

13b. The Fundamental Reason We Are Studying the Trinity - Part 2

Tess Lambert, 20.05.2022

Youtube Video

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OdXf7oa2460>

[00:00:07.390] - Tess

Lynne. I'll take your comment, Lynne. And then I want to give an explanation of why I think we are doing this.

[00:00:18.050] - Lynne

Yeah. I was going to make a comment in regards to why we're doing this. I'm not sure how relevant it is. But the thoughts that came to my mind were: sexism patriarchy society as it is and has been since Eve is so ingrained in us that it's very hard at times to recognize it in ourselves. In order to represent the truth that needs to be represented specifically at the Sunday Law. We need to have not only a better understanding from our own perspectives as in to change our own thinking, but we need to be able to see what the opposition is because we can't really counter something we don't understand. We've got to look at this from the perspective of, what are we fighting against. Especially now. It's one thing to look back and say, this is what happened with Eve, or this is what happened then. That's all well and good, but what are we actually contending with now today as we are approaching the Sunday Law? And what will that require of us if we're able to stand for this truth?

[00:02:03.610] - Lynne

What will that require of us? That's the thoughts that I had on it.

[00:02:12.370] - Lynne

Mainly the change within ourselves, our own view, so that we can represent a more accurate version of equality, as we increase our understanding and see the problems in society.

[00:02:33.470] - Tess

Thank you, Lynne. I'm going to hear from Marilyn, and then I'll comment on your point.

[00:02:52.770] - James

Just sort of to add on to what was said. I couldn't quite catch everything. But it's more about understanding of who's the perpetrator and who's the victim. In either their personal lives, in the past and in the present. Fixing that. I don't know how else to put it.

[00:03:27.570] - Tess

Are you okay if I write 'Understanding the mechanisms of sexism'. That's what I heard. If I was to condense what you said.

[00:03:38.420] - James

Yeah. Because everyone's experience with sexism is different. Some people are the victim. Some people are the perpetrators. Sometimes it's a mix.

[00:03:55.430] - Tess

I'm going to explain why I think we're doing this. This is what I see happen externally and I believe it happens in the movement. Let's take the concept of "defunding the police". What you have are two sides. And it's all too easy for the left wing to say about the right wing: the right wing doesn't care about African American lives. Wants police harming minorities. What they do is they create a straw man. They say this is all white supremacists and they have made what we call a straw man. Because that is an easier argument to fight. If we're fighting people who say: they should be shooting African American young men, we should be white supremacists. That's easy to fight. And then the right wing says of the left wing: you're trying to abolish the police. You're fine with murder, rape, theft. You're fine with anarchy. You're trying to get rid of the police force entirely. And what they do is they create a straw man. A man made of straw. Because it's easy to fight with a man made of straw. There's no real substance to him. You can go to town. It's easy to fight with.

[00:05:46.070] - Tess

Neither side in that scenario are representing the other correctly. And both are giving a misleading representation about what each side is saying. In reality, I won't go into the right wing arguments. What the people calling for the defunding of the police are saying is, we need to stop giving the police tanks. We need to stop funding them like an internal military. We need to create a radical cultural change, a radical change of mindset within the police force through a change in how they are funded. What weapons they are given. Through how they are educated, especially when it comes to issues of racism and mental health. But you make it reasonable and it gives nothing for the right wing to really fight. They create this kind of two sided system where you have these two terrible sounding scenarios. Just one point on defunding the police. There was a really good Vox article that Barack Obama shared and agreed with. You can't defund the police until you do something about gun culture. If you're going to arm 18 year olds in the United States with semiautomatics, you're going to have to give your police force a tank.

[00:07:24.520] - Tess

Not that they use their weapons correctly. But when you arm your population to a greater extreme than a modern police force should be armed. You're going to have to then arm your police force like a military to control the population. That's essentially a militia in a way that that was never designed to be. There's more to this argument than defunding the police and taking tanks off them. It's a call for a cultural change within the police force, but also a cultural change within American society that deals with gun control. And deals with systemic racism and education. It's a broader argument. But Fox doesn't want to fight that more complicated argument. It's too hard to fight that more nuanced and reasonable argument. They create a straw man. But the left can also do this of the right wing. And this is what I see happen in the movement, and I believe it is incredibly destructive. The reality of it is more like this. Over here you have Roy Den Hollander. And I could have spent all of the last classes instead of using Max, instead of using Dawkins who is a feminist, and Hitchens, who is a left wing Liberal.

[00:08:51.340] - Tess

We could have gone straight to Roy Den Hollander and seen the Trinity. We could have seen libertarianism, we could have seen men's rights activism, and we could have seen atheism. He held ultimately to the Trinity doctrine. And then we could have compared it with radical feminism. But my concern isn't this my concern is this. What people do in this movement is they come to me and they say, I love this message. This message has freed me. This message is beautiful. It is wonderful. And that to me is as meaningless as Hitchens saying he's a Liberal. What people do is they take this message. They discard a portion of it that which causes personal conviction. They take what is left and twist it just slightly. It puts them in a slightly better frame of view. They take what is left, and they add a little of their own. And then this is what they tell me they love. And I hear it over and over and over again. And what I've wanted to do is not to tell us what the Sunday Law will be like. Because frankly, I don't really care what they are going to do.

[00:11:19.050] - Tess

What I want us to see is what exists inside this movement. Because there are far more libertarians and men's rights activists within this movement than there are radical feminists. And I do not say that lightly. I know that sounds like an exaggeration. But I'll say it again. There are more men's rights activists within this movement, I would say speaking to Australia, within Australia, then there are radical feminists. And the reason that I wanted to go through this process is to not show you the Roy Den Hollander. Because it's easy to see it's easy to condemn. I want you to show the rational and the reasonable, not because we can condemn Dawkins or Hitchens, but so we can see that that is the spectrum on which we exist. When we misuse the message, which I believe happens to the majority of people within this movement. It's a fundamental reason why over four years, I still find so little change. It's not to see him. When I sold libertarianism, it sounded good. It sounded good because that is what to much of the movement does sound right, appropriate and attractive. Freedom. But my fundamental issue is not really libertarianism, though it's related.

[00:13:08.270] - Tess

It's not really atheism, though it's related. My issue is this one. This is what is constantly coming up within the movement. I had a message from someone recently. A man in the movement who we have also

organizationally disciplined for harassing underage women in this movement. He sent me a text and he said: most men's rights arguments are so extreme, they're terrible. They're obviously terrible. But he said some of them seem to make sense. Where do you Elder Tess draw the line? He wasn't completely honest when he said that because when he said they seemed to make sense. And then he asks me to accommodate those arguments, asks how I'm going to accommodate those arguments. He's not saying that they seem to make sense. He's saying that they make sense to him and he believes them. And then he's asking, where are you going to stop with radical feminism and allow the men's rights arguments that make sense? I said a few things to him. He doubled down on that. And then started explaining to me the men's rights arguments that make sense to him. And I think that if I'd have come out six weeks ago and started teaching those arguments, the majority of the movement would have said, Amen. Because we don't exist here.

[00:14:48.910] - Tess

But the vast majority of the movement doesn't exist here. They exist here, mixing what they have left of the message with what they still believe to be rational, reasonable, logical. Always the arguments that justify their own behavior. And then I'll make a comment talking about the love of Jesus, and people will say, Amen, we loved what you said. Why? Because it agrees with a tiny bit of the message that you had left when you already justified it. When you already cut up that message to justify your own sexism. That is why we are doing this. We are doing it because it's helpful to see sexism in society and in STEM. It's helpful to see that there's two streams of information within the scientific community. That Gina Rippon is fighting a battle with the scientific community. That they are so prone to bias. It helps to refocus sexism on a global scale. And then reevaluate the cause of sexism. It's important to find the underlying cause of sexism. Understanding the mechanisms of sexism, is important. But all because of this that you said, Lynne, so we can see it in ourselves.

[00:16:16.110] - Tess

Because the arguments that I continually hear people say. I want to teach about the Sunday Law, but I want to teach about inequality in how we treat our children. Sounds good. I want to teach about the need for radical feminism and also how this helps everyone, because of the male suicide rate. That is a men's rights argument. One that I'm going to need to tackle because it's so prolific. These are men's rights arguments. And people don't necessarily know that they are making men's rights arguments. They don't know where they stand on this spectrum. They think they are here looking over and condemning this. In reality, they're here. They might not be over here with Roy Den Hollander, but they're more over here with Dawkins than they realize. If this is an 18 year old white boy with a gun, this is Tucker Carlson. This is the rational and the reasonable and the logical, that paved the way for this. I don't want to spend my time condemning this because no one in the movement is here. But very few people in the movement are here. And they're not here because how they've treated the message over four years.

[00:17:38.950] - Tess

This isn't about us understanding the externals of the Sunday Law. This has always been about us understanding ourselves and this movement. We create straw man arguments when we only focus on the most ugly of what libertarianism is. I could have discussed libertarianism and gone straight to Gavin

McInnes. I still want to talk about him. But I wanted us to see the beauty of that argument. It's libertarianism that speaks with hope in this world. That says that humanity is so fundamentally good that if you backed off and gave humanity a chance to educate themselves, to work together, to dialogue, gave everyone their freedoms, they would figure it out on their own. They would move ever upwards. That's libertarianism. If you stopped trying to create a big government that through taxes is going to support institutions. If you stop that. People will fundraise. Individuals will rise up and raise money and fundraise to support the poor and the needy. Churches will support the needy again. It is a beautiful picture that exists here. And I want us to see that subtlety. Not because it exists externally, but because it exists internally. I hear on a day to day basis more men's rights arguments, either through spoken word or through the silence of people in this movement, than I ever hear radical feminist arguments.

[00:19:23.930] - Tess

It is more common still than radical feminism. Some of the reasons that I was given in this last week, some of the men's rights arguments that make sense to the fellow that wrote to me. He said men feel lesser, because they are failing to provide financially for their families. Men don't want to open up because you can seem to appear weak. The whole men can't cry ideology. They don't know how to express themselves. And he says feminism is not to blame for that. But these are men's rights arguments. I've heard that men's rights argument about the suicide rate multiple times. I have not enjoyed the research that has been necessary to combat that. It's a very dark place to go, but I've had to and we're going to have to discuss it. Not because of men's rights activists out in the community making trouble, but because this is what constantly comes up internally. And where do we go? Where do we go to understand the ugliness of the beautiful arguments? We go to race, we go to Millerite history.

[00:21:10.750] - Tess

I want to quote from the same source I read in 2019. And that should tell you something about how long I've been fighting this battle. The same source I quoted in 2019 at the German International camp meeting. Southern slavery and the Bible. Southerners making an argument for slavery. What were their arguments pro-slavery? I'm going to read it, and then I'm going to ask someone to turn it into gender. Reword it. Use gender and tell me what their argument is. *"In return for food, clothing, house, room, medical attendance and support in old age, about one third of the labor which is required of the white man in most countries is required of the black. The rest of his time is spent in singing, dancing, laughing, chattering, and bringing up pigs and chickens."* Catherine, I'm going to ask you to turn that into a gendered version. When the south says that in return for food, clothing, house, room, medical attendance and support in old age, African American slaves only had to work about a third of the labor that white men in most countries are doing for the same thing. Food, clothing, house, medical bills and support in old age.

[00:22:56.510] - Catherine

Okay, you got me there I think. My initial reaction is, is this idea that women don't really contribute anything. A lot of their work that is done by women isn't even seen. I'm not sure.

[00:23:31.930] - Tess

When someone in the movement says to me that men's rights activists make a good argument, because they recognize the burden that falls on men to provide women and children with food, clothing, a home, medical attendance, and supporting old age. That that falls to men, and they feel burdened with that. I want us to see the same argument being made here. What amount of worry did a slave really have for what he had to eat, what he had to wear? If he got sick, whether or not he would get medical attendance, how he would be supported when he was elderly? How much did a slave have to carry that weight? That was the burden carried by the slave owner. That was their responsibility. When someone says that that is the pressure, the responsibility, the guilt men feel when they can't provide. Do they honestly think that women are not worried about what they're going to wear or what they're going to eat? I've dealt with case after case after case within this movement where a husband leaving this movement is found to be refusing to provide his own wife and children with food in countries where they cannot access it without him and they're hungry.

[00:25:15.020] - Tess

I've dealt with case after case of where women are trapped in abusive relationships and cannot leave because they do not have the mechanisms to provide their own food, clothing, home, medical attendance. Cases of women not feeling they can leave, because they're aging and they're worried that they have no ability to provide for themselves. To say that women don't have that burden for themselves or their children, and that's a guilt a weight that men feel. I want us to bring that to race and see the south made that exact same argument. If we think that in Millerite history, all that occurred was slave owners who believed in torture. And then there were abolitionists who believed in complete and total societal equality. We end up, like many, rewriting the history of the Civil War and of slavery. That was not where the south stood. That's the first men's rights argument I wanted to tackle. Second, they romanticize a loving relationship. The Southerner has been reared, among them African American slaves from childhood and in general has a tenderness of affection of which Northern men can have no conception. Great care is taken by the law to guard slaves against oppression and wrong.

[00:26:57.200] - Tess

And after six years residence in the South, I can safely say I never saw more than one instance of cruelty towards a slave, and that was perpetrated by foreigner. So abuse doesn't really exist, certainly not on the scale that people are saying it exists. Instead, even though there is a hierarchy, it is built upon tenderness of affection and love. Bring that into gender. But the key argument that that document, that book made was 'Aren't white people suffering too?' They abolitionists seem not to be moved by the sufferings of those who are nominally free. White people. So abolitionists are not moved by the sufferings of the white free people. That is an attack they go to great efforts to make. Let me gender it. Radical feminists are not appropriately moved by the sufferings of men. They then give case after case after case of the sufferings of white people, especially in Britain. They give case after case of the sufferings of children. Here was a boy harnessed as a beast and worked and treated as a brute. No parallel to this inhumanity can be found on slave plantations in the south, but hundreds such occur in the Brampton coal mines.

[00:28:30.170] - Tess

There is tenfold more sufferings in some portions of the world among the Caucasians than in the south among the African race. Yet these poor white sufferers of other lands, excite no sympathy in their behalf. These suffering men are not exciting the sympathy of the leadership of this movement. I will give you one instance of labor and suffering, ignorance and degradation. It exists in the Brompton coal pits in England. Where if their own citizens were blessed with the Liberty and ease of our slaves, it would be a most glorious act of emancipation. What happened with second wave radical feminism? At the very beginning, even with the writing of 'The Feminine Mystique'. You find it in that book because it was early days. There's this idea that gendered stereotypes harm men and women. And that we can free women from sexism and abuse, but that this will also benefit men. Because men are also harmed by gender stereotypes, gendered expectations. Early days of second wave feminism was supportive of that idea. They wanted men to get on board and see that if gender equality came about, it could help them, too.

[00:29:55.900] - Tess

It could help men as well. And this is what happened. What men started to develop. The men who were at that point completely supportive of second way feminism. This is great. Sure, women in the workplace, women outside the home, this is great. There's unity between men and women. Of course, not between the extremities. But generally speaking, there's unity between men and women on second wave feminism. And then men started to say this. Men have the feeling of power. So man have the feeling of power. They have the power, and they feel that. In the home, in society, in Congress, everywhere you find men and women. Men have that feeling, the reality and the feeling of power. But they said women have the power of feeling. So men have the feeling of power and women have the power of feeling. And then men started to say this. We're all the same, we're all suffering, we're all hurting. And remember 1960's. In most places marital rape is still legal. We're generations of 20 year old, 30 year old women away from the #Metoo movement, when they can even start opening their mouths. They are still trying to open a bank account without the approval of a male relative. It is complete slavery in so many aspects of their lives, including in the hidden physical and sexual relationships of the home.

[00:32:02.730] - Tess

And second way feminists started to say. No, you can't say that. Sure, gender equality can help men, but only men realize that this is not the same thing. If only men realize that the patriarchal system is built on their misuse of power and their abuse. Only if they take individual responsibility for sexism misogyny and abuse. And this is where the men's rights movement started. It started right in the center of second wave feminism. Before radical feminists started saying, you individually, you men are part of the problem. Before they started saying that they all got along. It was like that in this movement. When we started saying gender equality, the men said, Amen. My wife can go off to work now. Maybe I might retire. It was fine. But then when we started to pull out the sexual abuse, the physical abuse, the psychological. When we started to say, no, these aren't equal. That's when so many in this movement started to cut the message down. Twist it, go quiet to me, often. Add a little of their own, and often are still here. Often are still here saying they love the message. That they want to support it.

[00:33:36.270] - Tess

The reason that we're doing this is because I want us to see what's inside the movement. We've already done that with libertarianism. We barely got into libertarianism when so many of us said, that sounds really good. It sounds so beautiful. I'd like that. Or messages from people that were saying, I was absolutely a libertarian in 2020. I didn't go into gender equality. I went straight into libertarianism and freedom. And I can see now the mistakes I made. What we need to do as a movement is see not necessarily how we went into libertarianism, but how we went into men's rights arguments. And if we're going to do that, we need to see that Dawkins is a feminist. And Hitchens is left wing. That the arguments are beautiful. And according to the last week's news, Tucker Carlson strongly condemns racism. We have to do two things with these external issues. One, we have to listen to what people say. Not misrepresent what they are saying. Not misrepresent Hitchens. And say that he is a far right extremist without explaining how he supports gay marriage, how he supports so many Liberal causes. How he is in so many ways left wing.

[00:35:35.330] - Tess

We can't go in and paint the picture that's ugly. We need to listen to what they're actually saying so we don't create straw men arguments. Because when we do this, it makes it so easy for us. If this is where the ugliness exists, then it's all external. But if it exists in a more subtle fashion, then it exists internal. And this is what I see in the movement. We have to listen to the arguments that these people are making. That a libertarian makes for freedom. Because unless we hear someone in the far right explain the beautiful picture of freedom that they are fighting for, we won't realize that we actually agree with them. That we actually agree with Gavin McInnes' fight for freedom. We need to listen to what people say. And then what we need to do is don't listen to what they say. Then when they tell you they are left wing, that means nothing. When they tell you they are a feminist, it means nothing. When Tucker Carlson says that he condemns racism, it means nothing. When people say that they love this message, that they love this movement, it means so little to me now. Because the amount of times I've heard it and I have known emphatically it was worthless.

[00:37:15.450] - Tess

We need to listen to what people say and then we need to not listen to what they say about themselves. Because how do we vote when it comes to the Kingdom of God? Brenden.

[00:37:49.590] - Brenden

We vote by taking the position of the Kingdom you want to vote for.

[00:38:06.230] - Tess

Tale of two Kingdoms. How do you show that you've taken that position? You have the great controversy. You have a 6000 year political election. How do you vote for the Kingdom of heaven?

[00:38:41.850] - Brenden

By living, breathing and speaking that position.

[00:39:12.750] - Tess

Breathing. If I can write, embodied and speaking. I don't agree with the speaking part. If I've learned anything over the last four years, speech doesn't mean a whole lot. What some said so well meaningly for some time was just stay on the boat. Just stay in the movement. If you don't like the leadership, if you don't like what they're saying, if you have to tear up and keep the bit you like and add your own. Just stay in the movement and you'll sail through. Don't agree with that. Because how did Adam and Eve vote for equality over freedom? In their case, freedom over equality? How do we vote for equality over freedom? Can you vote in God's government, by putting it on a piece of paper and say, I choose equality over freedom. Then turn to your own life and practice freedom over and over again. No matter how it harms the salvation of others. People in this movement, day after day are voting for the wrong side while saying that they love this message. You can't stay on the ship by just existing within the movement.

[00:41:00.330] - Tess

That's not what put someone on this boat. What places someone on this ship is adherence to a political creed. You can't vote Republican on a piece of paper and then come and say, Where is my universal health care? You have to embody the whole of that political platform. And you have to live it. We don't get to write on a ballot paper that we want heaven. We have to live now before we get to heaven, what constitutes the Kingdom of heaven. And too much of this movement is here. So, yes, we're going to study how this impacts our understanding of the Sunday Law. But that conclusion, in my mind, is insignificant. If we're not able to navigate the nice sounding arguments that are continually made on behalf of men's rights activism today. There was a video on YouTube, a short documentary on the split occurring through the evangelical community in America. And they interviewed this far right pastor of a little community. Or actually not that little. His congregation is absolutely boomed. They interviewed him and he said, emphatically, I am not a member of QAnon. I do not believe in QAnon. Do not associate me with QAnon.

[00:42:45.690] - Tess

And then he stood up in the pulpit and said, the Liberal elite are all pedophiles. Listen to what he says, but don't listen to what he says about himself. Because when he says he's not a member of QAnon, that's meaningless. When people say I'm not a men's rights activist because I'm not an activist. That's meaningless. It's whether or not you embody their arguments, you think their arguments are reasonable, and then whether you mean to or not, you will live as if their arguments are reasonable. I haven't wanted to teach on the men's rights movement because it's a very dark place to go. Especially when you start getting into the use of suicide rates and some of those components, some of those arguments that are prolific. But I'm going to have to. I would like to give a warning that we are going to do that. I think we're imminently going to have hopefully encompass it in one presentation. The arguments about the burdens men carry for providing for family. We can go back over speech. I've addressed that before, but not understood. Going to have to do a presentation that goes into self harm, depression and suicide. And if you think that's going to be hard to listen to, it hasn't been easy to study. But it's too prolific to leave. And it continues to warp people's concepts of where they stand on this line today. We're going to go into the court case of Johnny Depp and Amber heard. This is Gamergate 2.0.

[00:44:48.930] - Tess

We're living through prophecy. Do we realize that we are living through prophecy? Do we realize what this means to gender equality? That hasn't been pleasant. But there is far too much of this and a justification for people's misogyny, women as well as men. And what they continue to think is rational, reasonable, logical and fair, and it is not. An evolutionary psychologist. Arguing for biological inherent differences between men and women can make a robust argument that does not mean that they are right. A men's rights activist can make a robust argument for how gender stereotypes harm men. And they can use the suicide rate to do that. That does not make them right. It does mold whether or not someone in this movement is capable of being a radical feminist. I want to close, But I want to say something after we close. So please don't go immediately.

[00:46:15.370] - Tess

Dear Lord. We see how hard your work is. We see how deep these things lie. We see how hard they are to rid ourselves of them. Lord, I don't think people are seeing the ugliness of what exists in these arguments and in themselves. And I pray that we might. Not to crush people but to save them. I pray Lord that the ears who are blocked of hearing might hear, and the eyes that are shut might see. For their own sake. That people can be on the ship. Not on an iceberg, thinking they're on the ship. I pray this in Jesus name, Amen.