelation.

1989 in the lead-up to our time of the end you had the same thing: there was the cold war, the revolutions in Latin America, the Iran Revolution, the Afghanistan war, Israel which had been restored, and in 1967 had regained control of Jerusalem. We discussed those external events and how that created an interest in Protestantism of the books of Daniel and Revelation in the few decades leading up to 1989, particularly the last that 20-year time period.

We quoted at length from an article *the Atlantic*. So, I just want to refer us back to a couple of those references: “after the rapture a seven-year period of tribulation would fall on those left behind”, so there's some obvious things we disagree with that Adventism and Protestantism would disagree over, the rapture is one of them. “But they believe that that time period would begin with the appearance of an Antichrist as leader of a ten-nation confederation. He will seem to be a man of peace and will side with Israel when it is threatened by northern coalition which is now generally expected to be led by Russia, include eastern Germany, the Arabs, and Iran. Realization that the raptured Saints, the faithful who were caught up had been prudent to believe in Jesus will cause 144,000 Jews and a multitude of Gentiles to accept him as the Savior and Messiah these converts together with two outstanding prophets possibly Moses and Elijah brought back to life will win others to Christ. Unfortunately, these new Christians will be marked for persecution by the Antichrist who by this time will have begun to show his true colors.” He seems very benevolent at the beginning. “The Antichrist will seek total control over humanity by requiring that every person wear a mark or a number, probably 666, the designated mark of the beast in order to buy or sell. Those who refused to accept this mark of the beast will be slain or will risk starvation because they cannot buy or sell. Those who accept it will burn in hell. At about this point the Antichrist will be joined by the false prophet, a religious leader associated with Babylon, a city called the mother of harlots, and often identified in prophetic circles as the Pope of Rome.”

We took this and we went on to discuss Mary Stewart Relfe, who began writing in 1980. Two of her most famous writings a book “When your money fails” another book “the 666 system” I don't think they're any longer in print. I tried to find one of them on Amazon and it was well over a thousand dollars. I'm guessing there might be collectors now. But in this article from 1982 her logic is explained. She had come up to speak at the podium, and she'd have dozens of documents and photographs to back her claims. She would show you all these different companies from all over the world, from Caterpillar tractors made in the U.S. to shirts made in communist China, to things made in Germany, all they had 666 on their product code. Then she'll go to other companies and show in their computer programs they'll have 666 as a prefix. She'll take you to documents by the World Bank, the IRS Medicaid, Selective Service, she'll show you Anwar Sadat, then the president of Egypt reopening the Suez Canal, the commercial navigation and his worship with 666 allegedly emblazoned across its bow. President Carter he had tanks built that was stamped with 666 – not a surprise they didn't like President Carter (he was socially liberal), as were metric rulers widely distributed in the US during 1979. So she's just going to take all of these different examples and what she's saying is “can you see all of these things? can they really be a coincidence?” she's saying that they're evidence for a satanic deep state, a deep state led by Satan, which is why you would have the use of the 666. And all of these companies they're part of this secret society, that in the background they're all linked, and you only know they're linked by seeing these secret subtle messages that they'll send out to each other to say, “we're part of this system, we're part of this deep state”. I want us to think about the methodology behind these types of conclusions that Mary Stewart Relfe was coming to.

And I want to look at this really two different ways to different parts of this methodology and this first one I really don't want to have misunderstood the first one is ignorance.

Ignorance is a major part of this methodology that's being used. We're all ignorant about something. Ignorance is just it's impossible to avoid. In fact, we are actually ignorant about most things. I think that the more readily we can acknowledge that, the easier it gets to not see this as actually something ugly. We are ignorant about many things. I want to use an example: Ben Carson most I think most of us know who Ben Carson is. He is the Adventist who became part of Trump's administration. He is a seventh-day Adventists, he is a brilliant neurosurgeon, and then he joined Trump's administration in charge of housing in

the United States. Ben Carson is brilliant. As a brain surgeon. But what then he began to believe was that he had the answer to solve the economic problems and the deficit of the United States.

So, it's brilliant as a brain surgeon. I read his books well years ago, and in his books he made the argument that if only economists and politicians would listen to him, he was adamant he could fix the entire economy of the United States. He had this brilliant plan. So, you'd have to believe that every other economist everyone who studied for decades, who's part of that system who knows how the economy operates, that somehow that he has expertise that they don't have. Now that he is part of the Trump administration you don't see him solving the economy. Even now no one's listening to him, and there's no evidence that he's now even promoting his views, that were apparently the answer to fix the entire economy of the United States.

So, we're all ignorant about something: ben Carson is brilliant as a neurosurgeon, ignorant about the American economy. And if he could acknowledge that it would save a great deal of people a lot of pain. He is a brilliant neurosurgeon, how is he handling the housing crisis in the United States? – very very badly. Very poorly.

So, we're all ignorant about something, even if we're brilliant in particular areas. And when we can acknowledge that it can solve a lot of problems. I believe that this is part of the problem with Walter Veith. He might be brilliant in areas of science, but that intelligence, that knowledge does not correlate to another area, to another territory, for example, nothing that he understands about the making up of an atom is going to help him better understand that the cause and need for the United Nations. And many brilliant people create problems in the world when they believe that they are equipped to give their expert advice in areas that are outside of their field of expertise. I want to give some examples of how ignorance impacts conspiracy theories.

So, I watched a documentary I've got to talk about myself when I do this because these are things I used to believe in, so I'm going to talk about the death of Princess Diana. I watched a documentary about her death, and it was made by conspiracy theorists. They were arguing that she was murdered, that her death was intentional, and I watched that documentary and I thought it makes sense to me. What they're saying makes sense. So, I believed that she was murdered I want to give you one of the reasons they gave for their conclusion: Princess Diana

was in a car accident, and ambulance attended the scene, they picked her up from the accident zone, they had to take her three miles to a hospital. They had three miles to travel to take her from where she was critically injured in that accident to get her to hospital, and these three miles took some 1.1 hours so it took them over an hour in an ambulance with flashing lights with no traffic to travel three miles. The argument that they make in this documentary is “why is it?” and if you're like me and you've listened to Walter Veith, I hear him say “why is it?” That's the first thing they're going to take you to. They will take you to this thing that's really hard to explain, and then say “why is it that it took 1.1 hours in an ambulance with flashing lights, and no traffic to travel three miles?” the next phrase you'll hear “could it be...?” That's going to be phrased as a question. It is really hard to get Walter Veith to actually say anything concrete, because he'll phrase it as a question, he'll lead you to the conclusion that he wants to lead you to but he won't tell you that conclusion. It has to be phrased as a question. Why is it that Princess Diana took 1.1 hours to travel three miles to a hospital when she's dying? Could it be that there was a plot deep state plot to bring about her death to allow her to die?

It looks like a really neat conclusion, I don't have to say there was a deep state plot, people wanted to kill her, this was intentional. Don't have to say anything like that, and you won't hear other people say anything like that. Walter Veith will very rarely say something like that. It has to say “why is it?” bring a question to your mind and it seems strange, that seems like it's something you don't understand, and then just ask “could it be?”

So, I watched this documentary they made this argument. But then later I found out this other piece of information: the medical system in the United States works very different to the medical system in France. In the United States the way their ambulances operate when they attend an accident is if I had an accident here and I was thirty minutes from a hospital, that the way they operate in the United States is they get an ambulance here, they put me in that ambulance and then they're going to get me to a hospital as fast as they can. Their number one objective is to get me to hospital as fast as they can.

They don't run by that system in France. There are two different ways to operate an ambulance: “Scoop and Run” like in the U.S. and “Stay and Play” like in France.

So, in the United States its scoop and run, get in an ambulance and rush you to hospital. In France their ambulance is equipped that if you are dying the objective is not to get you to hospital, the objective is to treat you in the ambulance that means pulling over, that means getting all the medical staff in the back of an ambulance putting in whatever drips they need to put in, doing whatever they need to do, and the back of that ambulance becomes the hospital bed in the emergency room. So, it's a difference between how the medical system operates in the United States and in many other countries compared to how they operate in France and because this is how ambulances operate in France in France it's completely normal that it would take 1.1 hours to travel three miles when they're treating her in the back of the ambulance, which would require them to go slow or to pull over.

So, again this is something that you can say “why is it...? could it be..?” Someone who doesn't know this information, who's ignorant on the medical system like I was in some degree would see this evidence of a conspiracy but when you have information you see that this could it be is actually not sustained by any type of fact.

Another one: climate change. You'll see this argument made if I have a glass of water and in this glass I put ice cubes, and then I put some water in this cup. let's say I put the water to here ice is water that as it has cooled it actually solidifies but it also expands so ice has more of a circumference takes up more space than water so as this ice melted in my cup even though some of it is showing you could calculate that the water level if all of this ice melted would actually go down, not up. So, if this ice melted the water level goes down because this ice, as it warms and it shrinks, is going to take up less space. People use this argument to say that if the polar icecaps are melting then all of our ice, which is expanded water, is going to make the ocean go down, because that ice is water that has expanded, and even though some of it is showing, a great deal of it is underwater.

So, when we talk about rising sea levels people will argue you can't have rising sea levels. In fact, if all of the ice melted on those ice caps the water level is going to go down you should have lowering sea levels, not rising sea levels. So, again I heard that argument actually from a scientist and it seemed logical.

so I did not believe in climate change until I heard just one sentence that made my model go, and that was by another scientist who said “isn't one of the polar icecaps on land?” So, most of this world's ice much of it is sitting on top of a

landmass, and now we're in trouble. You can see that even though you have some ice that would melt like these icebergs as they melted and the sea level would go down, that would be counteracted and then eclipsed by the amount of ice that is actually sitting on top of the landmass.



So, again you could go to this (water+ice in a glass of water model) and say why is it that scientists aren't telling you about the fact that the ice going down, would shrink water levels? And you'll see on YouTube conspiracy theorists take a glass of water and demonstrate how sea levels should shrink. You could say "why is it they won't tell you that ice is expanded water? Could it be that there's some type of conspiracy theory within the scientific establishment to bring about a political agenda?"

This is just one example of an argument that is based on ignorance and uses people's ignorance against them. I don't want people to become offended when I

say ignorance, it's just a fact that all of us are ignorant about some things, if not most things. That's why we research and look for answers. The other reason behind these conspiracy theories is actually a mathematical theory. Again, I'm more ignorant about mathematics than I would like, so I'm not going to go into all the explanations of this theory, but I will have some links to a discussion about it placed on the Media Broadcast. This one is from a news article by Science Alert called TED education talk titled "The origin of countless conspiracy theories": "this mathematical principle makes us believe in crazy conspiracy theories. There's no denying that humans are incredible creatures, putting a rover on Mars, detecting gravitational waves, finding the Higgs boson, but then there's one peculiar behavior persists and that is our belief in the strangest conspiracy theories. What is even stranger than us needing anything anything to believe in, is that we pretty much can't avoid it. We humans love to find order in chaos," and I believe that God made us that way, we're designed to see patterns, that's why when we look up at the clouds we start wanting to know what shape they're making, and what they look like, "humans love to find order in chaos, and from trying to find order in chaos we get Helmand Melville, the soothsayer, the faked moon landing, climate change denial, as this video will point out that it links to this TED ed talk if you got the entire text of Herman Melville's Moby Dick and arranged the entire text of that book into a rectangle, you'll find within that brought together letters, as you squished it into a rectangle, you'll find the prediction about the Martin Luther King assassination, and the death of Princess Diana. Weird right? Well, not really. Because in a world of random chaos, where humans rely on order and our brains will do whatever it takes to find that order, whether it's finding word patterns in a mass of letters or familiar shapes in the constellations above us" we're built to do that, we're built to try and find order in chaos, this is all explained by mathematical principle called Ramsey theory. It's named after a British mathematician and philosopher Frank P Ramsey. Ramsey theory states that given enough elements in a set or structure some particular interesting pattern among them is guaranteed to emerge." So, he shows how even just with a small group you will almost inevitably find some pattern. one example they usually give to demonstrate this is if you have some people at a party "imagine you're in a party with six other guests. Without knowing anything at all about these people it's a mathematical inevitability that some group of three of those people either all know each other, or at this party have never met before. Based on the number of possibilities that can be applied to the group. But the mathematical equation takes to figure this out with just six people gets out of

control the moment you start adding more and more people in. Because the number of possibilities becomes overwhelming even for as few as 40 or 50 people. Seriously, if you wanted to use this equation to find a group of five people in a party of 48, who either all know each other or have never met, you'd end up with more possibilities than there are atoms in the universe. That's how prone we are to seeing the formation of patterns even within a small group. It's a mathematical inevitability that the sky's stars in our sky are arranged in familiar shapes and the letters in an oval appear to conceal a prophecy, and we humans have been conditioned to find them. But just as a math makes conspiracy theories an inevitability, so too does it render even the most persistent ones impossible. You can read more about it but let's just say that the suppression of a cancer cure would have been leaked by someone inside Big Pharma in just 3.2 years.”

So, mathematically they can show you how prone and easy it is for us to locate conspiracy theories, because in any even a small group set of data, you are inevitably going to find patterns. And if you have a nice big group of data let's say dates and you're going to expand that group of data on dates to include all types of numbering systems and a dozen different calendars it doesn't become so strange to suddenly decide that there's going to be a nuclear attack on Nashville on July 18, because you've taken a huge set of data and with no rules, with no principles of parable teaching, just looks for an abstract pattern that has no meaning behind it. This is the type of methodology that's being used. It was used by Mary Stewart Relfe back in the 1980s, it wasn't new, it was used in 1798 by Jedidiah Morse, it continues through Protestantism, it continues through Adventism, it continues through Walter Veith, it continues through those who left this movement and have held on to their conspiracy theories, and it is now their dominant methodology. So that is what has separated us.

So, all of these also comes back to our discussion on vaccines. A physicist calculated the probability that for widely believed conspiracy theories could have lasted this long without being uncovered and mathematically speaking is not looking good for moon-landing deniers, or anti-vaxxers the 2016 study revealed that for an old-fashioned cover-up to stay under wraps for ten years fewer than 1,000 people would need to be involved to remain secret for a century the number of people aware would need to be below 125 considering that the most popular conspiracy theories would realistically involve thousands of people, the odds aren't great. My results suggest that any conspiracy with over a few hundred people rapidly collapses and big science conspiracies would not be sustainable.”

When we start talking about vaccines, we're using the same thing.

“why is it?”: Correlation =?= Causation

So, I'm going to have posted in the media broadcast an article by the Atlantic that's titled “Correlation, Causation and Vaccination.” Why is it that people can see little children develop these illnesses like autism as a result of vaccination? Usually what we are doing is this: Correlation=Causation. And that is not a good principle to work of. I know many children who are healthy who were shown no signs until three years old and they start having seizures, children reach a developmental age, where those things actually start to be demonstrated, and because parents are looking for a reason “why did my child just have a seizure?” they're going to start looking for a cause.

So, some parents will say “well she fell and hit her head, and then the next week she said she had a seizure, and while it may seem that the fall caused the seizure there's no evidence for that.

The fact that these two things occurred within a similar set of time does not equal causation, it doesn't mean that one cause to the other, but whenever you have something traumatic occur and there can be a great deal of a painful emotion in this argument, it is because people are trying to find an answer. There's something they don't understand. So, they're going to go back to this “why is it..?” argument and go “correlation = causation”

I want us to have a little look at just one quote of Walter Veith. There are two parts of what can build a conspiracy theory first ignorance:

1. “why is it? could it be?”
2. The Ramsey theory, the fact that you are going to find patterns you're going to find a 666 in a random group of numbers, you just will if that group of numbers even in a small sack group of numbers that the chances are it is inevitable.

There will be some type of pattern depending on the size of the group highly likely that pattern will include a 666 we used two examples of how ignorance is built into these conspiracy theories the death of Princess Diana just basic ignorance about different medical systems across the world ignorance about our climate change, and the melting polar ice caps, and rising sea levels, and then we briefly looked at Ramsey. There's just one quote by Walter Veith really I want us

to take apart, and see how we have both ignorance and misunderstanding of the Ramsey theory built into this statement. Because it was the first thing I came across in his video, but it gives an example of his whole mindset and I know that this is an example of his whole mindset because he still continues to promote the total onslaught series: he says, "look at some false flags and distractions, the media tells us who is in control, and who is the troublemaker, who is the media telling you the troublemaker is? saying a terrorist in the Middle East." so he's framing this around terrorism, 9/11, who has ever been to the Middle East? who has ever seen those countries? who has ever seen those countries who has ever traveled through Syria? I traveled through Syria from the south to the north, and from the north to the south before it was destroyed. So, before the Civil War and before it was destroyed I thought it was already destroyed it was like going back into the Middle Ages: people on donkeys riding around with long beards, (speaking now with sarcasm) they were so frightening, I thought the whole world would quake in fear just looking at them. Ridiculous, and if you look at their society and how they live there must be something else that must be creating that false flag, so what is he going to do? He's going to take you to come and look at Syria, now he's going to take you at least thousands of kilometers away from where the actual issues were, they weren't in Syria they were in Saudi Arabia, and Pakistan and Afghanistan not in Syria. Syria is Shia.

So, he's also going to take you far away from the actual scene of where terrorism was fomented. But what is he doing? he's saying "why is it that when you go to Syria, you see people on donkeys, riding around with long beards who don't look fearful. How come you see that when you go to Syria and you're not seeing these terrorists that media is telling you exist that. So, it's the "why is it?" and now he's got to introduce you "could it be?" "could it be that these Syrian terrorists are a false flag for some someone else, that is controlling behind the scenes, and was behind 9/11

We showed previously that Iran is Shia, Saudi Arabia is Sunni. They are both "Church+State" models. We used a parable example as if she was Catholic, and Saudi Arabia, Sunni was Protestant. the reason we labeled one Catholic one Protestant is because one believes in taking care of sacred sites and images, essentially the Sunnis see the Shia as idolaters, the same way a Protestant would look at an image of Mary and all that Catholic regalia and call it idolatry. What you have is two church+state governments where the church controls the state.

We showed how that fomented in the 1979 to 89 Afghanistan war, when in Afghanistan you had it bordering Pakistan, and how Saudi Arabia said “they're radical clerics to create hundreds of religious schools, to export Wahhabism. It's a radical sect of Sunnism, that they have made go mainstream through these different efforts, and it's all to give legitimacy to their right to rule the throne and the sacred Muslim sites of Islam: Mecca and Medina that exist in Saudi Arabia.

So to give themselves legitimacy they have to export their sect of Islam, they saw their opportunity in the Afghanistan war and it spread through Pakistan, and that is what became in Pakistan in one town became like the birthplace of all of this. You had the father of jihad the founder of jihad call over Osama bin Laden and they became the two co-creators of al-Qaeda. The same town, same time period, the men that became the early founders of Isis, before they called that Isis. Those terrorist organizations springing up as his radical version of Islam was particularly fomented by primarily Saudi Arabia. Iran have their own. They have Hezbollah, that is essentially a Shiite radical terrorist organization. But you would never see Hezbollah. If you're to put Hezbollah and Isis in one room, they would kill each other, literally. They are not in agreement, because one is Shia, and one is Sunni. and it's this Sunni branch that created al Qaeda, led to Isis. That's why you find the vast majority of the terrorists at 9/11 was Saudi Arabian. It's come out of here, and Walter Veith has done? He said, “I went to Syria, I traveled around, and stared at the people, and they didn't look scary, they didn't look like terrorists that would have hit at 9/11.

1. Wrong country.
2. Shia not Sunni
3. and last of all I don't want to get into who he is as a person, this isn't a comment about him, this is a comment about this statement. This statement is racist. It's racist regarding how it sees what the Middle East is capable of, how much of modern Western society we owe to the Middle East right down to the mathematics, we were discussing before how much do we owe to the Asian regions, what did they give us.

So, I don't mean to comment on the man. The statement is racist, essentially saying they wouldn't be capable of terrorism.

His whole methodology is particularly based on ignorance and again he uses questions “why is it..?” that I went to Syria and I didn't see people who looked scary, and now he's going to bring in the “could it be” and again, he doesn't just

use questions, he also uses sarcasm, and it's so hard when someone teaches with questions and then with sarcasm to actually get into the intent of what their point is. So, he is continuing with the sarcasm he says: "No, it's the Zionists that are in control. The bankers, the money men, the Rothschilds at all of these, they're in control. He is going to quote from the Jewish encyclopedia that describes the Rothschild family as "the guardians of the papal treasure". Rothschild is a German word meaning red shield, who were the ones who wore red shields in war? – the Roman army. This is the Roman army, these are the front Jews, they are papal Jews, papal people in disguise where is Rome leading us to.

So, he is saying that the Jews are in control. He just wants to get out of it by saying they're not your average Jews, there's a papal Jews. These are Zionists and Jews who are being controlled by the Pope.

So, he is still spreading this anti-Semitic message that is still racist, but he can back out of that by saying these are that it's not their fault, these Jews are controlled by others behind the scenes, and he is giving evidence for it Rothschild is a German word meaning red shield. "why is it that their name means red shield? and if you look over here who wore red shield in war the Roman army this is the Roman army so he's going to take you from a why is it - could've bit could it be - a conspiracy theory that's actually completely illogical. I'm going to quote from Spectrum magazine article on Walter Veith: is it really just a coincidence that Veith is the Germanized name for Vitus, who was one of the fourteen holy helpers of the Roman Catholic Church, and who also happens to be the patron saint of actors? So, you if I was to use Veith's methodology I would say "why is it his name was one of fourteen holy helpers of the Roman Catholic Church, and who also happens to be the patron saint of actors? Could it be that he's an actor controlled by the Pope of Rome as one of their fourteen holy helpers? No, it is just a coincidence. He is not an actor acting on behalf of the Roman Catholic Church, but if you're to use his methodology that's the type of conclusion you would have to come to.

He says the Zionists are in control, the bankers, the money men, the Rothschilds. He claims to not believe that, but what he's saying is that they are in control. But behind the Rothschilds, the bankers, and the Zionists is the Pope. And what do they all have in common? Zionist refers to Jews, the Rothschilds were a Jewish family, bankers were associated with Jews. This is all the Jews. So, this is all the Jews that he's referring to, and he says they are front Jews, they are papal

Jews, the Rothschilds were the Roman army. And he's going to take you to a quote to prove that. He takes you to the Jewish encyclopedia that describes the Rothschilds as the guardians of the papal treasure.

I want us to actually look into the Rothschilds. He is quoting from with the 1906 Jewish encyclopedia. So, just so we know that's a 114 ago that they were described as "the guardians of the papal treasure", and this video was from 2018. So, it's not going back even a decade or so. This is recent and he takes into no account the fact that this Jewish encyclopedia is well over a hundred years old. So, the Rothschilds were a wealthy banking Jewish family in the 1800s. Some of their descendants spread around the globe, and many are wealthy, but just to put that in context today, the Rothschild in 2020 the richest Rothschild alive today is worth 1.7 billion dollars. This is Benjamin Rothschild. This is today in 2020 Benjamin Rothschild. He is worth 1.7 billion dollars as documented by Forbes wealthiest people alive. That may sound significant and impressive, but that is number 1121 in the list of wealthiest people alive. So, the wealthiest Rothschild alive today is the 1121 richest person on Earth. When you consider that this is supposed to be the wealthy family that controls the elite behind the scenes in a satanic deep state, that starts to sound crazy. The wealthiest the 1120 first richest person alive. The closest thing to any Rothschild family business that relates to the Rothschilds as a family, is the Rothschilds Group investment banking company, whose annual profit is 70 million dollars. The largest company in the world Walmart its annual profits of 120 billion dollars annually is almost two thousand times as much. So, when you talk about the money the Rothschilds have today, we're not talking about of any type of scale like what you would have seen back 150 years ago. Another point – central banks are state institutions and have nothing to do with any Rothschilds. Central banks are run by States, not by billionaires. So, where did these conspiracy theories about the Rothschilds come from the Rothschilds family were Jewish it is an aspect of anti-Semitism that believe that Jews are powerful behind-the-scenes manipulators of global events.

So, what happened is if you were to go back hundreds of years you would see that anti-Semitism was everywhere. Jews were only allowed to live in ghettos. The Jews were forbidden in some places from owning any property. The Jewish people are forbidden from owning any property, they're segregated and forced to live in ghettos. The Christians because of their belief

in certain passages of Scripture believe that they cannot lend any money, they don't believe that that it's right for a Christian to lend money to anyone because they believe that anti-biblical. So, Christians don't become active in the banking system because of their Christian beliefs about lending money the Jews don't hold to that same belief they don't read scripture and say that money should not be lent. so, you have a society which is completely anti-Semitic, where the Jews are segregated, they're not allowed to own property. Thus, they're forced to live in ghettos, but where they're also needed and they're needed for the financial system to work, because Christians cannot loan money to each other they don't believe in lending back then. But the Jews do, so if a Christian needs to borrow money where do you go? you can only go to a Jew. So, the Jews became very prevalent in the banking system. It's not because they had some deep agenda. It was because the only it was one of the few things, they could do to earn a livelihood and it was because of that anti-Semitism that segregated them while also the Christians needed them to finance their businesses. so you had was really that the prevalence of Jews within banking was built because of that system that difference in religious belief that related to lending also Jews recognized that as they lived in anti-Semitic environments as they were persecuted that the more highly educated their children were the more their children were likely to hold onto their Jewish faith so they became very conscious of education and they would do everything they could to get their children good education. So, out of this desire to keep the Jewish faith alive and to spread it from generation to generation you have two things emerge: first of all, they became very highly educated despite the anti-Semitism, and second of all they became very prevalent in the banking system this despite the anti-Semitism. Because of the different beliefs in money lending. So, it is true that Jews were both wealthy, highly educated in some areas, the ones that weren't still stuck in the ghettos in the system, and they were also prevalent in the banking system. That's something that is logical, where it goes is somewhere illogical the Rothschilds were just one of those families, they lived in the ghettos they became involved in money lending because only the Jews could, and they built themselves up into the banking world, and they did become extremely wealthy. I think I referred to a conspiracy theory back when I read it was actually it's a Russian led conspiracy theory Journal that spoke about the Rothschilds and the Jews or the Jews or Zionists as being behind the 9/11 attacks. It's the exact same thing Walter White is all he's talking about terrorism, 9/11, and then Zionists and the

Catholic Church, and he's really wrapping it all into quite a tight bundle. So, this created anti-Semitism right back from around the late 1800s it was particularly prevalent in the Catholic Church when we've done the studies on the counterfeit of modern Israel, where we went back and looked at modern Babylon, and we saw Hitler's Pope, the way the Catholic Church responded to World War II was as Satan was trying to resurrect this modern Babylon, this Caliphate of modern Israel. We saw that within the Catholic Church just generally through the society this anti-Semitism was very prevalent, and because of this anti-Semitism you have Jews become involved in revolutions. So, if you're a persecuted minority and you're oppressed for a great length of time what's going to happen? – when there's a revolution are you going to join that revolution? – Yes. You can see that in America right now, you can see that in the French Revolution. And oppressed society that has been subjugated for so long will react by forming part of this revolution. So, when you had the Russian Revolution were Jews involved in it? – yes there were Jews that were part of the Russian Revolution. The cause is a natural one they were oppressed and persecuted under the Tsar, but what Hitler does is he particularly takes this idea about the Jews as being wealthy, as being involved in the banking system, as being involved in in the rise of communism, and the Russian Revolution and it creates an entire conspiracy theory around the Zionists. And this is what is going to develop into the Holocaust. He blamed the Jews for the loss of Germany in World War I – it was a Zionist deep state; he blames the Jews for the Russian Revolution, and behind all of these is anti-Semitism. It was also right within the Catholic Church, really through most of society it was quite acceptable for people back then to hold on to this conspiracy theories and anti-Semitism. So, you have something that's actually quite logical: Jews involved in the Russian Revolution not just Jews, but they were there, they were there because they were persecuted under the Tsar, and they wanted freedom like anyone else. So, the Rothschilds became quite wealthy in the early 1800s as they worked within the money lending system, their business continued to grow, and then particularly when it comes to the Napoleonic wars the started lending money to different states in the Napoleonic Wars. Again, they can lend, Christians can't.

“As William I, Elector of Hesse refused to join the French supporting Confederation of the Rhine at its formation in 1806, he is threatened by Napoleon. In Frankfurt, he asks his agent Mayer Amschel Rothschild to convey

bonds worth £600,000 he has received from Britain to subsidize his army to safety in England.”

So, the Rothschilds were working between William I and Napoleon and they were lending money in those Wars.

“Rothschild however uses the money for his own ends, with the help of his sons, Nathan Rothschild in London and James Rothschild in Paris. They first use the money to finance Wellington's army in Spain's war against Napoleon, at advantageous terms of interest. In a notable coup, in 1815, Nathan spreads the rumour that Napoleon had won the Battle of Waterloo, causing London stock prices to collapse. He then bought a large quantity of equities at the bottom of the market, profiting handsomely as prices rose once the truth about the battle emerged. In a decade, the Rothschilds have accumulated a fortune of £11 million by using the Elector's money.”

And they were able to then formalize a European-wide network of family led financial institutions. If that sounds reasonable to you that was the plot of a 1940 Nazi released film titled “the Rothschild” and none of that's true. What Hitler did was he took the Rothschild and he created a film in 1940 that showed the Rothschilds stabbing William I, in the back and then Napoleon in the back using both these state governments to finance a foot or to create a fortune of 11 million pounds, how they crashed the London economy, this deep state conspiracy theory about the Rothschilds is not true. It's a plot summary of a film released by the Nazis in 1940. It was used to justify the Holocaust. So, when we start talking about the Rothschilds, this conspiracy theory there's absolutely no evidence for it they built their finances by lending money working through the banking system but what Hitler turned that into is a conspiracy theory that's based on no fact. they didn't steal money from William I, and then stab him in the back and then use Napoleon in the Battle of Waterloo. It's all just justification for the Holocaust. What did happen? As the Rothschilds were lending money they weren't lending part of money discriminatorily that they were lending money to whoever would take it. it's just finances. it's just work.

In 1831 Cardinal Capillaria is elected Pope Gregory XVI, the Rothschilds were considered reliable in conservative circles in Europe because they had worked with the Austrian government to stabilize finances after their Napoleonic Wars. So, they hadn't stabbed in the back William I and Napoleon.

The Rothschild are seen as reliable people to do business with, if they had have crashed the London economy, they would not have been seen as reliable with a good reputation as businessman. People wouldn't have worked with them, but when you have a new pope in 1831, and the Vatican finances are in a dire straits, they're going to turn to who is the most reliable. Initially there was resistance during the note negotiations. So, this new papal hierarchy with a new pope they want to work with the Rothschilds and there's resistance particularly from the Roman government and Monsignor Antonio Garibaldi at Paris. However, Alessandro Tolonia acting for the Vatican held direct negotiations with James Rothschild and thrashed out an agreement. So, the papacy is struggling, it's falling, it's losing its papal States. This is about 43 years after 1798. They need to make some financial agreements, they turn to the Rothschilds because they have a good reputation. There's resistance because a lot of Roman Catholics don't like the Catholic Church getting bailed out by a Jewish family. This did not go over well. But there is an agreement signed on the 30th of November 1831, thus in 1832 the Rothschilds agreement to provide a loan to the Holy See for 400,000 pounds equivalent in 2019 to 37.4 million pounds came into force. So, the Rothschilds lent money to the Vatican in 1831. James Rothschild head of the Rothschild banking family of France became the official papal banker his Naples based brother Karl Mayer von Rothschild geographically closer to Rome, went to meet with Pope Gregory XVI in January of 1832. It was customary for Catholics to show reverence for what they regarded as The Vicar of Christ, to kiss the Pope's feet when meeting him as a Jew Kyle Rothschild was permitted to simply kiss the ring on his hand instead. This outraged Catholics, Catholic critics of the deal at the time. So, this was a massive scandal for Catholics. The fact that a Jew Jewish family would bail out the Roman Catholic Church to the extent of in today's dollars 37 million pounds, and then that one of the heads of that family didn't kiss the Pope's feet. "A second loan occurred during the pontificate of Pope Pius IX in the early 1850s with the same members of the Rothschild family after the collapse of a short-lived revolutionary Roman Republic, and the restoration of the papal States. Reports of this loan led to stinging criticisms of Pope Gregory XVI in the Christian in particular Catholic world - particularly the Catholic world, but also through the Protestant world as well, almost all of which circulated around the Jewishness of the Rothschilds. So, this wasn't the fact that they were the papal bankers. It was not some hidden knowledge that Walter Veith has dug out, this was a scandal in the 1830s 40s and 50s. The

French poet Alfred de Vigny said “a Jew now reigns over the Pope and Christianity. He pays monarchs and buys nations”. Ludwig Vaughn a Jewish convert to Lutheranism and a member of the Young Germany movement stated a wealthy Jew kisses his hand, while a poor Christian kisses the Pope's feet. So, poor Christian kisses the feet of the Pope and a wealthy Jew only has to kiss his hand. The Rothschilds are shortly nobler than their ancestor Judas Iscariot, he sold Christ for 30 small pieces of silver, the Rothschilds would buy him if he were for sale.” Another prominent example is the mention of the loan in a sonnet by I won't read his full name I think they just call him Belly. While belly finds the Rothschilds highly objectionable for him the Pope was even worse as a weak man who had sold both Rome and the and the state and was thus no longer worthy of wearing the papal robes. This was not a deep state. Rothschild controlling the world was a conspiracy theory. They were doing their job, they lent money to William I, they worked through the Napoleonic Wars, or they controlled some of the finance some of his finances, and they interacted with the Vatican. It was no secret. It was widely acceptable. Let room but remind you, in the days when Adventism had a prophet and is she speaking about any of this? – No. If Ellen White was living through this and didn't feel the need to speak about it to include it in any of her writings in the dispensation she is living in, why is it somehow secret knowledge we've dug up today?

“Pope Gregory the 16th appointed Cardinal Tosti as the new papal treasurer in July 1834. Tosti attempted to refinance the debt in more favorable terms because of the backlash among the Christian and Catholic community by their doing work with this Jewish banking family, Tosti, the new papal treasurer tried to annul the agreement with the Rothschilds behind their back and to go into a deal with another banking firm in Paris because of this backlash. When he did this one of the Rothschild one of the Rothschild heads travelled to Rome held out his contract and said you signed this you can't back out of this contract and the Catholic Church was forced by that contract to not go into an agreement with another banking firm. The Rothschilds then tried to leverage their influence within the Vatican to improve conditions for the 15,000 Jews in the papal States. They asked the Pope to cancel the extra taxes that were levied solely on the Jews. The prohibition on taking property from the ghetto and the ban on working professionals, and that he abolishes evidentiary standards that put them at a disadvantage in court cases. Their requests were declined. So, they attempted to improve the lot of their

disadvantaged Jews living in the ghettos in the papal States, but none of that became possible. So, when you go back and you see the work the Rothschilds did within the Vatican going back into the 1800 through the Napoleonic Wars, through the 30s, and the 50s, and forward you had the Rothschilds working doing their job, also, working for the Catholic Church as part of their banking system. So, when you come to a Jewish encyclopedia that's written in 1906 that says the Rothschild are "the guardians of the papal treasure" as can as much as that sounds as evidence of a conspiracy theory it's really not. It's just a historical fact.


But that historical the fact that was true in 1906, not in 2020 or 2018. It was true in 1906 in 2020 how much influence does the Rothschild family have in the banking system? – None. In the finances of the Vatican? – None. None of that exists 120 years later. nearly 200 years after 190 years after that first loan was entered into, the system no longer work that way. So, to use 1830s and 50s and then one sentence! one sentence from the 1906 encyclopedia to prove this satanic deep state where the Pope controls the Rothschilds, controls the Zionists, controls the terrorists. That's the model has brought up Pope Zionist Rothschilds terrorists 9/11. Think about the evidence that that's actually built on and there isn't any. **In fact, it's built on ignorance.** Why is it that they would be listed in a 1906 encyclopedia as being the guardians of papal treasure? Could it be that there is that they have a relationship to the Pope a 114 years later? Could it be that this Pope controls the Zionists and that's a reason for 9/11, this satanic illuminati, deep state? Why is it that Syria is so apparently backward and not intimidating, that terrorists can't arise from the Middle East because "I walked through Syria and I didn't see any"? Can you see how that methodology is built up? But it's built up the same way Mary Stewart Relfe builds up hers. Can you see the 666, the lyrics from the Coca-Cola advertising campaign, the lyrics from the Beatle song, she uses the same methodology to come to the same satanic deep state conclusions?

You see conspiracy theories surround us: George Soros he's a wealthy man today, he's a billionaire and the Republican Party far-right again socially conservative Protestantism they were part of this all the way through, as much as they need Israel they need Israel where there's going to be 144,000 convert to Christianity, they can't have an Israel that's going to that's going to stay Jews they don't support they look that they don't support Jews they need the

Jewish state to bring about the thousand years, the coming of Jerusalem and then 144,000 of those Jews will convert is what they believe.

So, just to close we've just taken one quote by Walter Veith, just 30 seconds of that message, and it's really just one example of what his entire message is built upon. And it's the same thing that we see this socially conservative branch of Protestantism has done since 1798, when he speaks about the Bavarian Illuminati, and Alexander Hamilton, and Thomas Jefferson it's that "why is it? could it be?" It's a Bavarian Illuminati, how they use this literal to literal interpretation, the enforcement of morality, slavery, Sunday laws in the 1888 history, justifying segregation, and it's what we're seeing today when we see "why is it" that there are coronavirus cases where a 5G Network pole was just put up, what is it? Could it be that there's a correlation and that equals causation? Because the 5G networks went online and the coronavirus came, they correlate therefore there's causation one cause to the other 5G caused the coronavirus. You start getting into a problem with that the minute you bring some information to that. For example, why is Iran so hard hit by the coronavirus even while they try and suppress it and hide it. Iran has no 5G network. Many countries that are suffering under the coronavirus, that are digging mass graves have no 5G Network. But because we're looking for an explanation and we see this correlation we believe that there's causation. This is what happens to the most conspiracy theories around vaccines, saying correlation equals causation. It's this type of ignorance where we're all ignorant to some degree about many topics, that's why we research, that's why we have to trust experts in their fields. The Ramsey theory that we briefly discussed, we showed how it works through conservative Protestantism, and we're going to come back next week and look at conservative Protestantism, socially conservative Protestantism. As they stand up and back the Trump administration, and how they have continued with that same methodology, but their methodology always comes back to the same thing: there's a satanic deep state and the solution is to overthrow that satanic deep state and bring about a Christian nation. So, I just want to finish I know him, and I've gone for a while I just want to finish on one point, I'll put it over here because a sister asked this in a question time last week and it was a good question, I just want to address it. The question went something like this: how do we know what to believe of the Adventism that we've grown up with? All that we've heard from Walter Veith, from conservative Adventism.

We understand the idea of a one-world government. We get that from passages of Daniel and Revelation, particularly Revelation and we talk about the ten Kings. So, we all can believe in a one-world government this core idea of a one-world government, I don't mean to shake that. It's behind what Walter Veith will teach. It's what I will teach. Walter Veith and I both believe in one-world government. But consider the following: what he's going to do is the exact same thing that socially conservative the Protestant faction is doing: one-world government we understand that through the ten Kings which as we showed before that was all taught in the 1980s as being this Confederation of Nations. These ten nations and it becomes globalism, both the Protestants and conservative Adventists globalism and the UN why is Trump so antagonistic towards globalism and the UN because his base is socially conservative Protestants, and they have a belief system that is antagonistic to globalism, and the UN. So, you already automatically know what side you're on. 10-Kings, globalism, and the UN behind this all it's a satanic deep state. Within this deep state there are these secret societies, and we listed a few the Rothschilds who are now at their most wealthiest the 1120 first richest men on the Forbes list, Rothschilds, Illuminati, George Soros, Bill Gates, all of that faction, they tie this with growing immorality, one of the evidences is this growing immorality.



That's why they'll take you to songs, lyrics from bands like The Beatles etc. and you can know all this none of this is obvious to you, none of this is in the open you can only know this through secret knowledge, secret knowledge, handed from part person to person or through observing hand signals, or numbers or logos or through these subtle evidences that you'll find flashed. So you have to look for these

evidences through things like 666, song lyrics logos, etc. this was behind Mary Stewart Relfe, it's exactly Walter Veith does. We also believe in this one-world government we don't go to Revelation and redefine it to that extent, but consider this, we believe in the ten Kings but we're not going to approach it through conspiracy theories, this is going to be approached through conspiracies this is going to be approached through parables. So, where do you find 10? 10 of something, a group of 10? – The tribes of Israel. You have the two and the ten. So, when you have the ten tribes, how are they structured?

you have ten but does each one of those ten have autonomy? – No. You have one control the other nine. One control the other nine is a dictatorship. So one is a dictator over the nine, so you're going to go straight to a parable to know what those ten kings look like. Ancient Israel will give you that and what we can understand through other parables, this is one, that's just one, you can go to a second, you can go to 1989 history, and see it again. But this one world government instead of being a deep state where they're all friends what you see is the United States control the UN as a dictatorship, what we call unilateralism. This requires the coming together of republicanism and Protestantism. Church+ State. And you can prove that, you can see that even just through straight Ellen White quotes. What Protestantism is going to do? is Protestantism going to work with the UN to bring about a Sunday law? – No. Protestantism hates the UN because they say that Confederacy and globalism as being what is going to bring about the Antichrist. Republicanism and Protestantism, church and state, we're going to use parables, we can use multiple parables. If I list them down here it's:

- the one and the nine tribes, one over the other.
- Another parable is what happened in 1989 as we went from two superpowers to one superpower. In the Gulf War that's been demonstrated in other videos.
- Another witness again all using parables World War 1 + World War 2 = World War 3. So, World War one Kaiser Wilhelm + Adolph Hitler = Donald Trump. Now was Adolf Hitler or Kaiser Wilhelm working with a deep state where all the nations were friends behind the scenes? -No. If Hitler would have won World War II what would you have? you would have a one-world government. There would be other governments, so too much territory to control himself but they are subjected under his leadership. It would be as it was with the tribes: a dictator controlling the others.

So, World War I + world war 2 = World War 3. Dictatorship, dictatorship, dictatorship.

Two views of One World Government

Conspiracy Theories

10 King Confederation
Globalism / UN
Satanic "Deep state"
Secret Societies:
Rotschilds
Illuminati
Soros/Bill Gates

Parable teaching

10 Kings
USA dictatorship over UN
Republicanism + Protestantism = Church+State
1 tribe over 9 tribes
1989 2 Superpowers --> 1 Superpower
WWI Wilhelm I + WWII Hitler = WW3 Trump

So, these are all parables that will give us a witness for what this would have looked like. So, while we all can believe in the idea of a one-world government what that looks like will take you down very different roads, and the conclusion of that why we've come to a point in 2016 where it splits not just Adventism but also Protestantism, is because now it's visible. If you believe the one-world government looks like this who is Trump to you? If this is your one-world government globalism the UN satanic deep states spreading immorality that you can see through these secret science who is Trump to you? Trump is the hero. Trump is the Cyrus. He's the anointed to save you. If you believe in this is what the one-world government is built upon, not on conspiracy theories but using parable teaching, that we have given multiple witnesses that each standalone. World War II stands alone but we have scriptural evidences and historical evidences that Trump becomes the dictator. And everyone who goes down this line of thought will have the wrong understanding about the king, the kingdom, and the external events that tell us what is happening, and what is going to happen to the glorious land.

So, Adventism does not understand the external events they don't see that there's a destruction of Jerusalem that's coming because they're on this side with Walter Veith using the methodology and coming to the same core principled conclusions as conservative Protestantism.

This side (Parable teaching) this is the message of John and Christ in modern Israel that we're learning through parables that are designed to save us from this, to warn us about what's about to happen, and when the Sunday law of our dispensation passes. We won't be seeing Trump as the anointed Cyrus, the hero that's to save us from the one-world government. We will see that **he is the one-world government**. So, while we can come to many of the same conclusions

but what it looks like in reality can decide what side at the Sunday law you stand on. that's the message that we're trying to bring to Adventism. We'll bring to Adventism and the danger is that just like ancient Israel had the mindset of the pagan nations that led them to expect the wrong external events, Adventism has the mindset of socially conservative Protestantism.