

13a. The Fundamental Reason We Are Studying the Trinity - Part 1

Tess Lambert, 20.05.2022

Youtube Video

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8TL5Taq0meM>

[00:00:05.890] - Student

Dear Lord, we thank you so much for these Sabbath hours. We thank you for the messages that we have been studying, for the unlearning that we each have been doing. And we pray that as we come before you this evening and that we come together that you would help us to have humble and contrived spirits, to search deeply within ourselves and to continue to understand how deeply 6000 years of sexism runs. We pray that you would help us to be of one heart and one mind, to understand, to see clearly. And to be truly united in our search for the truth. We thank you for your patience towards us as we learn. We pray all these things in Jesus name. Amen.

[00:01:18.390] - Tess

It's been two weeks, so there has been a gap. I don't want to spend much time on review. Because our last class two weeks ago was mostly review. On the board behind us, I wanted to try to illustrate what we were doing. We took Max as a representative of a large segment of society. Especially the portion of society most prone to ending up in the far right. Most problematic to the messages of equality. And show how he developed his views, and also what his views fundamentally are. The three components of the Trinity. To remind, if you want to speak, please put a H in the chat. So we can remember all of our method of operating. A H in the chat will for me indicate that there is a hand raised. To remember, I'm happy to have dialogue. But if you could raise your hand please. I wanted to show Max as an example of a large group in society, which is exactly what the article was doing. They'd seen this broad segment and they had found someone in that portion of society willing to elaborate on the views that this portion of society has. And they broke it down to that Trinity doctrine.

[00:03:08.080] - Tess

We wanted to ask. Why do the Maxes have that world view? Why do they have this belief, a strong belief in atheism, men's rights and libertarianism. And it isn't that Max was somehow born with a brain that's inherently more logical, more reasonable than everyone else's brains. Like everyone else, he is developing his worldview from a source. We wanted to look at the source. The source is clearly not a Christian one. It's clearly not a religious one. We went and looked at the Mount Rushmore. The influences of post 1989 atheism, if we want to keep a prophetic model. Particularly finding their voices after 911. We looked at those influences of modern atheism and evolution. And we put Max here with that collection of doctrines. And then we moved it upwards to see the influence that someone like Max is coming under,

over the last 20 to 25 years. Remember when we're discussing Max. And we're also looking at this in the context of Gamergate. We're not talking about men in their sixty's, seventy's, eighty's. We're talking about someone in their twenty's and thirty's particularly. And also around the middle age. But someone going through the 90s. Someone going through 911 and developing their worldview through particularly the decade of the 2000s. Where you hear the rising voices of the Four Horsemen, Harris, Dawkins, Hitchens and Dennett.

[00:05:10.970] - Tess

In the last class that we had, I wanted to make the point that they are not proponents of atheism. They are also the proponents of men's rights and libertarianism. We went further into things that Dawkins has espoused and Hitchens has espoused. Particularly Dawkins and Christopher Hitchens. To show that not only are they the voices of modern atheism, they also embody libertarianism and men's rights activism. Which would make logical sense, because if Max has all of these views and they come in that package, then they're coming packaged from somewhere else. We went through various arguments that these four men made. We saw that Hitchens makes the point that civil rights, especially in relation to gender, were completed in 1968. And everything since then, and the concept of the personal is political is rubbish. We saw him make arguments about how men are the oppressed in society. The other men certainly gave sympathy to that view, but he stated it emphatically. Dawkins hinted at feminism, being a religion. And all of them, promulgate that idea that men and women have intrinsic strengths and weaknesses. That association to social Darwinism and what is more popularly called psychological evolution.

[00:06:54.910] - Tess

First tenant of social Darwinism, the belief that people have intrinsic abilities and talents and correspondingly intrinsic weaknesses. These men misogyny is not based in religion at all, but in biology. I do want to make the point that I agree with them when they say they have reason and rationality on their side. If we agree to the concept of evolution to begin with. I want to explain what I mean. Remember how the concept of stratifying the races by intelligence developed within evolution? They said that evolution could be seen through the development of language. And because you had all these different languages, then people evolved on nations, clans, groups of people, countries. These all evolved separately. And if an Indigenous person in Australia is evolving from an animal completely separately and independently to someone from Spain, then they're going to evolve differently. Not in body, but in thought, in brain, in intelligence. They're both evolving from an animal source. But they have to evolve not into different factions, but into a completely different being. And that being isn't rational to suggest there's going to be intrinsic psychological differences between an Indigenous Australian and someone evolving in Europe.

[00:09:17.830] - Tess

And then it only becomes logical to start stratifying them by intelligence. Their position is a rational one, a logical one. If you agree to this fundamental component of Darwinism. And then when they look at Indigenous Australians and see that the community here had no written language, only a spoken language. Then they develop the idea that language is the metric by which they measure how far the evolutionary process has taken a group of people. They're going to look at Indigenous Australians as virtually the lowest on that chain because they didn't have a written language. There is a reasonableness

and rationality to it. Not to what Darwin quickly entered into. Darwin, his cousin, the scientific community of Germany, which did not end well. There's a rationality to that. But it hasn't gone away, as we know through the book released in 1994. And also how particularly Sam Harris has continued to give airtime to what developed in the 1800s with Darwin. It's not a new concept. It has become increasingly unpopular to do this with race. But it is still incredibly popular to do this with gender. And I think that the articles, not just the ones from the Scientific American, but the Vox article I shared, they make that point quite well. When they say that they are not trying to be racist, being rational, logical, having scientific debate.

[00:11:23.460] - Tess

If that is the basis of your modern science, then I would argue they're right. It's rational. I don't agree, though, with an underlying premise that we evolved separately from an animal species. Separate evolutionary chain for the races. Separate evolutionary chain for men and women. Even though they're intermingling, they're pushed into different structures within society. And men hunting, fighting, politics, debate. Darwin said it best. Men ultimately became superior to women. They had to, because they were evolving in different environments. We'll go to the article, The Scientific American. I'm going to read a few bits from it and then check and encourage people to comment. That article goes into how Charles Darwin and the scientists surrounding him embracing psychological evolution, social Darwinism, built that into a model of sexism. Which, he says, hardened sexism into something that couldn't even be challenged. Because they made it inherent. They made it biological. *"Evolutionary psychology, a modern instantiation of Darwinian theory, still provides justification for female inequality."* And then he gives recent examples of how this continues widely today, popularly today. A 2000 book, *"The Mating Mind, how sexual choice shaped the evolution of human nature"*. Evolutionary psychologist Jeffrey Miller writes: *"Men write more books."*

[00:13:26.770] - Tess

Men give more lectures. Men ask more questions after lectures. Men dominate mixed sex committee discussions." I want to comment there. I remember when Elder Parminder came to Australia in 2017. And I remember when he would finish teaching, or when we would gather before a meal time. The men of the movement would gather around him like a circle to see what he was saying. And I remember very clearly the battle in my own mind. There was no women that gathered around him. The women would go off together or they would go into the kitchen, they would be cleaning, they would be packing up, they would be with children. The women didn't cling to him. And the battle in my mind was not that I couldn't. The battle in my mind was the social pressure of being the only woman in that group pushing closer to hear what he was saying when he wasn't presenting, when there were these private discussions. And women missed out on that. Not because they didn't want to ask questions after Elder Parminder taught. But because of the social pressure. Because of the feeling that when you would go up, that you would be looked at in a certain way.

[00:14:46.320] - Tess

And I was. There was that look like, what are you doing here? Are you trying to find a boyfriend? You're out of place. That was palpable in the room. And that was why I did go up. But it was an internal intellectual fight against the way that going up made me feel. Vulnerable, afraid, alone. *"Men write more*

books. Men give more lectures." Yes, they do. But I can't prove it through a scientific formula for these evolutionary psychologists. Again, it's experiential. *"These behavioral differences reflect biological differences, Miller argues."* They're saying this reason that primarily the men of the movement gathered around Elder Parminder, whereas the women would find themselves useful in other ways. Evolutionary psychologists argue that that is biological. Experience tells you it's not. Natural selection made males more aggressive in their pursuit of status than females. Huntergatherer societies, though, they say we're remarkably egalitarian. Then they go into the Google memo that James Damore released. And that's what I wanted to bring up with the Vox article. To make some very specific points. Does anyone have anything they want to say on the Scientific American article? Anything they learned from that or that stood out more clearly.

[00:16:40.530] - Tess

I'll continue then and make a couple of points from what I shared this afternoon. In this article for Google, James Damore makes the claim that the reason that women are underrepresented at Google and other tech firms is because of their biological differences. And therefore efforts to bring more women into tech are misguided. And what I wanted to do and something that I think I want to discuss in more detail is how we view arguments like that. What I did. When I read in that article that he said a number of evolutionary psychologists came out in defense of Damore. I went to see what the evolutionary psychologists had to say. One of those evolutionary psychologists wrote an article for the New York Times. His name is David Brooks. And what David Brooks says, in the defense of Damore's memo, is that Damore, the Google employee who wrote the memo, *"Damore was tapping into the long and contentious debate about genes and behavior."* On one side. He's going to make two sides. He's going to say, over here is Damore and evolutionary psychologists. *"On one side are those who believe that humans came out as blank slates and are formed by social structures."*

[00:18:44.080] - Tess

On the other side are the evolutionary psychologists who argue that genes interact with environment and genes play a large role in shaping who we are." He says. *"In general, the evolutionary psychologists have been winning this debate."* So he thinks they're winning. And on this side you have.

[00:19:07.810] - Tess

I don't want to put feminists. I'm going to put Gina Rippon. Because it's not feminists. It is perhaps a minority within science, but a group within science. He quotes other scientists. Debra Soh wrote in the Globe and Mail in Toronto. *"Despite how it's been portrayed, the memo was fair and factually accurate."* Jeffrey Miller, another evolutionary psychologist, wrote in The Cluette. *"For what it's worth, I think that almost all of the Google memos empirical claims are scientifically accurate."* What we have is a legitimate tension. Damore is describing truth on one level. His sensible critics are describing a different truth. One that exists on another level. Damore is championing scientific research. They are championing gender equality. It takes a little subtlety to harmonize these strands. It takes subtlety to harmonize gender equality with the scientific research, but it is doable. He says it's hard. It's hard, you have to be subtle about it, but you can harmonize gender equality with the research. But he says that Google's diversity officer Daniella Brown, when she said that these are incorrect assumptions about gender, he says, this is ideology.

Obliterating reason. I shared the Vox article to give a little bit more of a rounded perspective of what was in that memo and the problems with that memo.

[00:21:40.040] - Tess

But what I wanted to take us to take out of it, is that this fight over the gendered brain is not one that the scientific community has consensus on. It's an ongoing war. On one side, you have the Gendered Brain by Gina Rippon. On one side, you have those who are arguing for gender equality and trying to call science out for how their bias has misused research and data. And on the other side, you have the descendants of Darwin, the descendants of social Darwinism and psychological evolution. The same arguments that were used for race but still have not lost their popularity when it comes to gender. I wanted us to see how these arguments get packaged. *"Many defenders seem genuinely baffled that a document that works so hard to appear dispassionate, reasonable, could provoke such an emotional response. Note that these are average differences, the manifesto reiterates. Defense. Gender differences are average. Doesn't apply to every woman. You might be one of the special ones that are more rational than all the others. "Soothingly. There's some overlap between men and women. Here again, this studiously dispassionate and showy air of reasonableness create cover for the memo's defenders."*

[00:23:49.820] - Tess

Reasonable Again. It keeps coming up. Because those who are making this argument and those who are fighting this argument know what the defenses of it are. Reason, reasonable, dispassionate. Scientific research truth on a rational level. The author of that Vox article, a man on Twitter responded to what she had to say, by saying it was irrational for any one woman to take offense at a discussion of women's characteristics on average. Because, you take this side and you know what you're going to be accused of. Many defenders of the manifesto have eagerly and as far as I can tell, earnestly pointed me to the manifesto writer's frequent claims to support diversity in the abstract, as if these are supposed to be reassuring. I value diversity and inclusion and I'm not denying that sexism exists. This side will say we don't deny sexism, we are feminists. But that doesn't make their arguments or how their arguments are used any less dangerous. It wouldn't on race and it doesn't on gender. Going to assume everyone read the Scientific American article? I'm not sure if everyone read the Vox article. But Marie from the Scientific American, do you see the two sides how there is this fight within the scientific community?

[00:25:45.990] - Josephine

Yes, I do.

[00:25:49.750] - Tess

Do you want to describe any of it in your own words?

[00:26:03.410] - Josephine

I'm sorry. It's blank at the moment.

[00:26:08.090] - Tess

That's fine. It might settle in with time. Anyone else? Has anyone read the Vox article that was posted this afternoon? Is there time for that? Some haven't had time yet. Graeme.

[00:26:35.910] - Raymond

Sorry. I was responding that I did read the article that you posted today.

[00:26:41.790] - Tess

Thank you. I understand. And this is a brilliant book. She makes a scientific argument, but it is not one that many people, even within the scientific community, believe is rational or reasonable. And I want us to know that when we hold to this position that we are fighting a large amount of the scientific community. And this is where that argument has developed through psychological social Darwinism. They reference themselves as evolutionary psychologists. They've taken that component from Darwinism to argue about these intrinsic differences. And that's something that the author of the article is a Scientific American. That's something Gina Rippon is very well aware of. That they are fighting these centuries of damaging stereotypes. That were so solidified by the concept of evolution that they have made sexism so much harder to uproot. That's dealing with this. Seeing how Social Darwinism, I'm going to refer to it as psychological evolution. I don't believe, by the way, that people have rid themselves of this in the context of race. What has happened is they are less likely to want to talk about it. Except for those who find themselves or consider themselves to be the most brave.

[00:28:46.330] - Tess

But it is still very much there. When it comes to gender, though, it's a free fall. I wanted to show how Max developed his worldview. Which comes from the people that he spent the 2000s, particularly, listening to. And where they get not all of their sexism, but a lot of the defenses for their sexism from. And it's directly connected to their atheism. Coming back down to Darwin. The final piece that was meant to be our review was to take us over here. To Roy den Hollander. What you have when you have men's rights taken to its most logical conclusion. He embodies all of these arguments. He says gender equality for women is not an issue. There is no gender equality lacking for women. In fact, men are now of the oppressed in society. Feminism is a religion. Which is why he took Columbia University to court for violating the First Amendment. That women have intrinsic strengths and weaknesses. Strengths, being their ability to manipulate men. Like Hitchens' cunning mixes. And men have an intrinsic strength, bodily strength. And we all know how Roy and Hollander ended up. But everything he believed, you find here, you find here.

[00:30:39.950] - Tess

You find here, and you find here. He took it to its conclusion. Even up until his own death. He was a psychological evolutionist. Why are we doing this? Why are we studying this? Josephine. Why are we studying this? Josephine? Sorry, you're muted.

[00:31:23.930] - Josephine

Yeah, we go towards the Sunday Law. And I think we need to know more about these people that are promoting evolutionary psychology. And we need to understand there's no gendered brain. It's your environment in which you're exposed to and what you're exposed to.

[00:31:58.670] - Josephine

After that. Then we need to ask the question, which one is more superior? And I don't think men are more superior than women. Because I had an incident this last week that reminded me of what you've been teaching. Yeah, but maybe I'm going to talk too much.

[00:32:23.120] - Josephine

So I'll stop there. A real live one. And it proves that the idea that man are more superior is not true. It's what you're exposed to. And opportunities that you have.

[00:32:45.330] - Tess

You're worried you're going to talk too much, Josephine.

[00:32:49.290] - Josephine

I'm a bit worried.

[00:32:52.600] - Tess

That's sexist.

[00:32:54.270] - Josephine

Yes, sexism.

[00:32:56.730] - Tess

I don't think you're going to talk too much. If you want to tell your story, we're happy to.

[00:33:01.100] - Josephine

I will tell. Two high school students. Twins. They're twins. And they're taking driving lessons. And my son said one took the lesson straight after school and the other one took the lesson at peak hours. Before he went into the lesson. Because I was telling him there's no gendered brain. Men aren't any superior than women. And he thought men are more clever than women. When he put the students to the test. He soon found out that the girl was very observant. She was quick with the reactions. She was the skilled driver as compared to the brother. The twin brother. And then he said. You know, what you told me is quite right. What I did was, I swapped the students and exposed the boy to the peak hours driving. And the girl. And the boy came up the par. In other words, he was inferior because of what his environment was like. What

he was exposed to. And when he changed. But the girl was superior. The opposite can work. It's what the man that exposed engineering, medical science, all of that. They think they're more superior. But you expose the women to the same thing and they'll have competition.

[00:34:33.770] - Josephine

And we're studying that because I think the Sunday Law what's coming in the Sunday Law? We need to be aware of our beliefs and be sure about the gender and the sexism inequality. I don't know, maybe I'm talking too much, but that's what I think.

[00:34:55.790] - Tess

Don't say that in my class, Josephine.

[00:34:58.450] - Josephine

No, I won't. Now.

[00:34:59.910] - Tess

I don't think you speak too much. Happy to hear you. That is a good example. This is what happened with vaccines. People have had an experience. They have a friend. They see a child that develops autism or seems to suddenly develop around the age when it usually manifests, which is around the age they get certain types of vaccines. And they put the two together and think they've formed a conclusion. This is what happens with gender all the time. You put men and women in a certain scenario and it continues to build upon and validate what was an incorrect premise to start with. The idea that there are these intrinsic differences, strengths and weaknesses. And it does attack this message, the midnight cry message at its very core. Because if you're going to talk about Eden to Eden. And you see that sin created a patriarchal system. And we see the patriarchal system needs to be dismantled. Then Daniel Dennett is going to say, this wasn't sin, this is biology. Then it says it's not sin, it's biology. It's incompatible with the message of gender equality. If men have a biological and intrinsic strength for rational arguments, for leadership, then there's nothing wrong with... And again, they will say that this is general.

[00:37:03.380] - Tess

This is average. Most women can't be good leaders, not all. So don't be offended. It does make you look at society and see that there's nothing wrong with the lack of women representation in Parliament or in Congress. It makes you look at Hillary Clinton and not see the sexism that she's endured. It makes you not see the sexism in her defeat. It makes you not see the sexism in the attacks she came under. It makes you question the strength that she was able to exhibit. This argument, this psychological evolutionist argument, is incompatible with a message built on equality being the original and equality being what it should be. I want to come back and ask some more people though, why we are studying this? Because why do we care what Daniel Dennett thinks? Some of us might not have even known that Daniel Dennett existed before we started studying this. We only have a limited amount of time. Why are we studying this? Moli.

[00:38:26.330] - Moli

The way I look at it and understand the article, is that as we're heading towards Sunday Law, we can see the sexism against women in worked force. And men always try to suppress women in all parts. Even though they know that the facts don't approve what they are saying. They are doing it in a scientific way. But the women are compatible in everything that we do. And they are equal to us in a lot of things. Even in the scientific field in tech universities. There are higher percentages of women. They are qualified, but the men are still trying to suppress them as we're heading towards the Sunday Law. Because sexism is developing, which leads to a hatred of women. As we get closer to the Sunday Law.

[00:40:05.720] - Tess

You said a lot of good things. If I was to summarize it. It's here to teach us about sexism in society. And you said even in science. May I write STEM instead? Does that embody what you were saying, Molly?

[00:40:24.040] - Moli

Yeah.

[00:40:29.530] - Tess

That's okay.

[00:40:31.090] - Moli

Yeah.

[00:40:33.370] - Tess

Thank you, Greg.

[00:40:41.330] - Greg

I've got my ear pods in, so let me know if it's a problem. First of all, about the article. You had it written on the board, but you rubbed it out. Where Cynthia was saying one thing in Damore was saying something else. And it stood out that there was two streams of information quite clearly. Obviously, Damore was using, in my opinion, a pseudoscience. And Cynthia Lee, I think her name was. She was actually discussing how his stream of information was not correct. You wrote on the board that they use reason and science. To me it stood out. Like if I want to write an article, I can pull information together to make it seem like that I am reasonable and logical and using science. And I can prove my point that you should use this product A because Product A is the best product and here's the science to prove it. And I happen to make product A. But then someone can come along and say, well, even though you say product A is this, you are biased to product A.

[00:42:14.420] - Greg

And if you look at the science behind it. Therefore product A is not logical and the best way to go, and doesn't make sense. You have written it with a bias. And Josephine mentioned about the way we brought up the way we see things. Obviously it's our bias. So Damore obviously has a very strong bias and it's come from Darwinism, from science. And the patriarchal system in science has made us believe that the patriarchal system of sin in science is psychological and biological when in actual fact it's not. And the only way you can prove it's not is by listening to another stream of science. But of course, because of bias, you negate and reject the correct stream of information.

[00:43:26.420] - Tess

I've looked at two streams of information within Adventism, within Protestantism, going back to 1798. We've done that for Catholicism. And now we've gone to science and seen the two streams of information within science. Whenever you go to a different group, those who support the position of sexism, are pretty much always the leadership, always the institutional. I would even say that for Catholicism now. Even though Francis has in some ways embodied represented both sides. We can make to compare and contrast with Pope Francis and Catholicism. You're going to say that it's to show us the two streams of information in science, the bias that exists, that they are not immune to. Because that Google employee, he used a lot of science. And a lot of evolutionary psychologists said the science is with him. And in this fight between the two sides, the evolutionary psychologists are winning. That is not something that Gina Rippon would agree with. And we agree with her. We agree with her not because her arguments are fantastic, but because that is what prophecy teaches us. Brodie.

[00:44:57.890] - Brodie

Answering the question about why we want to know or understand this better, I think we're learning to refocus. In the early stages we were focusing on feminism and the patriarchy. We were looking at it from the perspective of Christianity and then broadening to religion. And we're learning to refocus, to look at where sexism sits globally. And that means we have to reevaluate the cause or at least consider its origin. Is the patriarchy from our patriarchs, Abraham or Moses or Christianity, or does it go deeper?

[00:46:07.820] - Tess

We're looking outside of Christianity now. We're seeing that it is a global issue. Not just in the context of the United States, the evangelical Dominionists and the Mount Rushmore of modern atheism. But it exists in the descendants of Confucianism in China, it exists through Hinduism, in India, it exists through Islam in Saudi Arabia. It exists through the Judaic Christian West. Within Russia. Where does this come from? We're refocusing on global sexism. And when we look globally outside of our Adventist bubble, it forces us to reevaluate the cause of sexism. The cause of gender discrimination and abuse. Brenden. Why are we doing this?

[00:47:15.610] - Brenden

I agree with what everyone said. We're now living in a post Christian environment. The direct opposition to this movement would be what we're looking at now, I think. And that's the threat. We're now looking at the underlying cause of a lot of the sexism that we find in society. And for me, particularly with that article. If you go back to the original two streams. Where Caroline Kenned in the 1880's wrote to Darwin directly, he could see the seed right there, what her argument was. And it's exactly what Josephine said. Let the environment of women be similar to that of men and with the same opportunities that he has, before you judge and make claims and suggest they're intellectually inferior. Back then the arguments were the same. On one side, you've got Darwin saying it's a natural state of affairs because this is how it is. This is the biases that exist in nature. And she's saying it's environmental. It's the inequality of society that is making that.

[00:49:37.250] - Brenden

And then it becomes a self fulfilling prophecy. Which then people use as evidence that say Darwin is right time and time again. Because of the inequality, it gives less opportunity for women to do certain things, and it perpetuates and perpetuates, and people use that as even evidence for their claims. Why are we looking at this? I think it's the biggest threat, particularly in the postchristian world.

[00:50:21.190] - Tess

To see the threat to true equality. Feminism?

[00:50:30.370] - Brenden

Yeah. To radical feminism. It's like the underlying threat. It keeps saying reasonable. If you adhere to all those that I'm going to call Darwinism, that ideology. If you adhere to that, you can see why millions of people are going to be stuck there. Not sure how else to say why.

[00:51:15.180] - Tess

We're seeing where society is stuck. Secular society.

[00:51:21.890] - Brenden

Yes.

[00:51:24.890] - Tess

And how that creates an impenetrable blockage to true proper gender equality. That's what I heard you say in the last portion anyway.

[00:51:39.230] - Brenden

Well, if it's a natural state of affairs, it's not seen as a threat because that's how it is. Everyone except their place.

[00:51:51.650] - Tess

Remember, there's no God. There's no sin, there is no true moral compass of right and wrong. However, unpleasant. Differences are the natural order of things. And it's irrational to fight that. Josephine.

[00:52:26.570] - Josephine

I find it interesting listening to your story about when Parminder came to Australia. And how you pushed among the men to ask questions or to inquire. I think that happened to me before with other speakers. This was before I got into this message. You got a bit sensitive because you're the only woman. Why are you with these men? You want to be up there, you want to be equal with them. You've got to be out there asking questions, learning what you need to learn. Finding out what other people think of the topic or what the lecturer has to say more. I'm glad that you put me up about me not talking too much. Because that's the way sometimes we think as women. I've said too much. Maybe I should keep quiet. While a man usually doesn't say that. They don't make excuses even though they talk too much. But we tend to put up forward. And I think I'm not going to have regrets next time. But I thought that's very interesting. Because I've had experience similar to you even before this time.

[00:54:10.730] - Tess

It's always a fight. It takes mental, emotional energy. To not stay in the portion of your sphere that society often, without even speaking, deems appropriate. And I'm going to quote someone that will make me wildly unpopular with some people and for reasons that I will get into at a coming presentation. I won't justify yet. *"I knew certain things early on without ever having to be told. I knew that men have the power physically, socially and financially and that a lot of institutions support that arrangement. I knew this long before I had the words to articulate it and I bet you learnt it young too."* You knew Josephine, you knew young that women talk too much and therefore you should talk less. And when you actually want to look at the data. Women speak less than men. And I've shared that on media broadcast before. Trying to undercut some of those stereotypes. But they are so ingrained. And for those wondering I quoted Amber heard and we will be discussing her more.