

12. New Atheism - Repeat & Enlarge

Tess Lambert, 06.05.2022

Youtube Video

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=c0DjDTel96I>

[00:00:12.370] - Greg

Our Holy and heavenly God. We thank you for the opportunity of being able to come together through Zoom meetings and through the Internet that You've provided. We pray that you'll give us your Holy Spirit, that you'll open our hearts and minds, that we may hear Your words and be able to have them stay in our hearts and minds so that we can retain them to use to glorify you. We thank you for this opportunity also that we may be able to share with other brethren all around Australia. And we pray that you will be with each and every one of us. And for those who can't make it. We pray a special prayer for them too, that you will watch and care for them this Sabbath. We ask for the blessing upon Elder Tess as she presents and all those who are participating. That her words may be your words. We thank you for these things and pray in Jesus name. Amen.

[00:01:13.790] - Tess

I thought that we would start with a review, but we're going to review and repeat and enlarge. I don't want to get bogged down in just all the quotes that we could use from these men. Because they certainly give us plenty to choose from. I want us to just focus on a few points. Just to revise. We were starting an investigation of 1888. And you Brenden asked: how do we tell truth from error when it's a left wing source? What are some of the warning bells that should be ringing for us when we're reading external sources that are from a generally reliable stream of information? What are some warning bells that would help us see in any particular source that certain views in that source are going to be wrong or problematic? Before we investigated the warning bells of the left wing. We know that there's massive bells with right wing sources. We wanted to see what those were. What's wrong with the right wing that makes us turn to left wing sources in the first place? What makes us prefer the Washington Post to The Independent? What makes us choose one over another?

[00:02:46.320] - Tess

What's the problem with the right wing? I believe that the warning bells that should ring for us with left wing sources are directly connected to the problem with the right wing. If we don't understand what's wrong with the right wing, we won't be able to sift the left wing. We looked back and said: Why are we left wing in the first place? Then we looked at 2018, the midnight cry, two streams of information. We looked at the points that were within that message that told us we needed to change our political perspectives. And then we started to hone in on the right wing. Why did we have to change now? When we started looking at the right wing, we could have just repeated what we've done in the past. Just do a simple investigation of Dominionism, Protestantism, seven mountain theology, church and state. It's all there. We've all covered it. But it's been nearly four years since 2018, and we are mature now. Speaking about

one reform line. We're mature now. We're meant to have grown from there. And we wanted to see what is the really underlying difference between right wing and left wing.

[00:04:13.300] - Tess

There are many, many atheists on the right wing, and there are many, many Protestants on the left wing. What is the really core beating heart of the left wing that differentiates it from the right wing? When we did that, we saw it was how they approach freedom and equality. The Covid pandemic has been a very good case study in this. We're able to see with just that one case study, how the left wing and the right wing approach equality and freedom differently. There are also a number of Supreme Court cases over civil rights that also help us see how left wing versus right wing approach freedom and equality. And what we identified was that the left wing prioritizes equality over freedom, even though it treasures both. The right wing prioritizes freedom over equality. Though many of them treasure both, freedom has to win. When these two principles collide freedom, inequality, whether it's in the context of a global pandemic or in the context of LGBT rights at the Supreme Court level. You're going to see the difference between the left wing or the right wing based on which one of those two they will prioritize, which takes preeminence when they come into conflict.

[00:05:41.710] - Tess

Democrats generally, it's equality. Republicans generally it's freedom. We could have left it there. But we wanted to look at the third political party in the United States. And while it is a political party, the third largest, more than a political party, it's a philosophy. And that's libertarianism. We're going back to libertarianism. We left it once Goldwater came up. Goldwater is the politician who many blame for introducing libertarian philosophy to the Republican Party. It is why the Republican Party is so heavily libertarian in their philosophy. We're going to go back to Goldwater and libertarianism and militia groups. But we wanted to bring in libertarianism, because libertarianism is different to that right wing Dominionist Protestant group that we have been looking at the last few years. Libertarianism supports gay marriage. Libertarianism opposes church and state. Libertarianism is, generally speaking, wanting to defund the police and the war on drugs. We need to understand right wing libertarianism. And the reason that I wanted us to investigate that, and it was not planned. We started heading down that road, and I do believe it's providential. Because so much of libertarian philosophy entered this movement in 2019, when people who were in the Dominionist section of the right wing moved from the Dominionist portion of the right wing just into the secular libertarian portion of the right wing. And that has had and continues to have an impact on this movement.

[00:07:36.280] - Tess

I want people to see more clearly, some of the issues and arguments happening within this movement currently and in the past, that are still all about two streams of information and right wing versus left wing. Still about Ipsus, still about the midnight cry. We're going back to libertarianism. But once we looked at libertarianism, we went to that Vox article. Now I am going to keep coming back to the chat to make sure I'm not missing hands. This is at the beginning a review and at some point a repeat and enlarge. But I want to stop at periods of time because we may be wrapping up our discussion on Atheism today. We went to the Vox article. That is written because of what happened the year prior, 2014. Gamergate. That

is the historical context of the article. The fellow being investigated in the article, the case study is Max. I just want to draw out what we've done the last three weeks. We looked at Max. But he's just a symbol of millions of predominantly men with the same worldview. But we'll just refer to him as Max, standing for a much larger group of people.

[00:09:19.310] - Tess

And we saw within that article made a number of times. I counted three times. They name a type of Trinity, something they've identified as existing within not just the right wing, but the far right in America today. And that is a worldview that's built upon three key ideological positions. First one: Man's Rights. Second: Atheism. And third: Libertarian. The third time the article lists this Trinity, it doesn't actually list these three. It lists the crusade against what these three positions are fighting. Men's Rights activism is fighting gender equality. It's a crusade against feminism. Atheism is a crusade against religion. And libertarianism is a crusade against big government. Not all government, but big government, left wing big government. Any government that prioritizes equality over freedom. Any government that restricts freedom. The third time the article references this Trinity it's listing this as a type of crusade against which these ideological positions are fighting. We've put aside libertarianism for the moment. But it's going to come up today and we've been looking at atheism. Max stands for a much broader segment of the US population. I wanted to ask the question, why does Max have this position?

[00:11:42.770] - Tess

Why is this his worldview? Why is he here? Because these type of men, this group within society, they say they're not following an individual. They have moved beyond the foolishness of following religions, which they all see as cults. They've moved beyond that. Brodie.

[00:12:40.110] - Brodie

He has been influenced and he has chosen to surround himself with people and read and absorb information that supports this world view. And something at some stage has resonated with him. And he has chosen to follow that stream. Is that the answer you were looking for?

[00:13:10.110] - Tess

Yes. Because that's not what he would want to hear. That's not what he would want to see. They have moved beyond a society where you follow someone. Where you listen to someone. Where you go to church and hear a sermon and be influenced by someone. It's very much an individualistic position where they believe they are following their own reason and their own rationality. And I don't agree with that. We all absorb information from somewhere. You're here because you think that this movement, like I do, makes sense. You're hearing things and thinking. I agree with that. That has a foundation that can be supported. He's there for the exact same reason that you're here. He's heard things that he thinks make sense. That appeals to him for one reason or another. Where did he hear these things? What is he listening to? We could speak about, as we have in the past, Jordan Peterson, Ben Shapiro. Depending on the faction within the right wing. Maybe even Tucker Carlson. And they might weave religion into what they say. Although I don't think what they say needs religion. But they might do that.

[00:14:29.470] - Tess

They do do that. Instead, because we see atheism as a component of this. We wanted to see where he gets his world view from. Before we do that. Three points stood out relative to gender in that Vox article, that have been repeating themes. I just want to list. I'd like us to consider. If anyone wants to contribute any, some key points about gender. About how he and that faction views gender. Katherine.

[00:15:28.630] - Katherine

One thing I remember from the article was Max's point of view. That some of those gender issues have already been dealt with. Voting rights and things like that have already been given. The problem is then solved and case closed.

[00:15:50.630] - Tess

I agree. I just try to think of how to put that on the board. I don't know if he explicitly stated that in the article.

[00:16:14.120] - Katherine

It was in the context of his mother.

[00:16:14.810] - Tess

I agree with you. Yeah.

[00:16:16.660] - Katherine

Okay.

[00:16:18.010] - Tess

I'm sorry. What I was saying was I'm not sure if he explicitly stated the year that he thinks it was. Did he do that?

[00:16:25.020] - Katherine

I don't think so. I don't think he said the year. Depending on how you define feminism, I think that he would consider himself a feminist in one sense. But not the way feminists are today. Because they're basically going even further than what the original feminists wanted.

[00:16:56.330] - Tess

That's a good point. Is it okay if I write: "civil rights in relation to gender has been accomplished"?

[00:17:03.050] - Katherine

Yeah, that sounds.

[00:17:07.290] - Tess

Josephine.

[00:17:13.690] - Josephine

I may be wrong because I'm trying to get it from memory. He thinks that women have their voting rights already. They got jobs. Equal pay. Abortion rights. And something about a dog whistle or something. I'm not sure.

[00:17:38.310] - Tess

I think that's a similar point to what Katherine was making. You've expounded upon this point here. But yes, you're right. It's that idea that women can vote now. Women can work in pretty much any profession they like now. There has been nothing left for women to fight for. Is it okay if I just fit that into this point here?

[00:18:07.590] - Josephine

Yeah, it's great.

[00:18:10.450] - Tess

Thank you for expounding on that for us. One point. I'll add one. You can still think, if you like, of another. I had three. The other one was that he associated feminism with religion. That it is a religion. Can we remember that? He pretty much said feminism is a religion. Marie.

[00:18:50.500] - Marie

I have a follow up thought on that the civil rights for gender are now done. That now it's infringing on men's rights.

[00:19:05.810] - Tess

I'm going to put that under here. Because it's directly connected. And yes, I think that is another key point. There is now reverse discrimination and women oppress men in society. It doesn't quite put it that way, but that's the conclusion that you have to see in his thoughts. Because now that women have their freedoms, then in asking more of that, they're taking away men's freedoms and it's turned into a reverse discrimination. I'm writing it this way for a reason that women oppress men in society. Do you have more Marie, or were you done? Don't want to interrupt now.

[00:20:06.280] - Marie

I'm done. Thank you.

[00:20:15.030] - Tess

Then I'll put it under here. What did I have up? Feminism. Feminism equals religion. Which is built upon the idea that there's no rational thought in gender equality. But we'll come back to that. Civil rights, gender equality has been accomplished. Gender rights has been accomplished. Women are oppressing men in society. Feminism is a religion. It lacks rational thought. And I had one more. And I'm not sure if he explicitly states that in the article or not. I didn't have time to go back through that article today. But I am positive that he believes this, whether or not it was actually stated explicitly. And that is the intrinsic differences between men and women. Intrinsic strengths and weaknesses. What are intrinsic strengths? That men would be considered to have.

[00:22:03.850] - Josephine

Their ability to think rationally. Biologically.

[00:22:14.090] - Tess

Rational thought? That's a good one. You can stop there. Or did you have more to contribute?

[00:22:27.230] - Josephine

Well, he didn't say this, but I think it was from what was said in the last lesson. Daniel Dennett talking about biological issues. It's not mentioned in the article. But it sort of connected in my mind. Because that's the way biology works. Men have that ability and women don't necessarily have that ability.

[00:22:59.350] - Tess

I looked up the definition this week of intrinsic. I think it's helpful for us to read. Intrinsic means: *"it belongs to the real nature of a thing"*. This is the columns dictionary. Intrinsic: *"belonging to the real nature of a thing, not dependent on external circumstances. It's essential. It's inherent"*. If I'm intrinsically something, then that didn't come to me through my external circumstances, my upbringing, anything that surrounded my birth, upbringing, society. It's intrinsic. It's inherent. Within me. Not dependent on externals around me. Inerrant means: *"existing in someone or something as a natural and inseparable quality, characteristic, or right. It's innate, basic, inborn"*. When it's seen as intrinsic, it's not something that affects you from a prenatal or postnatal. And the word you used, Josephine, is biological. I think that is connected to this word intrinsic. They're talking about biological strengths and weaknesses. And that's important for us to see once we come back to the subject of evolution. Marie, I see two hands. Did I miss you?

[00:24:31.090] - Marie

I was going to say aggression for one of their weaknesses or one of their main weaknesses that they tend to focus on.

[00:24:45.410] - Tess

I agree. But I would suggest they might not necessarily see that as a weakness. Because if you're a caveman and you're out there protecting your feeble wife who stays behind in the cave and pounds down grass or something for dinner. And you're out there hunting beasts, then evolution is going to develop

aggression as a positive trait. I'm not really wanting to put these into strengths or weaknesses because it might depend on the context. But yes, rational thought and aggression. I'm just not sure if they would always see that as something negative. Brodie.

[00:25:42.770] - Brodie

Leadership. Which I suppose is rational thought, isn't it? But perhaps physical strength is tied into that. And also humor of course, not forgetting Hitchens.

[00:26:00.570] - Tess

I thought of humor. But the reason that he said men had the intrinsic strength for a sense of humor was connected to the fact that he believed men think rationally. Women walk through life like in a movie. Where you see someone and in their mind they're in this field of daisies or something. They're just completely not in reality. He painted the picture that women walked through a world of their own imagination, not the world as it is. And because men walk through this cold, dark, awful world as it is, and therefore... He actually contradicted himself. Because he put women on both sides of that. That women live in that fairytale world, but also that women see the fear of losing their children. Therefore they exist in a dark world. But not the real world. It was a lesson in contradictions that article. But the point was that women don't have that rationality to see the world as it is. Combined with their fear of losing child. Yes, humor. And I wondered whether or not I put that on. But I think it's still connected to rationality. I'll write it down anyway.

[00:27:32.170] - Tess

We can contribute to the intrinsic strengths of women. What do they say the intrinsic strengths of women are? Greg, you can put for either if you like.

[00:27:49.250] - Greg

It's not related to the article. But in regard to the men, they think they have a larger brain, therefore they are more rational. And they have all the things you've written there. They have a larger brain, therefore they got more neurons and they can think better. But that's not related to the article. And for women, nature versus nurture. Women are more nurture than nature related.

[00:28:26.470] - Tess

Nurture. I think they probably wouldn't use the brain size argument now, but historically it's been one of their ways to prove their point about women. Nurture is an important one. James.

[00:28:48.530] - James

For men I was thinking of leadership. For women, I was going to say the same thing that Greg said. Kindness, empathy, making babies, that sort of thing.

[00:29:10.210] - Tess

Reproduction. Nurturing.

[00:29:16.790] - James

Yeah.

[00:29:17.430] - Tess

Just for space. I just leave that for nurture for the moment, because I dug myself into a corner there. But a good point. Katherine.

[00:29:26.510] - Katherine

Women have the ability to be cunning minxes. And they have their looks, their appearance. And those things. Beauty.

[00:29:36.590] - Tess

Beauty. Can I put sex appeal for that?

[00:29:44.430] - Katherine

Yes, I was thinking that.

[00:29:45.610] - Tess

That is what they're getting at. And connected to that. The other point you gave us was manipulation.

[00:29:59.700] - Katherine

There's this part in that article where Max is talking about how the waitress is wearing a certain outfit and she's got this big plan. And if it's not at work, then it's going to be at the nightclub later. And this is all big strategy. And this is for reproductive purposes. Because of her biological role. She's using her beauty and her cunningness and whatever skills she's got in her repertoire to do what she's got to do.

[00:30:28.670] - Tess

So he does say it. That's good to know. He's making the same point. Josephine.

[00:30:41.190] - Josephine

Katherine said it. I was just thinking about the waitress and her dress code for the night. And how he looks at it. The interviewer looks at it as just a normal uniform you wear at work. But Max had a totally different idea about the dress code. As if she was half trying to do her job and half appealing to the male. That's it.

[00:31:16.830] - Tess

You all have a better memory than I do. Because I'd completely forgotten about that part. But yes, he is seeing it like that. That women are manipulating him. That women do that within society, that's evolutionary. It's biological. It's part of their intrinsic strengths that men apparently don't have, because women aren't attracted to bodies. Brenden.

[00:31:42.870] - Brenden

Brenden, I was just going to say what Katherine just said as well. About the waitress. And it's just interesting that he made the note that she's wearing those clothes to get money out of people or tips. It's not just about picking up someone at a nightclub later on. Those dresses are there to get money out of people.

[00:32:20.030] - Tess

So it is about getting higher up in society. It's not just about a nightclub. It's about climbing the ladder in society and using your intrinsic strengths to do that. That was your point.

[00:32:32.330] - Brenden

Yeah. Getting tips out of people. She would dress a certain way. Well, that's what he's interpreting. She's dressing a certain way to get tips out of men. Whereas the interview was just seeing a perfectly appropriate set of clothes for a waitress.

[00:32:54.050] - Tess

And I want to remind us the interviewer was male. Otherwise those people wouldn't have spoken to him. His perspective isn't even just out of a woman. It is of another man who in his own words, believes that he has his eyes open to gender inequality. Thank you everyone for reminding us that important point. Because I want us to see that these views are Max's views. Before we start speaking about where he got those views from. Brodie.

[00:33:33.150] - Brodie

A side points to that. The observation is actually real, that the sexism in society is such that a woman's dress directly relates to her success economically.

[00:33:49.030] - Tess

Yes. A woman made one day that society gets angry at women who are considered gold diggers. And she said the only reason that women are gold diggers is because the men were the original gold diggers. They went out and dug the gold, literally while the women stayed home. Do women become gold diggers because they have this intrinsic biological strength for sexual appeal and manipulation to climb the societal ladder? Or are women doing that because every other alternative seems to be a closed door or a glass ceiling? This is the fight between culture versus biology as a root cause. Yes, it does exist. Maybe she was trying to get more tips, but is that due to her biology or is that due to society and culture? Those were all the main points done brought out as a class to broaden Max's world view. Men's rights as in

opposition to feminism. Atheism in opposition to religion. Libertarianism in opposition to left wing big government. These all relate to gender. Some perspectives of gender in society is that gender civil rights have been done and dusted.

[00:35:27.680] - Tess

If I was to put a date on it. The 1960's it's done. When women start to oppress men in society. Any thought otherwise is not rational. Feminism is a religion because it is not rational thought. And that men and women have intrinsic strengths and weaknesses. And we explained a little bit of what they mean by that. Josephine.

[00:35:55.950] - Josephine

Just going to add to culture and society. Those two words. In America you don't get a real good pay as a waitress. You're not given a really good pay because the clientele that come to the restaurant usually tip the waitresses really well. So they end up having a lot more money from the tips than they have from the actual wage. People usually tip the waitresses really well.

[00:36:38.410] - Tess

So it's that issue between culture and biology. If they raise the minimum wage. If they brought in economic policies that might promote equality. What they currently consider to be biological will probably disappear. We've investigated Max. And they're interviewing him because it's post Gamergate. He's a symbol of someone who's willing to talk to them. A symbol of a much larger group of people. That's the point behind the Trinity. And then atheism, we then looked at the leaders of modern atheism known as the four horsemen. The leaders post 911. Some of them famous before 911. But these have been the influencers in modern day evolutionary thought and atheism. And we listed them. Sam Harris, we discussed first. Second, we discussed Richard Dawkins. Third, we discussed Christopher Hitchens. Fourth, we discussed Daniel Dennett. And then we spend time listening to what these men actually have to say about gender. I just want to remind us of a view points, without going back through those same quotes. Harris said that there are more men within the leadership of the atheistic community, but also within atheism in general, because men have intrinsic strengths that women don't have. Primarily for rational thought. An openness to an aggressive emotionless debate.

[00:39:21.250] - Tess

And that type of rational thought is an intrinsic weakness for women, which leaves them more susceptible to religion. And therefore less likely to join atheism. He also said that women have intrinsic strengths, like emotion, nurture, et cetera. Sam Harris really goes in hard on the fourth point, intrinsic strengths and weaknesses. We looked at Dawkins. Dawkins said that to question trans identity is considered by society to be heretical. I refer to that as dog whistling. There are three levels. You have these leaders. You have all the Max's who are feeding off their messaging. And then you also have middle management within the atheistic community. People who do not have the status, power, voice that these four men have had. But they're still influential and leaders. You have a three tier system. And a lot of what happens up here is dog whistling. And it is more explicitly stated at this level, and when it gets to this level. While Dawkins didn't

necessarily call feminism a religion, he claims that he is feminist. He says everyone should be a feminist. But he says that to question trans identity is heretical.

[00:41:03.710] - Tess

And I said that was dog whistling. He's taking an unpopular position on a gender issue and saying that you're faced with a religious persecution. Just one point while we're discussing Dawkins. So this is what we're doing. We see what people genuinely believe, not necessarily just what they say they believe. They will show in these quotes when they're put on the spot. They will show what they believe. And you'll also see what they believe by the position of their base. Trump doesn't say that he's a white supremacist. He dog whistles. And then you see white supremacists follow him. You're not necessarily going to hear it all explicitly stated here. But when you see the effect of it, you see the effect of the dog whistling and you know more clearly what the messaging is. We are doing all of this in the context of an information war. Where Putin is able to convince millions of people that Russia is not at war with Ukraine. If Putin can convince millions of people that Russia is not at war, then end time events get a lot more complicated. Dawkins says he's a feminist. Dawkins says everyone should be a feminist.

[00:42:27.530] - Tess

Then he goes on Twitter and says. I'm paraphrasing, but I'm not doing him any justice. That date rape is not as bad as stranger rape at knifepoint. And any woman who says that it is needs to go away and learn how to think. He says he's a feminist. And then on Twitter, to make a separate, logical, scientific point, he starts stratifying different categories of rape by severity. And he got into trouble for that. But he doubled down quite hard. I don't think that anyone should suggest that being raped by a stranger with a weapon is more harmful than being raped by someone that you might have known, or had an element of trust in. But such is Dawkins. Such is the feminism that Dawkins espouses. He says he's a feminist. Putin says he's not at war. I don't care what they say. Just making that point. Dawkins hints that feminism is a religion. You see that in his base quite clearly. He talks about an intrinsic nature, men acting on attraction to women. And again, he doubled down. He said if women don't want to end up in a courtroom testifying against the men who raped them, then women should never get drunk again.

[00:44:10.770] - Tess

He will say he's a feminist. It's not about what people say they were. It's not about people in the movement who say that they are left wing and believe in equality when they're preaching libertarianism and freedom and men's rights positions. It's not what they say they are. It's what they live by. It's the effect of their messages. He also references intrinsic strengths and weaknesses. Men are aggressive, sexually excited by women. Women have sexual appeal and manipulation. You put a drunk woman with a man who has this aggression. Car crash in a brick wall. What do you expect to happen? I hope we can see in his comments about rape, his belief in intrinsic strengths and weaknesses, and his justification for rape. No comments so far. We're just going through what these men have contributed. These are Max's positions. I want us to see them from Harris, Dawkins, and Dennett. Hitchens says women are the oppressors in society. Remember his article on a sense of humor? What did he say about women? He says that women are the ones who truly rule in society. The only reason that anything looks patriarchal or anything looks like men are in control.

[00:45:45.950] - Tess

The only reason that there has never been a female US President. Me putting words in his mouth. Is because men and women engage in this carefully orchestrated act. Men pretend to be the ones in charge and women pretend to be the ones oppressed. We can get hung up on his phrase cunning minxes. But when he says that it's about this act, that women are cunningly pretending to be oppressed, in reality, women dominate society and are the ones in control and the ones oppressing. Hitchens makes this point very clearly. And of course, he makes the position very clearly about intrinsic strengths and weaknesses. Women oppressed men in society. Point two, and point four he really lays into. I want us to look at Hitchens on point 1. Do we have any thoughts or questions so far? I want to give Hitchens just a moment longer. Katherine.

[00:46:58.750] - Katherine

It's something vaguely in my memory, but I think there's a song or an old poem where the female of the species is more deadly than the male. I don't know if you've heard of that. But they used some animals from the animal Kingdom. I don't know whether they have that sort of an idea when talking about women are like a female Spider that is more deadly for some reason.

[00:47:40.090] - Tess

It's an interesting argument to try and defend.

[00:47:52.550] - Marie

The believe system that they have, and in particular the one about intrinsic strengths and weaknesses. These inbuilt strengths and weaknesses. It makes me think of Putin out playing that, in real life. And if they just stood back and just looked at what the outcome of such philosophy is. If they looked at someone like Putin and see what he's doing, it just makes you think, can't they just see where all this leads? I think that if they just stepped back a bit. And they saw that. You'd think that they'd have some common sense. And that they'd actually think twice.

[00:49:24.530] - Tess

Putin is using this to try and appeal to his worldwide base. That he has an intrinsic masculine strength, aggression, that makes him a rational, wise, powerful leader. Instead of the west, that with all of their equality and woke isms and LGBT is losing their way. That is becoming feminine. Putin is very much using this. But again, it's about not really looking at what people say they believe or what position they say they take. If you go to Dawkins Twitter feed, like I do, you'll find post after post condemning the war in Ukraine. Condemning Putin, concerned about the civilians there. I want us to see this clearly. Not just like an ugly manipulation of it. Because unless we can see it clearly, we won't see how much danger we might be in to think the same way. It's that old adage. If you think Hitler has two horns and a demon tail, then you're not going to expect a modern day Hitler to stand up and speak the way Trump speaks. Hitchens, he's passed away now. He was pro gay marriage. Against the war on drugs. He considers himself considered himself left wing. Voted for Barack Obama. And opposed church and state.

[00:51:15.650] - Tess

If you were to investigate Hitchens positions, I'll just repeat that. Voted for Barack Obama, support the decriminalization of Sodomy and the legalization of gay marriage. Supported the decriminalization of drugs or the end of the war on drugs. Opposed church and state. And considered himself to be left wing. In that context. I want us to read a couple of statements of his. But while he's those five things, he was also a strong supporter of the invasion of Iraq and a very strong supporter of Second Amendment gun rights. I'm going to quote him. He says, *"as 1968 began to add into 1969. And as anticlimax began to become a real word in my lexicon, another term began to obtrude itself."* Just to explain what he's saying. 1968 was a civil rights act. We have the landmark Civil Rights Act of 1964. And then in 1968, you have the Fair Housing Act, which is built on to the Civil Rights Act. Civil Rights Act. Fair Housing Act. What he's saying is that for many people, they just completely missed the Civil Rights acts and it was a type of anti climax for people.

[00:52:46.390] - Tess

And for people who missed that year and felt like it was an anticlimax, they started to introduce another term. That term, he says, is 'the personal is political'. At the instant I first heard this deadly expression, I knew, as one does from the utterance of any sinister nonsense that it was very bad news. He says, Civil Rights Act, Housing Act, done and dusted. People felt like it was an anticlimax. He started to hear the words, "the personal is political". And the instant he heard the personal is political, he knew that it was nonsense. Very bad news. For Hitchens, the fight for equality after 1968, any concept of the personal is political. What was his position on it? When did he think that it was all done and dusted? Again, we're looking at why Max has this position. Because I don't believe Max. I don't believe he was just born more rational and came to this position on his own. He's gone and listened to men preach, just like some people go to church. He's taken this in from somewhere and it has, for whatever reason appealed to him.

[00:54:23.530] - Tess

We've looked and seen how these four horsemen, let alone middle management, because it's much more obvious even in middle management, these four positions are held in modern atheism. We've looked at these last three, but this first one, I want us to see it in Hitchens. Because he's explicit. Quoting him again, *"I remember very well the first time I heard the saying the personal is political. It began as a sort of reaction to defeats and downturns. That followed 1968, a consolation prize, as you might say, for people who had missed 1968. I knew in my bones that a truly bad idea had entered the discourse. Nor was I wrong. People began to stand up at meetings and or ate about how they felt, not about what or how they thought and about who they were, rather than what, if anything, they had done or stood for."* He says with the personal is political. People started talking about how they felt and who they were, not what they thought and what they stood for. What does that remind you of, Katherine?

[00:56:02.570] - Katherine

It reminds me of this idea that if you can't prove it, measure it, or observe it, it's not really real. People talking about the way they feel. You can't prove it. I don't know. That's what it reminded me of.

[00:56:26.270] - Tess

We can bring a case study to that. Rebecca Watson. Now we spoke about Rebecca Watson, what happened to her in an elevator. It was 2011 and it's actually called #Elevatorgate. It was a major issue when it happened. It was quite a huge issue. It's called #elevatorgate and seen as a predecessor to gamergate. When Rebecca Watson spoke about being propositioned in this elevator. She enters an elevator. She spent all day talking to people about how she is sexualized within the atheistic community. Of course, what do they think of women? But she's sexualized within that community. There's sexism within that community. She spends all day at a conference talking about it. She's in an elevator. In the early hours of the morning, a man comes to her and really likes what she said and suggests she comes back to talk about it more in his hotel room at 04:00 a.m.. She felt very uncomfortable. And she said very few words. Please don't do that. Dawkins responds and says, Stop whining, will you? He is telling her to stop talking about how she felt. Dawkins and Hitchens, of all of these men, I'd like to suggest they were actually the closest. In ideology, but also personally. They'd never got together.

[00:57:59.770] - Tess

The four of them just the four of them since that 2007 meeting where the term before Horsemen was originated from. That's the only time the four of them met privately like that. But Dawkins and Hitchens had a very close connection. And you see that in a lot of what they say. I think it's reasonable to take what Hitchens says about the personal is political and feelings and see an example of that in his friend Dawkins. When he responds to Rebecca Watson, he's telling her to stop talking about how she felt. Because this is what he sees happening. There's an elevator and there is a woman. And there is a man. He's going to speak to her. That is going to make her uncomfortable. And she's going to ask him to stop. And she's going to say how that speech made her feel. Dawkins's point is that he did not physically hurt her. He didn't attack her. He didn't touch her. He didn't drag her out of the elevator. All he did was speak to her. He compared that to him getting into an elevator with someone chewing gum. It's temporarily uncomfortable.

[00:59:32.230] - Tess

You get off at the next floor, it's no big deal. She should not be speaking about her feelings. And his response suggested that this was an attack on this man's free speech. Because he should be able to say what he wants. Who is the victim here? Freedom and equality. She's saying, this is not just one speech for her. This is within the context of a massive amount of sexism, sexualization and physical abuse, even rape, that is happening within New Atheism. Some of it is physical. But for Dawkins, all she sees is equality versus freedom. All he sees is her feeling harmed and him saying that's just your feelings. That isn't harm. You want to know harm. Go experience female genital mutilation. Which is actually what he said. Go experience the life of a Muslim woman in the Middle East. Then tell me what harm feels like. Stop talking about your feelings. Dawkins perspective is the same as Hitchens. That's what I'm wanting to see from Hitchens quotes. And Dawkins, one of his real life examples. What does this remind you of? Both of them. Hitchens is supportive of gay marriage, supportive of separation of church and state, also supportive of gun rights.

[01:01:31.890] - Tess

Says his left wing, not right wing. What is the political ideology he's espousing here? Both of them. Greg.

[01:01:54.810] - Greg

Is it libertarianism?

[01:02:00.070] - Tess

Josephine, was that what you were going to say? Josephine?

[01:02:17.430] - Josephine

Sort of Parliament left wing if you support gay marriages, if you left. He says he's left wing. What's he doing? Striding both sides or more towards the left? Suppose in church and state.

[01:02:43.910] - Tess

Don'T have it up there anymore. I might ask the other few people because they might answer your question. They might go into further if that's okay. Marie.

[01:03:00.570] - Marie

I was just going to say that they're both espousing right when you got someone that's for Obama. There's so much of what he stands for, which is left wing, but there's aspects of him that are right wing.

[01:03:27.190] - Tess

Brenden?

[01:03:36.040] - Brenden

I was just going to repeat what Marie said. He's clearly on the right, as we already know. But his positions is right wing. Even though just by the sheer methodology he uses, appears to align with some of the things that the left agree with as well. That's why you had one of the white supremacist end up take up a Black Lives Matter flag.

[01:04:26.710] - Tess

It wasn't a white supremacist. I just want us to not say white supremacist unless it specifically fits. But I know exactly your point. Please continue.

[01:04:49.350] - Brenden

Even though he's on the far right, his methodology, his prioritization of freedom. I don't know how to say it. I'm not sure how to communicate it.

[01:05:10.920] - Tess

You are saying it. It's fine.

[01:05:17.210] - Brenden

I don't want to say it in the wrong way. Because it appears that they're agreeing with some of the positions of the left. Even though they're not, because the perspective is totally different. The underlying intention is the opposite. But they end up at the same place. But not really. I don't know how to explain it.

[01:05:56.150] - Tess

You did explain it. You all did. This is classic libertarian thinking. Can we see that what we discussed when we were talking about libertarianism with them. Libertarianism is the ultimate freedom over equality. Dominionists believe in freedom over equality when it suits them. It's interesting watching the right wing constantly compromise on freedom over equality. They'll say freedom over equality, and then they'll say yes, but animal welfare. A very small percentage will say yes, but the libertarian argument for combating climate change. They constantly try and make a point that what they see as serious really should be prioritized. That's what we saw with that debate over the Civil Rights Act, where a true hearted libertarian said title two and title seven of the Civil Rights Act are terrible violations of individual freedom. And then the other libertarians said yes, but racism was so bad, it was necessary. They do compromise. But true libertarianism is absolute freedom over equality. And it is absolutely right wing. That is why there is a disproportionate pipeline between libertarianism and far right militia groups. We're coming back to seeing that. Because we were meant to discuss the militia groups, but we got on another tangent called Atheism.

[01:07:51.890] - Tess

But a true libertarian believes in gay marriage, believes in the separation of church and state, believe in defunding the police. That's why you have the far right at Black Lives Matter protests. Not all of them. The white supremacist didn't turn up. But there were some of them there. Decriminalizing drugs or ending the war on drugs. It's a classic libertarian position, but it is based on freedom and not equality. And that's what we were making the point within the movement. Every fight we've had since 2018 has been between freedom and equality. And that's when we see people say, no, I'm left wing. I'm all for equality. I believe in equality. But they're not preaching equality. They're preaching freedom. And they're preaching men's rights. Especially men's rights, and they're preaching libertarianism. That's what I was speaking about in Brazil in the last camp meeting. Greg, did I miss you?

[01:09:16.860] - Greg

I was just going to expand on when I said libertarianism. When you actually speak to a libertarian, it could sound like you're talking to a left wing person. Until they get to a certain point and they would show their true colors of them being right wing. For instance, a libertarian will agree with you on gay marriage and defending the police, drugs, church over state. A libertarian can be a confusing person to speak to initially. Because they would come with agreement, agreement, agreement until it didn't suit them, and then they would choose freedom over equality. That's why I'm saying they can appear left wing even though they're far right or right wing.

[01:10:12.350] - Tess

COVID-19 has been a very good litmus test for that. COVID-19 and gender equality. Not gender freedom, but gender equality. Katherine, what is the difference? What does equality require of you that freedom doesn't.

[01:10:37.770] - Katherine

Equality requires you to make sacrifices for the sake of somebody else. Because if you have privileges, but they don't, then you have to maybe give up some of your privileges for their sake. It requires sort of like self sacrificing nature or generosity of heart. And it also requires somebody to be empathetic. It requires care and consideration. It requires a knowledge and an understanding. Not ignorance, but information. But also compassion. Freedom for everybody doesn't cost you so much.

[01:11:43.270] - Tess

I agree. Equality requires sacrifice that freedom doesn't require. I can say, I'm fine letting anyone marry whoever anyone wants to marry. If two men want to get married, that's fine. I'm giving them freedom. But if I want them to have equality. Then if I have a cake shop and I don't want to sell cakes to them, they have their freedom. They can do what they want. Equality demands I sacrifice some of my freedom to provide them equality. A society run on equality requires a sacrifice of a certain amount of freedom. Just believing in gay marriage isn't enough. Just believing in defunding the police isn't enough. That's why you have right wing militia groups at Black Lives Matter protests. They're not there for equality. They're there for freedom and their freedom more than the freedom of a person of color. They're there for their own freedom. Because they want the police defunded for everyone. Just everyone has freedom. They're not there for equality. To understand the need for racial equality in the United States. You need to have empathy. You don't have to have empathy to just give people freedom. This is the difference between right wing freedom, even where you see it in its most absolute terms under the banner of a libertarian, or left wing equality.

[01:13:22.810] - Tess

That is what equality requires. I might not like wearing a mask. It might give me a rash behind the ears. It might be uncomfortable. I'm going to sacrifice some of my freedom to wear on my face what I want to wear on my face for someone else's equality. They might be immunocompromised. They might need more of a helping hand from society. Society sacrifices. Freedom does not require anything from me, from you, from anyone. It doesn't require anything from Hitchens. Hitchens and Dawkins have a classic libertarian position. If they have interwoven libertarianism with men's rights with atheism, what would you expect as their base? And we haven't even gotten into middle management today. Libertarianism, equality. And especially when they oppose church and state. Why not gay marriage? Although you can say that, and then try and get married to someone of the same sex in China and it doesn't work that way. But for them in the United States, they don't mind. But then don't take Hitchens guns off him either. He has freedom to own any firearms that he likes. It shows that his affiliation is libertarian philosophy. And being libertarian, that same thing that libertarians say, the same thing that Max said, it's all done and dusted now.

[01:14:55.900] - Tess

It's just emotional people, mostly women, talking about feelings rather than beliefs. Talking about the personal is political. And I find it very interesting that it's that phrase, that radical feminist phrase that Hitchens calls nonsense. Did I miss you?

[01:15:24.730] - Josephine

I'm referring to the comment I made at the beginning. And everybody added to it. I wanted to say that what they say is not necessarily what they are in practice. Their practice is so different from what they say. It's just their so called, rational thinking that they try to explain. But in practice, they uphold freedom. They don't really want to sacrifice anything.

[01:15:59.700] - Tess

One of these women, I can't remember if it was Rebecca Watson or another woman. I think it was Rebecca Watson, who said about Dawkins. That while he considers himself left wing, while he's against Donald Trump. She said, that it's amazing how little these leaders had to say to condemn Trump. Their silence in the midst of 2016, and all that's taken place, has been telling. And one of the reasons for that, is they have more sympathy with Trump and the right wing than they're willing to acknowledge. Dawkins does hold the left wing partly responsible for Trump. Thinking that left wing woke isms turn society towards Trump. They blame the left wing and his fight for equality on the rise of Donald Trump. And they are less critical of him than many of their supporters who thought that they were genuinely left wing. It left many of them surprised, except for a lot of women. Middle management. I just want to read a quote. Today, if there was a Mount Rushmore of celebrity atheists, Lawrence Krauss face would be chiseled somewhere in between Sam Harris, Richard Dawkins, and the late Christopher Hitchens.

[01:17:26.150] - Tess

What that quote is saying is they removed Dennett and they put Lawrence Krauss in the Mount Rushmore of celebrity atheist. Lawrence Krauss, we spoke about before. Like many men who were impacted by the MeToo movement, quite able to make a comeback. But I just want to list four men. Particularly in this middle management arena, who all found to have sexually harassed, sexually abused, in some cases raped women. Lawrence Krauss. I will also list Rebecca Watson. But she's also within and fighting a community of other men in middle management. Lawrence Krauss. David Silverman was the President of American Atheists. Quoting the Washington Post: *"to the thousands of nonbelievers who attend atheist, humanist, and secular events across the country, Silverman was a rock star."* He had trouble with the concept of consent. Richard Carrier and Michael Shermer. Those were particularly for key men who were leaders in this arena and often defended by men in this arena. But this is some evidence that these women, like Rebecca Watson, they're not talking about feelings. The problem is this discomfort she is feeling is occurring within an environment. And in their own words, *"this is worse than Dominionism, sexism worse than they find in organized religion"*. Including instances of physical abuse.

[01:19:22.850] - Tess

And when they speak about it, they encounter death threats and rape threats to the point that some of them, many of them no longer attend conferences. And I'd like to also mention that the women here facing rape threats, death threats, hate from men here. Many of the men, when they've tried to find who these men are, when they're sending these violent threats to them, these are not teenage boys in basements who are just enjoying the freedom of saying inflammatory things on the Internet and getting away with it. They found that these were the men they were actually attending conferences with. These were adult men within the atheistic community who were sending many of the rape and death threats. Another reason why the women either stopped attending or some would only attend if they made sure they were never alone. Quoting from the Washington Post in an article, America's leading atheist accused of sexual misconduct. The alleged misconduct of these leaders, quoting Sakiva Hutchinson, was tacitly cosigned by an atheist leadership that is largely hostile to social and gender justice and complicit in the marginalization of women's issues. She, who is an activist for gender equality within some of these movements. Including the atheist movement, particularly the atheist movement. She is saying the abuse that these men wrought on many women and other men was cosigned by this atheist leadership. Hostile to social and gender justice because they believe it was already done.

[01:21:03.250] - Tess

Because they believe that women, through their sexual appeal, ask for it. Men can't help it. Because they believe that women actually oppress men in society. And feminism has gone too far. If they believe in feminism at all. All I wanted to do with this exercise was show us how we went to Max as an example of this. And from here we broke down his position on gender. Then we wondered where he got that from. And we went to here. And we saw his world view here. And then the huge issue within the whole of the atheist movement, which they certainly haven't fixed. I did also want to make the point of libertarianism combined with their own atheism and men's rights activism. We could go further. Krauss retweeted and supported the position that some French actors, famous French people took that was hostile to the MeToo movement. That said it had gone too far. Krauss spoke out in favor of them attacking the MeToo movement. There's a lot to package around that, but all that does is build up the points that we have already made. And I don't want to confuse the points by going into too much noise.

[01:22:36.210] - Tess

So that's what we've tried to do. Does that make sense to everyone? I don't think I've missed hands. I hope I haven't missed him. We did that. We went to Max. We saw his worldview. Focused on gender. We went up and saw where that originated from. And then what we also did last week is we asked, why does this exist within atheism? And we went back to Darwin. Because their position isn't just about their rationality, it's about their atheism. And connected with their atheism is particularly point number four. This idea of biology. The first tenet of Social Darwinism is point number four. The intrinsic strengths and weaknesses. For these men misogyny is not based in religion at all, but in biology. We might stop here for time, but there's a whole article I wanted to share, and I'm going to send that out. If we could read that before next week. It's good because I wanted to read the whole article and that probably wouldn't have been great. Do you have any thoughts or questions before we close? The article is by the Scientific American.

[01:24:06.490] - Tess

The Scientific American is a popular science magazine. Many famous scientists, including Albert Einstein, have contributed articles to it. It's been printed in print since 1845. It's the oldest continuously published monthly magazine in the United States. It's an article by the Scientific American. Entitled Darwin was Sexist, and so are many modern scientists. For far too long, Darwinian theory has justified sexist attitudes and behavior. I was wrong. We're not wrapping it up next week. I guess we will next week. But it's been great to have contribution. I hope you can see how we've reviewed. But we've repeated and enlarged. I've tried to show the steps we took. Step one, step two, step three, step four, to Darwin. And then we took a step five to see the ultimate conclusion with Roy Den Hollander. Roy Den Hollander, who believed strongly that women oppressed men in society. That feminism was a religion. Which is why he tried to sue a University that had gender studies for violating the First Amendment. And he believed that men's evolutionary physical strength should be able to be used to beat women if women were able to use their evolutionary strength, manipulation and sex appeal.

[01:25:32.350] - Tess

So we went one, two, three, Darwin and Roy Den Hollander. Which we can do next time. We'll repeat and enlarge and finish that. Brenden.

[01:25:52.960] - Brenden

I've got a question, but I'm not sure if I remember the way you phrased it, about six or eight weeks ago. I tried to find it in one of the Vespers studies. I'm hoping you can remind me. This is just as we were leading into this whole discussion on atheism Libertarianism. We were leading into that. And you said something at the end of one of the Vespers study that went along this line. Protestantism isn't the whole of the problem, and it's not the cause of the problem, in relation to sexism or the Sunday law. And it's not a church and state issue. Protestantism isn't the cause of the Sunday law. Is it this what we've been discussing here? Is this the cause? Now we're looking into Darwinism and the intrinsic strengths and weaknesses, are we looking at what's going to bring about the Sunday Law? I just can't remember exactly how you phrased it. It's only part of the problem, but it's not the cause. Protestantism. And then we started going down this track here and it was in relation to the Sunday law.

[01:27:40.570] - Brenden

And you were saying Protestantism isn't the cause. And I'm just wondering, if this, what we're looking at right here, the cause?

[01:27:59.510] - Brenden

Because you got the Trinity. It's only a part of it.

[01:28:12.280] - Tess

Protestantism is not the whole. And it's not the cause.

[01:28:21.150] - Brenden

Then where's the cause come from? Because you didn't answer it. But we've been doing this ever since.

[01:28:32.690] - Tess

I thought that is exactly what we would look at today, but I thought that we would complete our review today. What we've gotten so far through. I really thought that we would go through all step 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. And then address that tonight.

[01:29:02.530] - Brenden

Okay.

[01:29:03.610] - Tess

But if you can hold on another week. I just like to get through. Have one more look at Darwin. We don't really have much to say about Roy Den Hollander except to see how he took this to its logical conclusion. And then your point is exactly what we need to address. Otherwise all this discussion is pointless. If it's not going to teach us anything about the Sunday law. Thank you for reminding us of that though. Because that is the point of this entire exercise.

[01:29:40.030] - Brenden

Yeah, that's fine. I just appreciate it. It's the last thing you basically said before heading from apostate Protestantism into these subjects. And this appeared to be the rest of the whole. I'm trying to find a cause. It looks like there's lots of causes. I haven't explicitly heard you mention it yet.

[01:30:15.900] - Tess

I don't think a one word answer will make sense. I think we need to do that together. I'm not trying to just hold off. I really thought we'd do that tonight. But I think I would rather us draw that out. But I'm quite sure we will do that next week. And thank you for reminding us. I will leave that up here for then remind us. If it's okay, we close now because I know some people are really tired. I don't want to keep up anyone later. If you had thoughts or questions. If you're worried you won't remember them until next week, just text them to Elder Terrie or myself. And that way we will have your thoughts or questions that we can remind you, you had. If it's documented. I don't want to miss them. Brenden, would you close before us then?

[01:31:12.910] - Brenden

Sure.

[01:31:20.510] - Brenden

Dear God in heaven we are so grateful for the things we're learning. We pray for a blessing upon everyone who is listening to this, and who is going to listen to this. Help these things change our mind. So that we can be helpful and provide better service to you. Help us to increase our empathy and our knowledge. So we can help other people, those of our family and those we come in contact with. Bless your people. We're just so grateful, thank you. We ask it in Jesus name. Amen. Amen.

