

16. The Far Left & their Multipolar Vision

Tess Lambert, 03.06.2022

Youtube Video

<https://youtu.be/a8QZporpLlq>

[00:00:06.670] - Raymond

Holy God, we come before you at the beginning of this Sabbath. A Memorial of creation. And we thank you for the the precious hours that we have now. Set aside from the beginning of the world for us to study who you are. We pray that as we come together under your Holy Spirit this evening, that you would help us to set aside everything that we think we know. And approach these studies with a solemn understanding of the time that we're living. We've seen so many things go on during the week. Please help us to understand the seriousness of what we're studying, to not take it for granted. And we may be united in our purpose and our understanding. I pray all these things in Jesus name, Amen.

[00:01:22.750] - Tess

Amen. Before we begin. Thank you to the person who suggested that we have the date on the board for every class. So all the photos of the board work are dated. It's my fault we haven't been doing that, but it would have been helpful if we had have been from the start. That the board work was dated. If I don't have the date at the beginning of every class, if you can, please remind me. We'll do that consistently from now on. If you're unsure about something that we've already discussed in the class and you feel that we've moved on or we might not be going back to it, or for any reason, please communicate that. I don't want us to keep moving on, while you have thoughts, questions, or comments about something that we've already been discussing. Then I don't think it's very useful to move on. But we are also unintentionally doing a type of circular learning. I forget the exact term for it. But we are coming back two points that we've covered before. To build upon them. And I think that that is useful. But there's no use building upon a foundation that hasn't made sense. So we can always step back into what has already been discussed.

[00:03:21.890] - Tess

I have felt a sense of frustration, because there are loose threads. That there are things that I wanted to say or read, and they get left behind because we get onto a point and we're heading that direction and you don't want to lose that momentum. We did that when we were discussing libertarianism, and then we went to the Trinity, and then we went to New Atheism. We really needed to follow that momentum with New Atheism and cover that subject. But we left some thoughts on libertarianism behind. We didn't get to talk about the militia groups. And some of that is, I think, quite useful. I've been thinking through the week of how to progress. Before we go further into culture, I want to go back and review a couple of things that we did months ago. And study it again, but from a slightly different direction. I'll explain more of that in a moment. I left the board work up behind us, but I'm going to erase one of the sides of the board.

[00:04:43.230] - Tess

I really like what we've done on New Atheism. Considering that this is ad hoc, I might erase this side of the board. So we have somewhere fresh to start with. There's a lot of things that have happened during the last week that are awful and negative. A lot to cry about. But I remembered too late that I never mentioned our election last weekend. But I was wondering if anyone had any thoughts, questions or comments on the election and our new government. I meant to bring that up last week, actually, and I completely forgot. While I'm erasing, I'll give people time to think.

[00:05:29.780] - Tess

Marie

[00:05:59.710] - Marie

It's very intriguing the way it's all gone. And I have wondered what does it mean? It seems to be going in a different direction to the norm. I would be very interested to hear what your thoughts are Elder Tess.

[00:06:25.790] - Tess

By the norm, do you mean the right wing swing? That global right wing?

[00:06:32.190] - Marie

Yes.

[00:06:39.570] - Tess

I think it's a characteristic of the culture war. There are two sides and there are victories and there are losses. 2014 is a good example for that. They gave LGBT people gay marriage. Which really was built more on freedom and equality. Freedom to marry who they want. But then they with Hobby Lobby. Not Hobby Lobby. The other one. What's the one that we kept putting on the board. Does anyone remember? Do you remember the court case, Ray? Do you remember?

[00:07:20.230] - Raymond

Is it the cake shop?

[00:07:22.150] - Tess

Yeah, the cake shop one.

[00:07:24.860] - Raymond

I remember the cake shop. I don't remember the name. Sorry.

[00:07:28.510] - Tess

That'll do. With that court case it wasn't about freedom, it was about equality. That was a win for freedom, but there was a loss for equality. And it goes back and forth. But what you had: 2008, election of Obama, you'd think the left is winning. The right wing capitalizes off that. They capitalize off the election of Obama. They play off the idea that they are the ones under threat. The Great Replacement Theory is one example of that. But there's many examples. The militia groups are mobilized around 2008 / 2009, because they're playing off this idea that they are the victims. They are the one threatened, not women, not minorities. It hasn't always been the left wing losing every fight. Obama was a victory. But then you see the reaction to that. Gay marriage was a victory. You see the reaction to that. Me too was a victory, this last week we've seen the reaction to that. It does go back and forth, but you can see the general trend. And what it does every single time the left wing wins, it ups the anger, it ups the fear. It gives the right wing something more to lack hold of. Something more to use to portray themselves as threatened.

[00:08:52.670] - Tess

That's why I think when the Media Broadcast announced the legalization of gay marriage in Switzerland, which was only last year. With that article announcing the legalization of gay marriage in Switzerland, we also put a warning. This is good. This is good news. But remember 2014. What came after? The backlash. And when Media Watch did their segment. I quite like ABC's Media Watch. And when they did their one directly after the election, the very last thought they left us with was: now we have a few years of watching the resistance. They didn't call it the opposition. And I thought that that was insightful language. It's not our new government, and the opposition. It's our new government and the resistance. There's hope. I introduced the election, because it's better news than we have in most of the things we could talk about to start with. But I think to answer your question, Marie. There's victories and losses all through this culture war. Sometimes, though, a victory can have negative consequences to how violent things become in the future. Does that make sense, Marie?

[00:10:22.050] - Marie

Yes, absolutely. I have been thinking along those lines, too. And I think Peter Dutton changing his approach and trying to paint a different face for the party is almost impossible. I think what we've been learning about the culture war, more so than religion. A leopard can't change its spots. And I don't think Peter Dutton is going to either. Three years time from now is probably going to be very interesting.

[00:11:06.190] - Tess

If you look at who's winning primaries and elections in the United States right now. They're not necessarily Donald Trump's candidates. People want those who are not necessarily better than the candidates that he's recommending, but those who paint it in a nicer picture. They put that same right wing conspiracy theory ideology. But some of the candidates who Donald Trump is not endorsing are as bad, but they're putting it in a nicer setting and people are voting for them. I agree with you. Just putting the same thing in a gilded frame doesn't make it any better. Scott Morrison was naive in thinking that he could behave and

speak the way he did to women especially, but also to other communities. He would still be speaking to a base that he wouldn't have any negative consequences to that. Brodie.

[00:12:20.190] - Brodie

I think that we are often a step behind the United States in Australia. There are some similarities in this election. The first one is that the people have reacted to an autocratic style of leadership. As you've mentioned, Scott Morrison had a very right wing style that really emulated Donald Trump in some ways. Another similarity is that our new government, it really has compromised leading up to the election. We saw that in its response to the religious discrimination bill. So as we expect to see compromise with the Democratic Party in the United States, we see that here. And another similarity is that they've been handed a bucket they can't fix. They're bandaiding a broken situation. But one of the key differences perhaps is that with our Labor Party, our new government isn't really left wing. It's more centrist. We don't have a true Democrat Party, do we.

[00:13:48.960] - Tess

If you think of the mainstream too, No! Which is why I voted Greens. And I know some of you were speaking about that. When you looked at their position on gender, it was the best on offer. Greens first and Labor second was the position that I took. They aren't a left wing party. They are obviously better than what was on offer. I think Biden and the Democrats took a similar approach to win the election as well. But I do think that Biden didn't necessarily try and disown the left with the energy that Albanese was trying to distance himself from left wing. Yes, that's a few good points. James.

[00:14:45.750] - James

I don't know if anyone knows this, but since I've been studying the Seven Mountains Mandate, Scott Morrison is actually a part of that movement. He's actually a member. And there's a couple of other high level that are actually part of the Seven Mountains Mandate.

[00:15:11.590] - Tess

Okay. I didn't know of his closer involvement. I know he's spoke on the Sunday morning at Hillsong, after he lost the election. Speaking about how all politicians, everyone in that role is called by God. It definitely did unite church and state in a way. He said that he was only in that role because God willed it and it was God's doing. It doesn't become hard to imagine that he had sympathies along those lines. I think anyone that takes their pastor on the plane to meet Donald Trump is someone to be a bit concerned about when you're approaching the Sunday law. You would think. I'd be interested to know what you're looking at there. It is interesting. And his ideology, unfortunately, is not gone. We know that.

[00:16:17.110] - Tess

Thank you to those who wanted to contribute on that. It has been an interesting election and we will see what happens. It's nice to see a few of the changes, though. I think particularly nice to see Penny Wong representing Australia internationally rather than what we've had the last few years.

[00:16:50.860] - Tess

I want to go back and pull together a few of the threads that we have left behind. I'll illustrate a plan. There's two key points that I wanted us to make in these classes. One of them we've already gotten to. We've already said, this is not church and state. It can't be. We are in a post Christian world. The test is global. But even within the United States itself, this is not church and state. That is not sufficient an explanation when it comes to gender. Gender is the original, the deepest. In Eden it didn't embedded itself in religion. It embedded itself in culture, every culture. And it spread from then to now universally. And it's culture that is at the root, at the heart of the problem. We can change our glasses. We can change our tint of how misogyny is practiced. But the core ideology is always the same because it's not in the glasses, it's in the eye. We're going to come back on that, to discussing culture when we get to our second main point. But if we were to go backwards, we started off with 1888. I'm not interested in that now. Because it's not part of what we're currently looking at.

[00:18:31.880] - Tess

It's not part of this theme. But if we were to go back to the beginning and tie off loose ends. Someone asked the question, how do you sift the left wing? And I said, if we want to know what's wrong with the left wing, we have to know what is wrong with the right wing. And the difference between the right wing and the left wing. I've given a review of the steps we've taken a few times now. So we don't lose touch with with each step we've taken on this journey. But I've oversimplified that part. We didn't straight away move from left wing to right wing. Instead, we spent at least one class. I think it was only one class on the left wing. We actually took time in looking into the left wing. Not the left, but the far left. We said, if there's a problem and something we need to sift, let's go to the far left and see what that looks like. What does that world look like? What do they believe? What do they say? And it's there that I want to return to today.

[00:19:35.520] - Tess

I want us to repeat and enlarge upon what we did with the far left. I'm going to ask anyone in a moment... And I might put a dot in the chat so I don't lose touch with where we were up to with questions or comments. I'm going to ask people in a moment to tell us what they remember from that class where we discussed the far left. And then we're going to review that today. This is the political spectrum. And this is the center. And that is right wing, and that is left wing. Someone asked, how do you sift the left wing? Some may have noticed that when I share articles or sources, when I quote, I have never shared and I have never quoted from Democracy Now. There's a reason for that. When I sift, I read or listen to Democracy Now, and I have seen so much in there to sift, I no longer consider it worthwhile even watching it. Let alone the danger of sharing it and having people imbibe what they get wrong.

[00:21:09.720] - Tess

I am sifting a lot in the left wing. Individual articles, but also whole sources. Whole sources that I do not consider worthwhile following. Especially if they're are videos, especially if they're opinion pieces. Not just videos, but news briefings like that or panel discussions. It makes it even harder to sift. But Democracy Now is one that I've pretty much sifted out entirely of anything that I watch or share. And there's reasons

for that. We might even get to some of that today. But someone asked, how do you assist this? And I said, oversimplifying, let's look at the right wing. What's the difference between right wing and left wing? We said right wing was freedom over equality, and left wing was equality over freedom. Now you need to be a functioning democracy to have that. Otherwise it gets more complicated. Because for example like China they don't really have either of the two. But equality is certainly what is the final goal. And in a country that is meant to be a democracy, you're meant to have equality. You can still have a certain amount of freedom in an authoritarian regime, if you're a certain type of individual.

[00:22:36.230] - Tess

But equality is not permitted. We went into the right wing. We looked at the right wing, and we saw Max and the Trinity. And there were three things that we saw here. We saw libertarianism, and we got quite far along in that journey, but we didn't complete it. I want to tie off those loose threads before we go further. Then we looked at atheism. We said about all that I want to say there, but I think it's something that's going to need to be reviewed. Because it is very hard to change our Adventist wide brains that want to see everything through a church, everything through religion. That has been so hardwired into us that even though, at the moment, I don't have much to add to that, I think it's going to need to be something that gets repeated and repeated because it's here that we can make such a strong point that this is cultural. That we are dealing with something cultural. And last week, we added to that argument by showing Dawkins position on Cathedral bells in Europe. And his supposed animosity towards religion, his hatred of Christianity, and yet his love of the Judeo Christian West.

[00:24:22.990] - Tess

Someone can love the Judeo Christian West and hate God and Christianity. It is possible. It sounds impossible, but it is possible to have that. Because the concept of a Judaic Christian West is more rooted in culture than religion. We can learn a lot from atheism and it needs to be repeated. Then we have, and I'm going to draw a bubble around this, men's rights. And what comes under men's rights? There's three points. I've put a bubble around this one, because on the trajectory we are following with these classes, I don't see a way to easily introduce this into the classes, as part of what we are discussing. So at some point in the near future we're going to have a single class, probably not a Friday night, maybe a Sabbath afternoon. At some other point in time we'll have a standalone class on just this. As it relates to the repeat of history. Of course, that being Millerite History. And arguments about suicide and men's mental health. Just to have one of the key arguments that people use inside this movement, to make men's rights activist arguments.

[00:26:01.830] - Tess

There are quite a lot of them. But these seem to come up quite frequently and I believe it's necessary to combat it. To show how easy it is to take a little bit of data... While something might sound good, the end of a trial this week showed the result of that. The result of that sympathy. Of mistaking who is the perpetrator and who is the victim. There is so much of that in this movement. As I've stated, it has to be addressed. But I believe that will be a standalone class, not part of this school. That's why I've put it over there. Then we need to come back around to studying the issue with the left wing. We're going to come back to the left wing, circular teaching. What we are reviewing again today, to understand how do we sift

this? And while we're doing this, we need to keep in mind 'culture'. I hope that makes a little bit more sense. That we have a plan of what we're going to do.

[00:27:31.090] - Tess

Does that make sense to everyone? Is anyone confused? Great. See some happy nodding. I want to tie up some loose ends and review what we did months ago with the far left. I've given some time in talking about that. And if anyone's reviewed their notes or they have a better memory than mine, does anyone remember what we said about the far left? One other point before we begin. While we're doing that this week, next week. I suspect it shouldn't take us more than two weeks to review the left wing and also finish off libertarianism. While we're doing that, to prepare us for dealing with culture and to prepare us for dealing with the issues with the left wing. There are a few key articles. I could flood people with a dozen articles a week, and expect everyone to sift them and find the specific point or paragraph that is helpful. I don't think that's a good use of anyone's time. Especially when so many people are even watching these classes are not reading the Media Broadcast. And I do not understand the point of what people are doing.

[00:28:58.880] - Tess

If they're studying two streams of information in these classes and then going and watching nonsense during the week. To put it mildly. It's defeating the purpose. But I'm not flooding with articles for a reason. There are a few very key articles that are like the Vox article. Ones that should be read, then should be reread. It should be copied and pasted and underlined and highlighted, so the points aren't lost. We've already shared the Vox article. I've got about three or four others, that will help prepare us when we come to this. When we are coming back around, and making our final arguments for the position that prophetically we should have as a movement. In preparation for that, I'm going to start sharing those articles and asking people to read them and reread them. And I'll share the first one at the end of today's class. And give context for it. Back to the left wing, what we're doing today. Does anyone remember when we did that? We tapped the left wing. We went to the far left. We went right to here. What will we find?

[00:30:24.870] - Tess

Will we find the most progressive people on the planet? Will we find the people who believe in absolute equality? What will we find? And we introduced one source of journalism, if we can call it that. And one journalist in particular, and then a couple of people who work for him. Does anyone remember any of those details? His name, the publication. Brenden.

[00:31:02.790] - Brenden

I believe it was Max Blumenthal. You got Max on one side, and Max on the other, is that right?

[00:31:11.490] - Tess

Yes. That's a good way to remember it. Actually, I hadn't thought of that.

[00:31:20.590] - Brenden

Not sure how much help I'll be moving forward now. I remember his name. I do remember that his net belief ended up being in agreement with the far right, and I can't remember specifically what that was. I can't remember what the topics were. But in summary, he was in agreement with those on the far, far right. And I can't remember what they were. I'm sorry.

[00:32:02.430] - Tess

That's fine. We're going to review it anyway. You've given us Max Blumenthal. Josephine.

[00:32:15.470] - Josephine

I had the same name as Brenden. I know he said that he's supposed to be as far left as possible. Many of his ideas are supported by the people in the far right. And they're placing him for lack for a better way. That's the one that I've chosen to sort of express what I remember about them. I think there's one other. Is that Norton, somebody in that same area. Is it Ben Norton?

[00:32:57.630] - Tess

Ben Norton. Yes.

[00:33:00.990] - Josephine

I remember that.

[00:33:01.860] - Tess

Wonderfull. Not him. You!

[00:33:04.110] - Josephine

Yeah, I understand.

[00:33:07.590] - Tess

Definitely not him.

[00:33:10.020] - Josephine

There is a third person. I can't remember. Maybe somebody else might want to have a try.

[00:33:17.310] - Tess

Thank you, Josephine. Katherine.

[00:33:22.230] - Katherine

I think we spoke a little bit about their ideas on foreign policy and American interventions. That's an area where the far left was finding some common ground with the far right. Can't remember a lot of specifics, I remember things like Palestine.

[00:33:51.890] - Tess

Yes. I don't want to leave us with the idea that the far left and the far right are the same. We're not necessarily going to come to an explanation today. A full explanation of why they are the way they are. Why the far left have the disposition to have these views that they have. Because I think that the answer to that is better built on a stronger foundation than me just stating it. And some of these articles are going to help build that foundation for us. I'm not necessarily wanting to give a full explanation today, in my words, of why they are the way they are. I would say that just like the left wing is equality over freedom and the right wing is freedom over equality, that even this far left is coming from a completely opposite platform to for example Tucker Carlson, or the far right. But as everyone seems to have remembered, that they end up having a few things in common, even though it's stemming from an opposite platform. Marie.

[00:35:12.190] - Marie

Is it possible that it was libertarian views that connected them to the right and some of their philosophies?

[00:35:29.490] - Tess

I don't believe so. It's an interesting thought. The last things I looked at, although I haven't investigated it to the extent you could, some of their positions on vaccines and lockdowns have been quite interesting, to say the least. But I think that the point where they join with the right wing is not so much on libertarianism. If there are not any more questions, I might go into the review so that I make some points rather than say what I think.

[00:36:15.400] - Tess

The web page that they have, the source that Max Blumenthal operates, is called the Gray Zone. This is the far left. I'll illustrate that in a moment. It was founded as a blog in December of 2015 by Max Blumenthal. I'll list some of the key individuals. Max Blumenthal, you've already given us. And Josephine, you said also Ben Norton. And there's a couple we'll add to that. Who are involved in the Gray Zone project. And there are others like The Gray Zone in the far left, other publications. The problems that we're going to see illustrated there are prolific through the left wing and particularly through some sources. In a watered down fashion through Democracy Now, which is why I said I don't watch them.

[00:37:31.280] - Tess

You can see that Tint. But we are going like going to Roy Hollander. We're going straight to where it is in its most pure, awful form. And then if you were to look back, you would see it diffused through other sources as well. And I'm going to start with seeing it in its most pure form, which is really at The Gray

Zone. And there are a few other publications like The Gray Zone, but it is probably the most widely read and the largest of its kind. Matt's Blumenthal had a father, Sidney Blumenthal, who was also a journalist. He was, I believe, an aide to Bill Clinton. He was quite known by the Clintons, but his journalism always was a little bit problematic and it became more and more problematic over time. The son, unfortunately, is like the father, but if you were to look at his father, also far left and also quite a number of problems with his journalism and his ethics as well. *"The Gray Zone was founded as a blog in December of 2015 bymatz Blumenthal. The blog was hosted on AlterNet"*, which is also a far left site.

[00:38:51.940] - Tess

It's not quite as far left as The Gray Zone, but it's still far left. "AlterNet hosted The Gray Zone as a blog from 2015 to 2018. And in 2018, The Gray Zone became completely independent. Its news content is generally considered to be fringe, with its content ideologically centered around the website's desire for a multi-polar world. If you go over to the far right, you and we've discussed this before. What world order are they looking at? What was Reagan looking for? What was George Bush senior looking for? How do they want the world to look? How do they want the world to look? George Bush sr. Josephine.

[00:39:57.540] - Josephine

A New world order? Is that what they're looking for?

[00:40:02.590] - Tess

And what's George Bush sr definition of the new world order?

[00:40:08.890] - Josephine

Sorry, I can't remember.

[00:40:13.910] - Tess

I might come back to you. Katherine

[00:40:17.410] - Katherine

The United States is like at the top.

[00:40:23.230] - Tess

Yes. And what would you call that?

[00:40:25.430] - Katherine

Uni-polar.

[00:40:27.130] - Tess

Yes. United States at the top in that uni-polar position. That's George Bush senior. That's Reagan. That's the right wing. Looking for this uni-polar world. Ray, was that what you were going to say? The Gray Zone is far left. And what they are not only discussing in a journalistic fashion, but what they're actually fighting for. Because they are quite activist. What they are fighting for is a multi-polar world. They want that multi-polar world. Again, I'm going to try and sell it. I'm going to try and say how it sounds good to us, and then I'm going to ask you whether or not you like that, and then I'm going to tear it all down if you'll let me. They are all about a multi-polar world. That is their central philosophy. Which means no great United States coming in and conducting regime change. No great United States interfering and meddling in foreign affairs. They oppose all Western imperialism. They completely oppose US foreign intervention, such as the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. But other forms of foreign intervention as well. Including foreign conducting foreign influence campaigns.

[00:41:55.330] - Tess

And they hold the United States responsible for their compromises, for their hypocrisy in their foreign policy. Does that sound good? Multi-polar world hold the United States and the west accountable for imperialism and for colonialism. Have I sold it. I picked on Moli last time I wanted to sell something. I don't know if he's on now. Moli, does that sound good? I see you. Might be having a little trouble. That's fine. Brenden, does that sound good? Just the picture not asking you to commit for what you don't know or don't remember.

[00:43:02.090] - Brenden

I think it sounds reasonable, but I see some problems.

[00:43:09.530] - Tess

What problems do you see?

[00:43:14.190] - Brenden

Well, if there's no intervention by some Democratic country, the oppression of human beings will continue and get worse. There's got to be a check somewhere.

[00:43:42.670] - Tess

The oppression of who? By who? Generally.

[00:43:53.210] - Brenden

With authoritarian regimes. They generally oppress women more than anyone. There needs to be a check on authoritarian regimes globally to protect most vulnerable, or women, and other minorities.

[00:44:22.670] - Tess

So you're pro regime change?

[00:44:32.270] - Tess

What do you do if it's 2001 and you care about women and the Taliban run Afghanistan. Can you see the problem?

[00:44:51.950] - Brenden

Yeah, I think I'll hand that one to someone else. I can see Barack Obama's challenges. When you're facing situations like this. It's very complicated. But at the end of the day, you still got people being human beings being persecuted. You can't just stand by.

[00:45:26.150] - Tess

I've known the movement has had a problem for a long time. These classes are me venting after a few years of being gagged by COVID. But I've been tracing the movement issues within the left wing and the not sifting for a long time. And at no point did that stand out more clearly to me. The dangerous path members were on until the United States withdrew from Afghanistan. And I saw individuals response to the end of the Afghanistan war. And I thought, we are in trouble as a movement. We're getting to the heart of why that was. It's nearly a year ago that Elder Parminder and I put out on the media broadcast a statement that was accusatory and did upset a lot of people. It was weaponized against us, when we said, what are people in the movement thinking? And that was a moment of panic for me. Because, like you said, you draw it back and you can already start to see a problem with that leftward argument. What do you do with some of these regimes? But if you go to especially the far left, then the US intervention, regime change. It's not only hypocritical, it's colonialism and it's imperialism.

[00:46:54.630] - Tess

And then they will do the comparison. That we have done with the movement. And say, the United States is no better. But is it? Are we meant to compare or are we meant to compare and contrast? Is there not a contrast for a reason? These are the difficult questions that we have to discuss when we get into the left wing. We won't have all the answers today, but we're coming back around. This is something that we are going to have to handle with care. Because so many members are down the wrong stream of left wing. Because they're watching this, they're not reading the media broadcast. When I say people are out on their own, I know what sources they're listening to. They don't even realize how much of this has become problematic. But it's been an issue for a long time. I'm excited to deal with some of these things, and I hope people are willing to change some of their thinking, like they did in 2018. Katherine, I think your hand was up in the midst of our discussion. Did I miss you at all?

[00:48:12.590] - Katherine

That's okay. It was earlier on. Before Brenden spoke, I put my hand up as well. Just like he said. This idea of the United States standing by while abuse is going on in other nations. And how that it is a problem to just not help. And the other comment that I wanted to make: this philosophy reminds me of during the Millerite era with the slavery issues. The Southern states wanted to have their state rights and they didn't want any intervention. They wanted to have a multi-polar country. And that wasn't right in that time period. Just seems like this is the same thing, but on a bigger scale.

[00:49:25.350] - Tess

The more I look back at the thinking back then, the more you can see that it's so similar to today in some ways. And that's our Alpha history, the Alpha history of the Papacy is the world wars. And there is so much of that mindset as well that is worth tapping into, to help understand today. Thank you, Katherine.

[00:49:50.010] - Tess

I want to screen share to make a couple of points. This is Democracy Now. Not the Gray Zone. You can see where they sit on the right wing, left wing chart. And they are here on the left wing. I'll discuss them more at the end. This is The Gray Zone. They are as far left as you can get. Just to prove that point so you can see it. I will take you to their website. This is The Gray Zone. Independent news and investigative journalism on empire. You can see that what they're particularly targeting, the focus of their news and journalism is on empire, empiricism. And that in the context of the United States. They're very much focused on the need for a multi-polar world and for the United States to back off.

[00:51:30.410] - Tess

I scroll down, it'll give the masthead. Max Blumenthal, founder, editor in chief reporter. Ben Norton, assistant editor, reporter, video producer. The two other names that I wanted to include are Aaron Maté and Anya Parampil, and they will both come up. I've added them to our board. That is The Gray Zone. They support a multi-polar world and oppose US imperialism. They oppose empire building. What they see is modern colonialism and US interference in foreign affairs. They support that multi-polar world, they also support Syria, the regime of Bashar Assad. Probably more focus of their attention than anything else over the last years, has been defending the regime of Assad. They support the regime of Maduro in Venezuela. They support Vladimir Putin in everything, including in the current Ukraine war. To reiterate, on the current invasion of Ukraine, they support Vladimir Putin and Russia. When it comes to the genocide of the Uighur population, Muslim minority population in China, they support China and the state government. They support the regime of China, of Russia, of Venezuela and of Syria. That is them supporting a multi-polar world and opposing US foreign intervention.

[00:53:24.050] - Tess

That's a few of them. The main ones. The main ones that we would hear about in the news. Quote: *"Along this vein, the website has supported the government of Assad in Syria, publishing content denying that the Syrian government used chemical weapons against civilians during the Syrian civil war. They maintain a pro Kremlin editorial line. The website published pro Russian propaganda during the Russian invasion of Ukraine, including the debunked claim that Ukrainian fighters were using civilians as human*

shields. Nirma Gelassic, writing in the *Index on Censorship*, describes the Gray Zone as a Kremlin connected online outlet that pushes pro Russian conspiracy theories and genocide denial. In March 2020, the English version of Wikipedia deprecated the use of Grey Zone formally as a source for facts and its articles." If anyone wants to update an English Wikipedia page, you're not allowed to use the Gray Zone, because the English with Wikipedia recognized that they are factually unreliable to the point they cannot be used as a source on anything.

[00:54:46.330] - Tess

I want to give a couple of more screen shares. One of the main basis of what they're saying is that everything is Western imperialism. The United States has messed up this world. Everything new continues to be the United States, the west meddling, interfering. Part of that, they believe, occurred in 2014 when you had the Ukrainian Revolution of 2014. They believe that that was a United States CIA orchestrated plot. Which is also what the Kremlin teaches. And they believe that Zelensky is a far right white nationalist neo-Nazi. A lot of it is couched in such complicated language. And they bring defenses to it and arguments to it that become a little bit difficult to unpick. There is truth to the fact that there is an issue with Nazism in portions of the Ukrainian military. The same way when you look at Navalny. Navalny is not a very good character. If you didn't have to compare him to Vladimir Putin. If you compare him to Vladimir Putin, then yes, you would want Navalny let out and you would want him to topple Putin. If there was no Putin and they had a democracy, you'd never want Navalny in power. There are some of these issues, but the way they use those issues, amplify them, add to them, twist them out of context. At the end they have a completely incorrect world view.

[00:56:38.740] - Tess

I'm going to share screen and include some of what they say and what they do. This is from their Twitter feed, the Gray Zone. US agencies have trained and empowered Nazis and ultra nationalists at home and abroad to fight Russians in Ukraine. The program follows the blueprint established by Western intelligence agencies in Afghanistan and Syria. They're saying that in Afghanistan and Syria the United States trained and mobilized Nazis and fascists to oppose the completely legitimate governments that they already had. We've listed some of the main ones, but also when it comes to Nicaragua, from 2018 to 2022, ongoing, there were protests against the Nicaraguan government. The government killed hundreds and injured thousands. And the Gray Zone said this was a justified response. "*The Inter American Commission on Human Rights documented in detail the killings, torture, and threats made by the government towards demonstrators. But the Gray Zone said that these were a justified response. They celebrated Daniel Ortega and parroted the Nicaraguan government claims that the protest movement was not legitimate, but part of a Western led international conspiracy.* Again, for them, the great demon, the great villain is the West, is the United States. This is what they see as Western / US imperialism creating a uni-polar world.

[00:58:26.170] - Tess

We looked at some of their sources when we did this. Some of this is repetition. But I'm adding a little to it. We looked at some of their sources. I want to screen share. I'll show you Max Blumenthal, because he might come up. When you see someone brought on as a panelist in a discussion. Let's see if this works,

because sometimes it doesn't. You might see him around. That's Max Blumenthal. His face was familiar to me. I do believe that I have seen him before as well on some publications. But that is Max Blumenthal, the founder of the Gray Zone. To share their views, they have also united with a number of other individuals. Paul Antonopoulos. Paul Antonopoulos created the website South Front. Now there is a Nazi site called Storm Front. And Paul Antonopoulos named his site South Front to mirror. To draw the same crowd as a Nazi site. And when people went into Storm Front, the Nazi site, they found Paul Antonopoulos as a member and active on that side. You have someone who is acting, speaking out on a Nazi web page. Antonopoulos said,

[01:00:05.990] - Tess

"I think of white Australia is pretty much a long gone now with the influx of Chinese, Koreans and Sudanese. I believe all whites should migrate to Victoria and Tasmania, let the immigrants in other states kill each other, overdose, rape each other, etc. Don't get me started on the Jews."

[01:00:24.630] - Tess

Paul Antonopoulos, that's what he said on Storm Front. He created his own site modeled after it, called South Front. It was shut down. And when it was shut down, Max Blumenthal said that the shutting down of this site was a coordinated attack on English language sites known for defending the Syrian government and presenting its perspective. Paul Antonopoulos, essentially a Nazi, also supported the Syrian government of Assad. And when he's shut down for creating essentially a Nazi site, Matt Blumenthal defends him and says this is a conspiracy. It's a take down of all those supporting Assad. It's part of this Western cover up. That's one of the people who celebrates and supports. Both of them supported each other in saying that Assad never used chemical weapons. This is the CIA building support for their attempts at regime change. Max Blumenthal wrote a book. It's called The Management of Savagery.

[01:01:30.090] - Tess

It's essentially a book blaming the United States imperialism and war machinery for the Syrian war. One of his sources for this book works for the AfD, which is the far-right anti-immigrant alternative for Germany party. And he equated the suffocation of George Floyd with US sanctions targeting Assad in Syria. He said, like George Floyd was suffocated a knee on the neck. So US sanctions are a knee on the neck of Assad and other governments. It's US unilateralism and imperialism at work. Any comments so far? Is this bringing it back? There's a bit more information, but this is what we discussed before when we went to the far left. Can you see how they're starting from a different platform? This isn't about celebrating the United States. The United States is not the hero here. The United States is the villain. But you'll have Tucker Carlson defend Russia and Putin, and then you'll have Max Blumenthal defend Russia and Putin. This is what many of you were saying before. You see them come together. You see the far right and the far left. But I want us to see how they're starting from an opposite platform. Opposite position on the United States. Opposite position on foreign intervention. Anya Parampil has been hosted four times on Tucker Carlson.

[01:03:19.670] - Tess

Why does he like to host her? The views unite. Her views on what? Immigration and Hillary Clinton. Ben Norton has particularly gone hard on supporting China in presenting the view that the Uighur genocide is a carefully orchestrated racist conspiracy theory to try and stop China rising up and taking the United States place in the world. That it is part of the United States racist efforts to denigrate and suppress China. In doing this, he has then taken the position, that the Uighur genocide didn't happen. They don't deny that China has put a certain amount of the minority Uighur population into work camps. But he has shared the views, retweeted and endorsed the views of a Chinese Han supremacist justification for the genocide, which is the mainstream Chinese Culture. This Han supremacist said, *"China is not enslaving Uighur in work camps. This is government affirmative action."* Affirmative action is a good thing. They're deliberately not employing Han workers, the mainstream Chinese population, but conducting affirmative action by hiring the unproductive, aka lazy Muslim workers, at the expense of the majority population. They're painting this as a formative action.

[01:05:30.170] - Tess

Another quote from the same source, *"the Turk is the eternal enemy of the Han genetic lineage. And racial warfare is not only a historic but biological inevitability that serves both eugenic and prosocial purposes."* Quite positive about racial warfare. The Han's are considered the true genetic lineage, the true Chinese. And we also read his quote on Chinese female journalists. He said that Western people only want to hear women Chinese journalists, because the Jews, who are the ones making all the hiring decisions in the west, apparently, prefer pretty young Chinese women as journalists. These Chinese women pandering to their boomer ideology of these Jews. And these Chinese women won't even have children, which makes their Chinese parents cry. And these Chinese women are being employed taking the jobs of Chinese men who tend to be more independent. So, when you go down that line of thought, you're going to find misogyny. And I used that quote as some evidence of that. This is Ben Norton, but it's really the entire publications, and all of that far-left wing stream has much the same ideology against Western imperialism.

[01:07:12.200] - Tess

It sounds good, but then look what it is in reality. Let's come back and look at Afghanistan and say if you were Obama, what would you do? No comments so far. Just a bit more on Ben Norton. I want to quote him. He says that *"the New York Times engages in anti-China propaganda, that the New York Times is a mouthpiece of the US government that exists to manufacture consent for new wars and Imperial conquests. All of these corporate media stories on China and Xinjiang are the same. They are weaponized disinformation in the new Cold War on China, brought to you by Western governments, NATO and the weapons industry. To portray a voluntary employment as dastardly Chinese forced labor, this New York Times imperial stenographer relies on anti-China "expert" from a warmongering think tank. Another extremely a dubious New York Times story on China's Xinjiang region originated with outlandish claims by the so called Uighur Human Rights Project, a separatist group created / funded by US government regime change arm, a CIA cut out."* They blame NATO, they blame the CIA. They say the New York Times is a mouthpiece for the weapons industry and Western governments.

[01:08:40.230] - Tess

And with all of that, then they deny the genocide outright. Aaron Nate. He was a producer and a writer for Democracy Now. I start to make my point. We're looking at the extreme. When I watch Democracy Now and I watched them handle the Afghanistan war. They probably wouldn't have him on now. Max Blumenthal, Ben Norton, they're really unhappy with Democracy Now. Max Blumenthal used to be interviewed and speak on Democracy Now. Some of these people used to be quite involved with it. As I said, Aaron Nate was a producer and writer for Democracy Now. While the most extreme views you will not hear on Democracy Now, there is a flavor that still exists. It still exists, particularly when they come to the United States and they start dealing with foreign policy. Even before I knew that any of this existed, I watched Democracy Now and picked up on it enough that I gave up trusting them as a source on any subject, especially on foreign policy. The Gray Zone isn't the only far left source to take these positions. There's something called Counterpunch, another called Popular Resistance, another called LA Progressive.

[01:10:07.280] - Tess

These are all far left publications. The same people who take pro-Beijing positions on Xinjiang often follow suit on China's ongoing crackdown in Hong Kong. Popular Resistance is one example. Again far left. Quoting them. *"What is happening in Hong Kong is not actually a people's uprising for democracy, but at tool for anti-china rhetoric and great power conflict."* Western imperialism. Popular Resistance has repeatedly cited Gray Zone in its coverage of Xinjiang and republished Haiphong's Black Agenda Report article. And another quote from that same source I read from by codastory.com, *"left wing support and equivocation for authoritarian regimes is by no means a new phenomenon. In the past, notable figures such as Noam Chomsky and Alexander Cockburn have questioned the scale of atrocities committed by the Karma Rouge and Stalin. These positions have generally been rooted in anti-imperialism and a deep suspicion of America's dominance in global affairs."* In this article they show the problem with Gray Zone. The last two paragraphs I read were from them. They show what Gray Zone, but also other publications are doing now, under the banner of multi-lateralism. And then they say, this is not that new.

[01:11:47.120] - Tess

If you go back and look at Noam Chomsky and I did. Noam Chomsky was much more careful in the language that he used. He was not quite so open, but it still existed. He was so against Western imperialism. His position on some of these issues of foreign governments in light of what he's known today is deeply problematic. This is a more embedded left wing problem than for us to take Max Blumenthal. Like you said before, Brenden, this is a Max and this is a Max. It's a symbol for thinking that permeates farther than the most extreme, which is why I used Democracy Now as an example. Certainly not the only one. *"Many on the US left take issue with a hegemonic position occupied by their country. But very few end up defending Assad's bombing of the Syrian people or Xi Jinping's mass incarceration of religious and ethnic minorities. However, publications such as A Grey Zone function on a purely ideological level based on a desire for a multi-polar world in which global military, cultural, and economic power is distributed among multiple nation states and Western influence greatly diminishes. They've been quick to argue on behalf of authoritarian regimes such as China and Syria."* "Grey Zone functions on an

ideological level a desire for a multi-polar world, a desire for a world in which the military, cultural, and economic power is more evenly distributed."

[01:13:34.540] - Tess

When they do that, I think we should spend some time in our minds seeing how good that looks, and then the reality. Which is what we've been doing for a while now, see how good it sounds, and then look at the reality. And start dealing with some of the harder questions. We want to criticize the United States war in Afghanistan. Sure, a lot was terrible and they did a lot wrong. But it's easy to slip into a different camp and start making dangerous arguments. So, as I said before, this isn't a conclusion. We're not stating why they get things this wrong. Perhaps you can already start to form a picture of why they get things this wrong. This is the start of reintroducing the left wing and the problems with the left wing. We looked at the right wing. We saw their position of freedom over equality. Part of that is their desire for a unilateral world. They want the United States to have an awful lot of freedom at the expense of equality of other nations.

[01:14:45.470] - Tess

But when you look for the multi-polar, if you don't keep a grip on equality, you start to see what happens, especially on the equality of women. We need to know what and 2016 were designed to teach us, because 2016 is the increase of knowledge for the midnight cry. And 2016 was two elections, July and November. Clinton versus Trump, but also Clinton versus Bernie Sanders. And I would like to say at that one point, look at the people supporting Bernie Sanders over Hillary Clinton in 2016. There's some problems there. If we don't have any other thoughts or questions. I will wind this up for now, and introduce the article that I wish to give us to read this week. Brenden.

[01:16:02.960] - Brenden

It seems the left has their own version of a deep state and a whole range of conspiracy theories to support their ideology. Just like the right. I guess they're very similar. They almost work on the same principle, but there's a very bright contrast as well. Not sure what I'm trying to say. I think I need to let it sink in.

[01:16:59.970] - Tess

What I didn't go into in more detail. An important point that shouldn't be missed is how popular the Gray zone is. Between December 2019 and early 2021. By about 14 months, the main Chinese government news networks shared Gray Zone articles over 300 times. Over 300 times in 14 months, once every few days. They are extremely popular. Max Blumenthal extremely popular on Russia Today, on Sputnik, with Kremlin propagandist machines. He came out and fought and attacked. When Russia Today was listed as a propagandist site in the United States. He fought against that. He is extremely popular. He has been to Venezuela. He was given an award by Maduro in person. They are popular within these regimes. They've traveled to Syria. It's not Tucker Carlson. It's Assad knows they exist. Putin knows they exist, and they're using this. But what I want us to see. We can demonize Tucker Carlson all we like. We can see where they unite. But they are not saying the same thing. Tucker Carlson might like to have Anya Perampil on

his show to say how bad Hillary Clinton is. They agree on that. But the reasons that they think that she is so bad come from a completely different opposite platform.

[01:18:58.030] - Tess

And I don't want us to lose sight of it. I really don't want people to start saying, well, the far left and the far right are the same. Remember, if somebody asked me, are you a feminist or are you a men's rights activist? I would know. I would say I'm a feminist. If someone says, are you left wing or are you right wing, I wouldn't know. I am left wing. But I'm not just a feminist. Liberal feminism is not feminism. Cultural feminism is not feminism. They can call it feminism, but it is not. And the more we get into understanding the culture, the more strong that point becomes. I don't want people to say, well, the left wing and the right wing are the same. But I thought the midnight cry was meant to turn us left wing. It was, we are. The same way the increase of knowledge for the Sunday law was meant to turn us into feminists, not men's rights activists. But we need to be sure about what feminism is. Feminism has to be radical. Only true feminism is radical. It's the same with the left wing. If we're going to prioritize equality over freedom, then we need to be sure about how we're doing that, and that's what we're doing now.

[01:20:18.950] - Tess

There's a couple of hands, but I don't want to get in trouble. So I'm closing for time again. Please write down your questions or thoughts if you think that you might forget them. We're not doing this to have all the answers today. We're doing this to remind us of what we did before we ever went to talking about how we moved to the left wing in the first place. This preceded us going back to 2018 and saying, why are we left wing? Then we went to the right wing. Then we discussed Max and the Trinity Doctrine, all in the context of freedom over equality. We went into libertarianism. We're going to do that next week. Go into the militia groups. Have one look at libertarianism. Unless something comes up not heavily review atheism. Then I want to come back to this. In the context of culture with a couple of articles that I really want you to read. The first one of those articles I will screen share. I will screen share the title with you. It's by the Raoul Wallenberg Institute. I did have a couple of things to say to explain this, like the Vox article.

[01:22:00.870] - Tess

It's one that needs to be read more than once. You can open it and actually listen to it on YouTube. I'll explain that in a moment. Raoul Wallenberg Institute. It is titled "Do not Dare to Tell Me Human Rights are not universal". Anna Lindh was a politician in Sweden. She was assassinated, I think, about 15 years ago, going back quite some time. Anna Lindh was assassinated by a man who had a hatred of politicians. She passed away. In her honor this University in Sweden conducts a yearly lecture that's to be given by a distinguished scholar, politician, diplomat, or international top level civil servant. This is Lund University in Sweden. This is their once a year lecture. It's known as the Anna Lindh Lecture, in respect and honor for the Swedish politician who was assassinated. She was assassinated in 2003. What I want to share is the lecture that was given in 2017. It was given by the UN High Commissioner for human rights, Mr. Zayed Rayad Al Hussain. In 2014, he was appointed to be the United Nations High Commissioner for Human rights. And he served from 2014 to 2018.

[01:23:54.640] - Tess

This particular lecture he delivered in 2017. It's titled from something he says about halfway through where he says, "*Do not dare to tell me human rights are not universal*". And I want us to see the context in which he's saying that. He was popular in the human rights community. If you want to, you can open and read or listen to his entire lecture here. It is quite lengthy to listen to because it has heavy introductions at the beginning and then it ends also with questions at the end. Many of the questions I didn't find particularly useful. He's careful in what he says, because, of course, people are speaking up and saying, how are you going to stop what is occurring in Syria? And I don't know how people necessarily expect him to stop what is happening in Syria. First of all, please read it. I think we'll learn more when we read and then when we reread. But if you do go and listen to it, someone asks a question. There's a couple of questions that people ask him that aren't included in the transcript that you read that I think are worth listening to.

[01:25:45.510] - Tess

One of them is a fellow who asks a quite libertarian question. But it's like an international libertarian question. Not just libertarian, but what is connected to libertarianism, that idea of non accusatory language. And he says, why do you need these international courts? Why do you need to be attacking people? Why can't you reason with governments and work with governments? It's the exact type of libertarianism that we've been fighting inside this movement. And I found it interesting to see that similar flavor of question asked to the Human Rights Commissioner. And his answer is worth listening to. Why they need law, why they need to be able to hold these governments accountable to essentially attack them. I'm sure that this man, the human rights Commissioner, is not perfect. He's actually a Prince. A Jordanian Prince. But he became quite popular in the human rights community because he speaks simply, he speaks plainly. He speaks pointedly. So much so that Russia complained about him in the UN in 2016 because Russia did not like the way he was speaking about Donald Trump. He had serious concerns about Donald Trump's candidacy, as you would expect for the human rights Commissioner.

[01:27:14.190] - Tess

He was known to speak quite plainly. And some people have been very concerned for his safety, because of how plainly he spoke about human rights, including women's rights. And if we could read that article, I will share it. I'll have Elder Terry share that on the Vespers forum. When we're done, if we could read and reread the transcript of his speech, I think it would be a worthwhile contribution to what we are discussing about culture. It's one of the few articles that I think are crucial to building upon what we are saying. Katherine, would you mind closing for us? I'm sorry I didn't get to the last hands raised.

[01:28:04.570] - Katherine

Okay.

[01:28:09.610] - Katherine

Dear God. There is so much going on in the world. There is so much going on among our selves. As we try to grapple with all those nuances and details and complexities of the left wing and the right wing. Geopolitics. We try to understand the issues of gender. We observe the world changing so rapidly and things progressing in ways that really confirm this message. And this is a very awesome time. I think many of us feel the weight of the responsibility that we carry as a movement. And we ask that you please help us to understand what we're being taught. It does require a lot of rewiring in our brains, a lot of serious contemplation, and serious dedication. Spending time to read and reread. And really spend time and give priority to study. I pray that you remind us of that responsibility. Thank you so much for presentations that have been given. Thank you for Elder Tess leading the study tonight. And ask for a special blessing. As we continue to follow your guidance and transfer that information and knowledge to us. We ask for a blessing for the leaders and for all of us. Thank you so much for this Sabbath. That we have special time for studying. In Jesus name, Amen.

[01:30:25.350] - Tess

I want to encourage us before we close. We did all of this to make one point. It was a lot of material and it makes everything sound complicated. We go through all of that and we say it's not church and state. And I think it can cause this fear. And I go through that just like you do, of thinking this is all so complicated. But when you come out of the other end, it's not. I'm hoping we can start to see that. When you come out the other end and see that sexism is embedded in culture and that's why these four men are so deeply misogynistic. When you see that. All of this is really to try and help us change the wiring in our brain. So that when we say that it's culture and not Christianity, it makes sense. It's changing those thought processes. But the conclusion is really that simple. To say it's embedded in culture. Therefore, you don't need Christianity. And if you got grow up under these men, then you'll be misogynistic with, a blue tint. When you grow up Islamic, you'll be misogynistic with a green tint.

[01:31:52.890] - Tess

When you grow up Christian, you'll be misogynistic with an orange tint. Some glasses are worse than others. Some manifestations are more awful. Some comes out in different ways. Some are impacted. Of course, there is that element of being convinced of it, because someone will give you a Bible verse. I'm watching my friends, that I grew up with, leave Adventism. They didn't leave Adventism and become atheist and become any less sexist than when they were Adventist. They might have been more okay with people doing different things that are not Christian traditionally. But none of them were less sexist, not one was less misogynistic, because it's not rooted in the glasses, it's in the eye. I'm hoping that using that as an example, we're doing the same thing with the left wing. We're showing the complication of it, so that when we show the hopefully simple conclusion and when we come out the other end we'll be able to identify the problem on our own more easily. And then we'll be able to try and undo the damage done in our own minds, through wrong left stream information. I only say that to make the point.

[01:33:27.440] - Tess

It looks complicated, but the conclusion isn't. The conclusions are really simple. And I'm hoping that in the complications no one despairs. That's all I wanted to add. Next week maybe we'll review a few things because there were some hands up and I don't want to leave them unanswered. And then we're going to

tidy up libertarianism and the militia groups. By that time I will have shared the three main articles that are the building blocks, for what we will say about the left wing. That's all. Thank you, everyone. And happy Sabbath. Always a pleasure to be with you.