

17. War with the Neocons

Tess Lambert, 10.06.2022

Youtube Video

<https://youtu.be/fxVWxINicbo>

[00:00:06.010] - Graeme

Dear Lord, thank you for this day that we've been blessed to receive. Thank you for the Holy Sabbath hours that have come upon us. As we come before you this evening Lord, we ask you our help, please. Sexism is so deeply ingrained within us, and we want to change this. And as we look at this, the problems associated with also the left wing ideology. God bless us, to undo the damage that has been done and that we've allowed done to us. That we may be better fit to serve your needs and to be a blessing to our fellow humans. In Jesus name we pray, Amen.

[00:00:53.130] - Tess

Amen. I thought if people didn't mind to carve out a little space at the beginning of each week. Maybe not everywhere week, probably most weeks. Just a little spot at the beginning to say something that's disconnected from the classes we've been doing. Sometimes I come across something and I think it's worth sharing, worth saying. I had two for this week that I wanted to address. I guess it's a little bit of prelim and then we'll get back in and continue with classes. I don't want to take up half of the class with a separate subject, so I might do one of them and see how long it takes. I wanted to remind people of a court case. In the media it's commonly said that every single Australian knows this court case. But I'm not really sure how fair it is to say that. I know nearly half of the people in the community where I live, nearly half of the people here were not born in Australia. So a case that occurred over 40 years ago, it's problematic to say every Australian must know it. But is there anyone here who doesn't know the name Lindy Chamberlain?

[00:02:33.930] - Tess

If you could put your hand up in the chat. If you don't know who Lindy Chamberlain is. I'll give people a few moments. Maybe you've heard the story and the name passes your mind. Maybe it'll come back to you. But I will explain a little background for you. I won't go into detail. It was a court case from 1980. They were Adventists. I think he was an Adventist pastor. They were a young family. They had a number of young sons and they finally had a baby daughter. She was about six weeks old. Azaria Chamberlain. And they went camping at Uluru. It's about mid 1980. And they're camping at a popular campground at Uluru. There's other people there. There are other people camping here in the center of Australia. And Lindy Chamberlain notices that a dingo has crept into the campsite and has snatched her baby daughter. And she screams to all the campers "a dingo ate my baby". The entire nation was following what took place.

[00:04:28.840] - Tess

"In 1980 at Uluru, at the red heart of Australia, a two month old baby went missing from the local camping ground. Her parents, Lindy and Michael Chamberlain, claimed Azaria had been taken by a dingo. Trackers, and police searched the flat, dusty area and patchy bush land but found nothing. Initially, the Chamberlains were believed. But a week after the disappearance, police found the baby's jumpsuit, bloodied and torn. And the media, without evidence, suggested that Lindy Chamberlain had murdered her daughter. She was young, attractive, energetic, working class, and she infuriated the media and public from the start. She looked the cameras in the eye. She didn't break down. She spoke in a resolute monotone. She snapped at reporters when they asked inappropriate questions. She wouldn't play the role of anguished mother in front of the cameras that was expected of her, and she refused to bow to baseless accusations. Newspapers, TV and radio reports across the country incited the public to find Lindy Chamberlain's demeanor suspicious and suggested her claim of dingo aggressiveness was without basis. Despite the fact that the local Ranger had for two years been asking local authorities to initiate a cull for dingoes that had become threatening. They reported that she dressed her baby in black. The 60 Minutes interview with her was titled 'Did You Kill Azaria?' To calm media and public hysteria, the coroner of the first inquest announced on live TV his findings that the Chamberlain's innocent, saying he wanted to put to a stop to "the most malicious gossip ever witnessed in this country.

[00:06:17.090] - Tess

"Unrepentant, the police continued their investigations, and the media held to its line that Lindy Chamberlain had cut the throat of her daughter. After a second inquest and a trial, Lindy Chamberlain was sentenced to life imprisonment for murder. Although no body or weapon had been found and no motive established. Protesters outside the courthouse carried signs that read, don't shoot animals for human lies. The dingo is innocent. And, free her? No hang her. Heavily pregnant throughout the trial, she gave birth in Darwin Hospital and was then returned to jail. Meanwhile, 'a dingo took my baby' became a punchline across the world, finding its way into scripts for Seinfeld and The Simpsons." Today, we would say, finding its way into the scripts of Saturday Night Live. "Three years after being incarcerated, police found by happenstance evidence that proved her innocence. She was released immediately, with accompanying shamefaced government apology. In the next trial, expert witnesses claimed that marks on the baby's jumpsuit were in fact consistent with marks made by the teeth of a dingo."

[00:07:27.210] - Tess

"20 years after Lindy Chamberlain was pardoned, another mother came under the media's attack. In 2007, Madeleine McCann went missing. In the beginning, people were sympathetic, but it didn't take them long to turn on the mother. Madeline's mother was too attractive, too thin, and she was suspiciously composed. Like Lindy Chamberlain, Kate McCann was criticized for not crying enough. When one reporter suggested this was because an abduction specialist had told her not to reward a kidnapper with a shell of emotion. People suggested only a certain type of woman could follow that advice."

[00:08:15.390] - Tess

Baseless claims were made. Lindy Chamberlain called out the media in this time period for treating Kate McCann the same way she was treated. She said in one interview, *"how can you apologize to me and do this again to someone else?"*

[00:08:42.590] - Tess

I want to read from another article. It's from 2020. *"It marks 20 years since Lindy Chamberlain life spiraled into a never ending nightmare."* They say there's not a person in Australia who doesn't know this case. I'm not so sure that's accurate. *"The truth in this case was less appealing to a pack of hungry journalists and a skeptical public fueled by gender bias. A dingo taking a baby from a tent in the middle of the Outback became more farfetched than the possibility of her mother carrying out a convoluted ploy and cutting the throat of her daughter a few feet away from several possible witnesses. She was judged cold, callous, emotionless, blank. Of course, her quote became popular because the media and public never perceived Lindy Chamberlain as a human. She was a monster well before her trial even began. And a quote uttered by a grieving mother was used and is still used to mock and diminish a horrific accident. It became an iconic pop culture reference. When I think of how Lindy Chamberlain must have felt about this, I'm filled with a clawing sense of shame and heartbreak. How could we get this so wrong?"*

[00:09:56.640] - Tess

How could a public and a media and Hollywood Seinfeld, The Simpsons all take such a horrific quote and horrific experience and turn it into a mocking pop culture reference? What was Seinfeld and The Simpsons back then, is today Twitter, social media influencers and Saturday Night Live.

[00:10:19.890] - Tess

"The answer is simple, but it brings no solace. Lindy Chamberlain did not fit the bill for how a grieving mother should look. It didn't matter that not a single skerrick of hard evidence pointed to her guilt. It didn't matter that the apparent blood spatter found in her car was actually paint splash mixed with iron oxide from a hometown of Mount Isa. It didn't matter that she supposedly committed the murder, disposed of the body, wiped herself clean of blood in under 10 minutes. It didn't matter that several Indigenous elders and trackers living at Uluru bore witness to fresh dingo tracks the day following Azaria's disappearance. It didn't matter that several bystanders, including one very emphatic one, vowed to have heard the baby cry out. At the time, she would have been snatched by the wild dog. None of this mattered because Lindy Chamberlain didn't cry enough, she didn't scream enough, wailed enough, or show enough feminine emotion. For this reason alone, the police, the media and the public determined, with rapid force, that she was guilty. She was a monster. And it's this very theme we have seen throughout time and across countless cases. Women who don't behave the way we expect them to. Women who break the norm are very likely evil women."

[00:11:37.410] - Tess

They go back to Kate McCann. But not Kate McCann. *"Amanda Knox. Foxy Knoxy, nicknamed by a frenzy media at the time, became the prime suspect. Her perceived lack of emotion exhibited later at trial,*

ironically underscored her guilt. People respond to trauma differently. Lindy Chamberlain may have escaped the majority of her life sentence in jail, but she completed it outside."

[00:12:06.040] - Tess

I personally know people, older people, older women who have experienced their own abuse, who say they will go to their deathbed no matter what anyone says, no matter what any evidence suggests otherwise, they will go to their deathbed knowing that Lindy Chamberlain killed her baby. Nothing will shake them from that conviction because they saw her lack of emotion. Older women who have been abused took that position, continue to take it. 40 years after losing her baby, she is still tormented by strangers on the street who recognize her and greet her with dingo house. *"It's hard to believe that Chamberlain will ever find lasting peace. We have robbed her of that as we've robbed thousands more women over the ages."*

[00:13:02.110] - Tess

Lindy Chamberlain, one of many. Monica Lewinsky, now late night comedians. Social commentators say how did we ever treat Monica Lewinsky so badly? They haven't changed. It's 20 years later. Britney Spears, Amanda Knox, Kate McKinnon, a few famous cases of many cases. And then when you look at Amber Heard, can we stand with the level of society with that bias that hasn't changed. If you go to the comments section, really dangerous to do. The top comments from women are something like: *"I don't believe anything the media says about how the judgment of this court was wrong. I'm so glad that this was live streamed, because I was able to see with my own eyes that she was manipulative and lying."* In the context of the women and cases I've mentioned, what do these people think they saw on camera that suggested that Amber Heard was manipulative and lying? What does a jury with the same gender bias that looked at Chamberlain? What did the mostly male jury think they saw to say that she was lying when a judge ruled she wasn't? *"Amanda Knox has since spoken out against the gendered nature of public shaming."* They recognize what they are experiencing. The problem is. The same commentators, the immediate descendants of the commentators who thought that it was funny to skewer Monica Lewinsky, are silent today. There has not been a change.

[00:14:59.410] - Tess

I want to compare it, and we won't go into him for time. But I wanted to talk a little bit about Steve Bannon. Maybe next week. At the beginning, I want to make some observations about Steve Bannon. But one of the things that people writing about him find fascinating. I thought you would remember the story if I brought it up. It is a famous one. You hear OJ Simpson mentioned by social commentators in a way that's humorous. There's a fellow that killed his wife and got away with it. People have less visible disdain for him than they have for McCann. But Steve Bannon is a particularly interesting subject. And people who have known him and that work in Washington say it's really incredible. If you go to Washington, people hate what he stands for. Democrats, the left wing, progressives hate what Steve Bannon says and what he stands for. But they love him. They love the man. They find him charming. And it's something that they giggle about over, over and over again. It's like, why do we like him so much? And I think that is worth investigating. It gets to the root of the gender bias. The women that are judged the way they are, but also come back and look at someone like Steve Bannon. He is charming. They don't know why. But their heart

feels warm when they see him, when they talk to him. He has many friends on the left wing, who don't agree with him, but like being his friend because they think he's such a nice person to be around. Other than the ruling by the jury in the court case with Amber Heard and Johnny Depp, the most stupid decision made was to have that live streamed. To have that put before a public who think that they can, with their own eyes judge her guilt. That, combined with social media, created the witch burning and this modern day stoning. So much worse than that experienced by all the women I mentioned. It's worse. But the decision to do that is, despicable. And for people to be claiming they're feminists. We're feminists, but don't call dingoes for a woman that should be hanged. Nothing has changed in society. Social media is making sure that it cannot. I wanted to remind people of Lindy Chamberlain of a long legacy. These are a few famous cases.

[00:18:08.450] - Tess

There's a woman in the United States. I think they managed to stay her execution. She was on death row for supposedly murdering her child. The main issue, first responders said, she didn't show enough emotion. And for that she was sent to death row. They're trying to save her. The evidence does not point to her murdering her child. But it's something that society, and in that case first responders, that the media, that juries do over and over and over again. And we as a movement cannot afford to stand with society. We could not have afforded if we were back in any of those cases to stand with society. I wanted to remind us of those cases before we begin. To try and drive home that point about bias. That's one side.

[00:19:15.010] - Tess

We can begin our review getting back to where we left off last time. And yes, thank you for the reminder to date the board. I did forget. It's good to remind me. I'll take one step back. We were able to get to one of the conclusions we need to, when we looked at church and state. We said, it's not church fundamentally. It is fundamentally culture. That was an important conclusion that we came to. We have a lot more to say about that. But we left that alone for a second. And we came back to the left wing last week. We wanted to draw the left wing back into the story. Because we've been showing the problems with the right wing, their preference for freedom over equality. We wanted to pull back. And as we identify culture as the problem, I want us to address all the issues at once. The spiral teaching method. Because they're all related. They're interconnected. I don't think it'll work if we deal only with the right wing, then only with culture, then only with the left wing. They're too interconnected. We're addressing it all at the same time. And we're spiraling back around. Between them. We have left wing, right wing, equality over freedom, freedom over equality. We investigated the far left. We used the Gray Zone as one example. I want to give a few more examples today. That's a source. But under them we have particularly Max Blumenthal.

[00:22:18.860] - Tess

Anya Parampil actually is his wife. They are married now. Aaron Nate, Ben Norton. They're some of the Gray Zone crew. The main ones. And we showed how they factually, without fully delving into why. If we fully delve into why, we start going into the problems with the left wing. But we stated factually, and then used some evidence to prove that they support some awful authoritarian regimes. Some of those being Maduro in Venezuela. I want to spend one moment to add weight to the point. In Venezuela in 2019, they had an election and it's widely believed this was a show election. United Nations High Commissioner for

Human Rights, someone we should all know by now for that period. *"Zeid Ra'ad Al Hussein noted that his office had concerns that reports of extra judicial killings cast doubts on fairness. Stating this context does not in any way fulfill minimal conditions for free and credible elections."* I wanted to mention him in context with that 2019 show election in Venezuela, because we know him now. *"The European Union, the Organization of American states, the Lima Group, and countries including Australia and the United States rejected the electoral process. However, countries such as China, Cuba, Iran, Russia, Syria, Turkey and others recognized the election results."*

[00:24:37.100] - Tess

I'll try and screen share. I want to play a little bit of Tucker Carlson for you.

[00:24:55.140] - Video

"Anya Parampil is a reporter who just spent a month in Venezuela.

[00:24:59.140] - Tess

Just double checking. Can everyone hear that?

[00:25:17.310] - Brenden

Can hear it, but it's quiet.

[00:25:19.190] - Tess

Stop. Share. Sorry. It's quiet. Okay. I think I can try again. I'll turn my volume up one moment. Can you hear that now? Okay, great.

[00:26:12.770] - Video

Anya Parampil is a reporter who spent a month in Venezuela reporting from the ground there. And she joins us here in studio. Thanks very much for coming on. Thank you so much for inviting me. What do you make of the news coverage of this?

[00:26:25.940] - Video

Your viewers won't be shocked to hear this, Tucker, but the fake news media are lying about the situation in Venezuela. Let me put it for you this way. Imagine if Hillary Clinton had refused to admit defeat after losing to President Trump in 2016 and banded together a group of 24 US soldiers and attempted to take the White House by force. I don't think she'd be walking freely on the streets the way Juan Guaido is walking right now in Caracas. And I certainly think the news media would be calling it rightfully a coup. And let me tell you, when it comes to what's happening on the ground there. I was there for a month earlier this year. The opposition has no popular support. Juan Guaido proved today once again that he will only ride in to power on the back of a US tank.

[00:27:21.370] - Tess

That's the far left for you. That's the far left on Tucker Carlson. That's Anya Parampil, the wife of Max Blumenthal. One of the four key operators of the Gray Zone. I wanted to give one evidence. This is one regime of all the regimes that they support. And they do. They travel to Venezuela, they travel to Syria, and they tell that story. They have a basis different to Carlson. But I believe that the world's problems are caused by colonialism and new colonialism and US imperialism by the CIA, by the US deep state. Like she said, Maduro is legitimately elected. We quoted the UN High Commission of Human Rights during that period, who said that there was extrajudicial killings. All of the countries and agencies that rejected the results, all the ones that did. And we see them line up with these regimes. Because, as she said, regime change will come through only US tanks, because the people don't want the opposition. That is fundamentally untrue. When you go into those countries, as she did, Maduro would have them under his wing. He'd take them to the parts of the country that still have wealth, his cronies.

[00:28:51.200] - Tess

They know how to work the system, that they go and meet with Maduro, they meet with Assad. That was to drive the point a little more. Venezuela, Syria, Russia, China. Question come back to this line. Let's move away from the Gray Zone, because they are only one example. Question, in this context, where would you put Julian Assange? Have you had problems before now understanding Julian Assange's politics? A lot of people do. I have. Until I understood this, I couldn't understand Julian Assange. I couldn't understand WikiLeaks. Does it make some sense now? Where would you place him? Katherine.

[00:30:06.030] - Katherine

Probably right up there with the others like the Gray Zone.

[00:30:15.280] - Tess

So many publications are confused by Julian Assange. They don't know how to understand him. Julian Assange, WikiLeaks. They're strong left, far left. And yet he helped Trump get elected and has a deep hatred of Hillary Clinton. There were articles confused. How did Julian Assange become, quoting one article, "the information kingpin of the alt right." How did he become Donald Trump's hero? Yes Katherine, this is part of the context in which we can understand Julian Assange and WikiLeaks.

[00:31:08.010] - Tess

There's WikiLeaks, the international leaking source of journalism, if you can call it that. There's that WikiLeaks international WikiLeaks. But Australia also had a WikiLeaks political party. Separate from the international WikiLeaks media. The Australian WikiLeaks Political Party in 2013 put together and sent a delegation to Syria to meet with Assad. Now, the International WikiLeaks Media Organization said it had no knowledge of and did not approve that delegation. But that delegation included members of Australia's WikiLeaks party, and it included Julian Assange's father. The delegation aimed at showing solidarity with the Syrian people and opposing Western military intervention in Syria. John Shipton, Julian Assange's

father, CEO of the political party, was among the number that on December 23, 2013, two years into the civil war, met with Assad. International Wikileaks, the media organization, protested once they found out about this, because they said this would be spun without care. In other words, you shouldn't have because our media will use this against us. Not because meeting with Assad, this violator of human rights was a bad idea, but because they were worried about how the publicity would be spun. The delegation included Shipton, WikiLeaks National Council members and Sydney University academic Tim Anderson and refugee activist Jamal Daoud.

[00:32:59.580] - Tess

I want to list a couple of names. I'm going to put WikiLeaks. It's not quite as far left as the Gray Zone, which is more there. Julian Assange. Why is he so close with Vladimir Putin? Why do they like to operate their Internet services out of Russia? Why do they not attack authoritarian regimes and only attack the United States, and some other Western countries? Why is their reporting so biased? And if they can access the information that they can, why aren't they targeting the genocide that is occurring in China? They have a focus, and that is a Gray Zone focus. I also want to mention Tim Anderson as a separate individual, because he will come up again. The WikiLeaks Party said the visit to Syria was to show opposition to violence and Western military intervention. Their fear is the same one that Anya Parampil expressed, that regime change will occur in Venezuela on the back of US tanks. They want the United States to stay out and in that they tacitly sometimes quite openly show support for these regimes.

[00:34:33.510] - Tess

"The WikiLeaks Party was the first party in Australia to warn of deadly consequences if the Western military intervened in Syria. They went further by questioning the credibility of the excuses of such intervention. Based on unsubstantiated reports of the Syrian Army's use of chemical weapons against civilian citizens." That is what they all deny happened. Gray Zone takes the same position. Tim Anderson has campaigned in support of East Timor, North Korea, Cuba, Venezuela, Palestine and Syria. The civil war, he said, is a fiction created by the United States to destroy an independent nation. I want to mention one more. Glenn Greenwood. I do this to illustrate that the Gray Zone is not on their own here. It is a wider left phenomenon.

[00:35:33.010] - Tess

Glenn Greenwald commenting on the January 6 interaction. He says, "when it comes to melodrama histrionics and exploitation of fear levels from the January 6 riot, there has never been any apparent limit. And today the one year anniversary of that three hour riot, 3 hours. There is no apparent end insight. Too many political and media elites are far too invested in this maximalist narrative for them to relinquish it voluntarily. The orgy of psychodrama today was so much worse and more pathetic than I expected. That the January 6 riot was some sort of serious attempted insurrection or coup was laughable from the start and has become even more preposterous with the passage of time and the emergence of more facts.

[00:36:19.270] - Tess

So Anna Parampil said that if Hillary Clinton hadn't conceded defeat in 2016, she wouldn't be walking free on the streets. Everyone would recognize it was a coup. And yet when Donald Trump, a few months after she said that on Tucker Carlson's show, Donald Trump doesn't concede defeat and he wages a legitimate coup, the far left says, oh, that's psychodrama, that's melodrama, that's exploitation of fear.

[00:36:52.370] - Tess

Why do they hate Hillary Clinton? There's a quote from The Atlantic, an article from The Atlantic titled, *'Donald Trump's Defenders on the Left' why some progressives are minimizing Russia's election meddling.* *'When it comes to possible collusion with Russia, Donald Trump's most interesting defenders don't reside on the political right. They reside on the political left.'* Now this article goes back to 2016 and Russia's meddling in the election, and they're saying that the most interesting defenders of Russia and Donald Trump come from the left wing and not the right wing. "Sean Hannity and Newt Gingrich aren't defending a principal, they're defending a patron. Until recently, they were ultrahawks. Now to downplay Russia's meddling in the 2016 elections, they sound like ultra doves. All that matters is supporting their ally in the White House.

[00:37:52.280] - Tess

For left wing defenders like Max Blumenthal and Glenn Greenwald, by contrast, ideology is king. Blumenthal and Greenwald loathe Trump, they're left wing, but they loathe hawkish foreign policy more. So they minimize Russia's election meddling to oppose what they see as a new Cold War. It's a genuinely principled position. The problem is that principles are blinding them to facts. On Tuesday, on again Tucker Carlson's show, Blumenthal laid out the progressive case against, "Russia hysteria". When it comes to Russians interference in the 2016 election, progressives like Blumenthal are behaving the way many conservatives behave on climate change. Conservatives fear that progressives will use climate change to impose new regulations on the economy. And because they oppose the solution, they claim there's no problem. In fearing a solution US intervention on any level. The left wing claims there is no problem with these regimes. That's roughly stating what we're getting to with the left wing. But we need to become much more specific with that. If they are so left wing, why are they on Tucker Carlson? Do you have any thoughts? How can they find common ground with Tucker Carlson? Raymond.

[00:39:46.230] - Raymond

I don't know if this is thinking a bit differently. I've seen a few graphs of recent times. Traditionally, we've looked at a spectrum on a line like this, but here they've started to depict it in a circle. So I'm sort of wondering if the left wing and the right wing, on the extremes, are a little bit like that. That they end up coming full circle. Even though they may not have the same reasons, they end up with very similar, identical outcomes.

[00:40:42.170] - Tess

I think with every part we've taken in this movement, we are driven by prophecy, by prophetic message. And the 2016 election has a lot to tell us, not in the electoral process. But in understanding that Hillary Clinton was, if not the entire solution, the beginning of the solution to the problem with the United States.

But it's global now, not domestically, but also in regards to foreign policy. What I believe people have done in this movement. When we said we need to move from right wing to left wing. Those that said, sure, we'll move from right wing to left wing, but they got into the left wing, and there are many women that aren't liked. Hillary Clinton is not liked. Many progressives, Democrats, people in the left wing, personally like Steve Bannon more than they like Hillary Clinton. It's gender related. And people in this movement, they got into the left wing and then they found all the streams that even if they don't explicitly oppose Hillary Clinton, enable them to at least ignore her. Ignore her as a person, and also ignore everything that she stood and was fighting for.

[00:42:30.290] - Tess

I get that there's graphs now that illustrated in different ways. I think the problems they have is that graphs never seem to quite do it justice. My concern is that, I really don't want us to lose sight of the fact that they're starting from completely different platforms. And as you said, and you did say this, Ray, I'm not saying that you said something wrong. You recognized for different reasons. But those reasons are crucial. They are opposite reasons between Tucker Carlson and Anya Parampil. They're very different platform they're starting from. My concern for this movement is not that they're watching Tucker Carlson and liking what they're hearing. My concern is that they're coming from this platform. This isn't a Hillary Clinton platform. I think, though, that it's accurate, that complicating politics a little more does bring us to our solution. Brenden.

[00:43:54.870] - Brenden

I'm struggling with this a little bit. Please bear with me when I try and explain this. The far left support any an authoritarian regime, because they are so fearful of American imperialism, or them interjecting, or creating regime change. Ultimately, they're scared of American superpower. If I could say that. They will support someone like Putin. Tucker Carlson on that side. Now we jump to the other side. Tucker Carlson or the right will support Putin as well, but from a very different reason. Putin looks very similar to me, because look at his stance on traditional values, family, LGBT issues, whatever the traditional values look at. So Putin, from a cultural point of view, looks similar to the right. Are they the two platforms that we're looking at, or am I missing something?

[00:45:37.150] - Tess

Yes, I think that we could add more to that, get more to the root. Especially with Tucker Carlson and the right wing, which is what I think that we need to do. But yes, those are two different platforms. One side essentially hates the United States and blames it for the world's problems. The other side is coming from a seat of deep nationalism. Those are very opposing views. And yet the deep nationalism, and the hatred of what they believe is neo- or new-colonialism bring them to the same point where they look at Putin. One side says we need to support him, because all the world's problems are created by the CIA and the deep state, and the United States, and the war Hawks. Tucker Carlson says, the right wing says, from a seat of deep nationalism, Putin stands for some pretty good things. But America first, America first, America first. Don't get involved in if I can reference an awful quote, ass hole countries. I hope we can start to see that's very different. Does that make sense? Brenden. Those are opposite platforms to come from.

[00:47:01.930] - Brenden

Yes. One despises the country, and one absolutely loves it. If love is the right word. Nationalism, that's a better word. They're deeply nationalistic, patriotic. Yes, they're totally opposing views. I can see that. Thank you.

[00:47:25.510] - Tess

I think it's right to say they love their country, but the country they envisage, the way it should be. The part of the country that's their vision, not those leftists who are ruining it.

[00:47:40.270] - Brenden

And they would prefer to ally with Putin, than Hillary Clinton. Because they say so themselves. I've seen it in rallies.

[00:47:51.910] - Tess

Yes. I've read some of their arguments today. Going back some years, where they saw that it wasn't really an Inter American fight. It was a global fight between their conservatism, of which Putin is the embodiment, and a global fight against the left. When pushed for a definition, when understanding, it always comes down to gender. It always comes down to women's rights, LGBT, etc. Josephine.

[00:48:47.950] - Josephine

Perhaps my point is not as important.

[00:48:54.530] - Tess

Don't say that. Everything you say is important to us.

[00:48:57.960] - Josephine

Okay. I listened briefly to an interview by Tucker Carlson and Anya Parampil. I didn't listen to a lot of it. At the beginning, she was talking about the Ukraine - Russian war and that it wasn't Russia attacking Ukraine. But it was a result of what America did. A coup in Kiev. And he was going along with it. In that few minutes that I watched, I thought, well, you both got to be agreeing at some level or else you wouldn't be interviewing Anya. But sorry, I didn't go through the whole tape. I was listening to that bit there. But I came to that conclusion very quickly.

[00:49:56.430] - Tess

I don't suggest that people suffer that much for the cause. You don't have to listen to all of Tucker Carlson. But it is good to see it, to hear it and to see it. So we know what we're dealing with. It helps it, I think, sink in. Thank you for informing us.

[00:50:20.550] - Josephine

Thank you.

[00:50:22.950] - Tess

Sharon.

[00:50:29.830] - Sharon

I'm not sure if I'm missing something. I'm feeling a bit confused. I was of the understanding that we are on the left. And then watching that short clip that you showed. Is this more about us seeing that the left and the right are similar? I'm a bit confused.

[00:51:13.770] - Tess

If we were to draw up our reform line and the dispensation of The Midnight Cry. It was in 2018 that we recognized we desperately need to change from right wing to left wing, if we correctly want to deal with the Sunday Law. Because, what we said then, the right wing is church and state. We're part of this. We were part of this story. We were siding with Protestantism. But the increase of knowledge of understanding that, was 2016 and the 2016 election. W. Are right to move from right wing to left wing. That was important. And I'm not questioning that at all. What I want us to see was when we moved, it wasn't so simple to say Trump and Clinton. You can see that it was Trump versus Clinton. But we went quite far with that message. We went quite far with understanding the 2016 election prophetically through some prophetic stories, such as the battle of Ipsus. Some things we studied at that time. I know Graeme has done the battle of Ipsus probably more thoroughly than anyone I know. I think that's been recorded. And we saw at Ipsus that Hillary Clinton could have turned the course that the United States was on. It's on a trajectory to the Sunday Law.

[00:52:56.830] - Tess

And she could have turned that ship around. She could have stopped those events from happening. But she wasn't wanted. She was rejected. The point I'm making now is, Hillary Clinton is hated by a lot of the left wing. It's not enough to say that we're feminists. A lot of feminists are supporting Johnny Depp or people who say they are. It's become a term that many people co opt for their version. If we understand true feminism, then we don't get to say that. It's not enough to say we're left wing. We have to know what that means. We have to know what the left wing should stand for and where they struggle and fail. It's not enough to move from Trump to Clinton. We have to actually side with Clinton. And there are other factions, other streams within the left wing that people can follow that do not lead them towards gender equality. Does that make a little bit of sense?

[00:54:04.570] - Sharon

Yes, that does make sense. I was looking at the Gray Zone and thinking that they were on the right. But this makes more sense.

[00:54:21.010] - Tess

I think that's because the conclusions they come too often agree with the right wing. We're not suggesting that we should be right wing. In fact, the opposite. We now know what the issues are here. Because what's wrong with this is what makes them agree with the right wing. We are dissecting it a little more. We get to the heart of what 2016 was designed to teach us. I am hoping that through explaining conservatism a little bit more, it will make more sense to you. I might ask you at the end or even after the class, if that's okay.

[00:55:06.710] - Sharon

Yes, thank you. That's great.

[00:55:10.550] - Tess

Marie.

[00:55:16.590] - Marie

This might seem a bit simplistic. But it seems like George Bush being the unilateral power was like a template to the far left as to why they're so against America been involved internationally. But in the process, then they're actually supporting autocratic leaders. It's a bit contradictory.

[00:55:54.250] - Tess

That gets to the heart of what I'm about to say.

[00:56:01.270] - Marie

I'm sorry then.

[00:56:06.290] - Tess

No, please don't be sorry. I need to ban women from apologizing in these classes. That's perfect. You're already seeing it. That makes me happy to hear. Because we need to bring in George Bush and those wars. Were you done, Marie?

[00:56:27.090] - Marie

Yes. That's all I had to say.

[00:56:30.230] - Tess

Graeme.

[00:56:33.450] - Graeme

I had a quick question. In the past we have focused on the church and state relationship in America. And then a state over a church relationship in, for example, Russia. The king of the north and the differences that we see in the king of the south. This mindset we see throughout all of the world in these spheres of influence. Is this something similar we're seeing here with this left and right wing ideology. Instead of it being church over state? Are we seeing culture over state and state over culture?

[00:57:24.950] - Tess

If you don't mind, I might log that question in my databank. As faulty as it is. But I'll try and lodge that question in my databank, because I'm not sure if I can answer it now. Things get clear in my own mind as we discuss them, and perhaps as we go more into culture an answer to that might materialize and make more sense. I'm not sure I can answer that now. Is that okay?

[00:57:55.370] - Graeme

Yeah, no problem.

[00:57:59.790] - Tess

Josephine. And then I'll continue.

[00:58:18.090] - Josephine

We don't have church as we first thought. We have culture. But culture, to me is like a form of God. I am my own God. Like an Apis Bull, like as in Egypt. Is that confusing everybody or confusing myself by saying that? It's your culture, you want to serve your own self. It's self exaltation. It is God in your own mind?

[00:59:07.890] - Tess

I think that's another question that we need to keep in mind and address as we go through. But it has to relate to that. We can easily see Apis Bull within religious institutions, and within individuals. But it becomes so much more potent when you bring it to culture. And say, I will make this suit me. I don't want to go into the article I gave out last week yet. I want to give out another one today. And come back to it once we've been through about three or four articles. But isn't that one of the points, that the UN High Commission of the Human Rights is making. Countries that say we will take universal human rights, but only how they suit us. And we will mold something that is basic, factual, universal human rights, not hard to understand. We're going to mold that and mix that into what feels good for us. The more we think about

it, the more we should be able to see this. Even this in the Old Testament. The hardest battle that God had was separating Israel from all the cultures that surrounded them.

[01:00:31.900] - Tess

It was more than put up an idol to Baal, and I'm a jealous God. It was more than that. When they brought those idols in, they took in all the cultures of their family members that surrounded that worship. You have those idols, therefore, you have those temples. You have those temples, you have temple prostitutes. You have layers of abuse begin. God wasn't saying I'm jealous and I don't want you speaking to another God. **He's trying to get Israel to accept a culture that was meant to belong to a new kingdom** that wasn't even found on this Earth. And that required to identify the cultures that they lived in, Egypt. Or the cultures that surrounded them, that surrounded them embodied in their families, and reject those cultures. The ones that they lived in, the ones that they came from, the ones that surrounded them. It was a cultural fight. Because it is, going back to that time period, it's very much looking religious. It looked religious. I would argue right until the 2000's it looked religious, but it's not today. But yes, even when we look back, we should see that Apis Bull.

[01:01:59.530] - Tess

What does Anya Parampil say? That where did she get fake news from? They manipulate news and culture to suit themselves. But not to suit themselves. What the culture they love has taught them is right or wrong. Usually on issues that relate to women, gender, lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans, intersex asexual queer, people. In that gender spectrum of issues. Countries and cultures are saying we will take the UN Charter for Universal Human Rights, and we would take that and mold it how we want it. But not how we want it. How our fathers did, how our grandfathers did, how our great grandfathers did in a way that respects what we worship, what we hold dear, which is not religion, it's culture. People worship their culture. That's why they will rather leave this movement, or leave Christianity altogether, than have their culture questioned. We're going to keep going over that point. And hopefully getting more specific as we go along. I wanted to bring this to the right wing again. If we look at conservatism. If I write conservative. If you would let me divide this out one more time. I want to quote Max Blumenthal. I quoted last week from a source.

[01:03:51.410] - Tess

It's called Coda Story. I don't like all their articles. They are fairly left wing. They're somewhere in here. I also wanted to put the Young Turks here. If you know the Young Turks, they're not as bad, but they're definitely bad. You still find quite a lot of conspiracy theories. They don't have a very clean record on factual reporting, and there's some other issues here. There's quite a lot here. But I quoted Coda Story, which can do a little of the same. I haven't read their source much at all. But on this one, they called out the Gray Zone for supporting Assad in Syria and these regimes. And they reached out to Max Blumenthal and said, we're publishing this story. Do you want to make a comment? And Max Blumenthal wrote back to them and said, *"we Gray Zone consider Coda Story to be a NATO propaganda shop wrapped in a boring neocon blog. We're not interested in any back and forth. But we do encourage you to run the following statement in the context of China. The Gray Zone does not favor reeducation centers for anyone except Smami warmongering neoconservative fordsters."* Neocon, neoconservative.

[01:05:31.190] - Tess

You see this over and over and over again. They're attacking the neoconservatives. What does it mean to be a neoconservative? Neo means new. It's new conservatism. And if you go back and you read these people, they're using it as a slur, neocon. I want us to see the two splits. Because there's two types of conservatism, neoconservatism and paleoconservatism. Have you heard of the paleo diet? Moli? What is the paleo diet?

[01:06:24.870] - Moli

Is it sort of a meat diet?

[01:06:29.190] - Tess

Why do they eat so much meat and call it paleo?

[01:06:37.270] - Moli

They wanted to place it on protein. Diet instead of carbohydrates.

[01:06:45.670] - Tess

Do you know why they incorporate so much meat?

[01:06:53.380] - Moli

That you don't put on weight?

[01:06:58.230] - Tess

Yes. You're going into the health side of it. The historical side is that paleo means old. The paleo diet, translated literally from the Greek, means old diet. And people who eat a paleo diet, the whole mindset behind it is that we should be eating what we ate back when we were cave people, going back to evolution. The idea of what people ate while they were cavemen and women. And that was pre-agriculture. It was supposed to be a lot of meat because they are hunting. It's what you hunted. We should be eating what we would hunt today. Does that ring a Bell, Moli?

[01:07:59.710] - Moli

Yeah, we're sort of the original diet.

[01:08:03.310] - Tess

Yeah. What they think was. We have the Eden diet, an evolutionist has the paleo diet. The evolutionist version of our Eden. Where I don't want to return to. Paleo means old. Neo means new. We have new conservatism versus old conservatism. And I want to explain the difference. Greame?

[01:08:37.590] - Graeme

No, it's fine. Sorry. I was mentioning paleo. That was all. You've already said it.

[01:08:42.570] - Tess

I'm sorry I missed you. I'd like to hear it in your words. It's from the Greek root paleo, meaning ancient or old. They use it somewhat tongue in cheek. It refers to a paleo conservative claim that they are the historic, authentic conservative tradition. And in contrast to neo / new conservatism. They are the classical conservatives. *"They trace their philosophy to the old right Republicans of the interwar period, which influenced the US not to join the League of nations, reduce immigration with the passage of the Immigration Act of 1924, and oppose Franklin Roosevelt. They often look back even further to Edmund Burke, the anti Federalist movement stretching back to the days of Thomas Jefferson and John C. Calhoun."* I want to try and keep it simple, because they go into so much language. But it's essentially different over what is most clearly seen with their foreign policy. Neoconservatism is concerned primarily with foreign policy. In foreign policy, the neoconservative's main concern is to prevent the development of a new rival. Many of its adherence became politically influential during the Republican presidential administrations of the 70's, 80's, 90's and 2000's. Neoconservatism peaked in influence during the administration of George Bush when they played a major role in promoting and planning the 2003 invasion of Iraq.

[01:10:23.360] - Tess

"Critics of neoconservatism have used the term to describe foreign policy and Warhawks who support aggressive militarism or neo-imperialism, new imperialism, new colonialism. Historically speaking, the term neoconservative refers to those who made the ideological journey from the anti Stalinist left to the camp of American conservatism during the 60's and 70's. Neoconservatives support a restoration of traditional gender roles and a strengthening of traditional families in order to adapt social structures to the free capitalism they demand." If you think neo think George Bush, Donald Rumsfeld, all the people that surrounded them in the early 2000s. That was when neoconservatism peaked. This is a fight between interventionists and isolationists. And if you look them up online, they like to denigrate and use slurs against the other. A paleo will say that a neo is not a true conservative. They're actually a liberal. And neo will call a paleo not a true conservative, and actually a liberal. They are both conservative. It's that the word liberal for them is a slur. They attack each other with it. But they are both strictly conservative. It's the difference between an interventionist and an isolationist. Paleo conservatives found a resurgence as soon as the Iraq War started going downhill.

[01:12:02.770] - Tess

Mid to late 2000s, neoconservatism starts to die a death. Everyone's turned on it. And what starts to rise up for the first time in some decades is paleo conservatism. And I want us to see that this is truly awful.

"paleo conservatives support restrictions on immigration, decentralization, trade, tariffs, protectionism, economic nationalism, isolationism, and traditional conservative ideals relating to gender, culture, and society." They tend to oppose abortion, gay marriage, and LGBTQ rights. So they're both conservative on issues of gender. The difference is particularly on foreign policy. Paleo conservatism particularly became a term around the 1980s, in the aftermath of the Vietnam War, which further drew these two sides of conservatism apart. For the Vietnam War and against the Vietnam War. Chronicles, a paleo conservative publication promoted a southern traditionalist worldview focused on national identity, regional particularity, and skepticism of abstract theory and centralized power. They are against big government, but also a powerful executive branch. George Bush made the executive branch really powerful. Neoconservatives don't have such a problem with that.

[01:13:36.990] - Tess

"Paleo conservatives question the supposition that European culture and mores can ever be transplanted or even forced upon non Western cultures due to separate cultural heritages. As a result, paleo cons are more distinctive in their emphatic opposition to open immigration by noneuropeans and their general disapproval of U. S. Intervention overseas. One paleo conservative wrote, Republics mind their own business, their governments have very limited powers, and their people are too busy practicing self government to worry about problems in other countries. Empires not only bully smaller, defenseless nations, they also can't leave their own hapless subjects alone. Empires and small governments aren't compatible either." They say, we are a republic. We are not an empire. Therefore, we mind our own business and don't intervene or care about what other governments are doing. We should be too busy governing ourselves than concerning ourselves with problems in other countries. *"They see neoconservatives as empire builders and then paleo conservatives as defenders of the republic. They point to Rome as an example of how an ongoing campaign of military expansionism can destroy a republic."* On issues that relate to capital punishment, handgun ownership, original reading of the US Constitution, and anything related to gender, they are equally conservative.

[01:15:12.990] - Tess

Where the far left and the far right unite, is with this hatred of US foreign intervention. But it's not all conservatism that these are attacking. They're attacking neoconservatism. They're attacking today what is essentially dead. I'll give a couple of more quotes and then we'll have to close for time. *"Many paleocons say that Westerners have lost touch with their classical and European heritage, that they are in danger of losing their civilization."* The replacement theory. It comes from this branch. This is Tucker Carlson, which is why Anya Parampil and Tucker Carlson will get together and rave about neoconservatism and US intervention. But paleo conservatism is, if anything, worse. It's more to be feared. It's what died in the presidency of George W. Bush and started around 2009 to ascend. They say that *"they have a concern for states rights, local self government, regional identity. They say that regional identity used to be taken for granted everywhere in America. But the United States is no longer, as it once was, a federal union of diverse states and regions. National uniformity is being imposed by the political class that runs Washington, the economic class that owns Wall Street, and the cultural class in charge of Hollywood and the Ivy League. In the 1995 New Dixie Manifesto, Fleming and Michael Hill, paleo*

conservatives, argued that southerners are pelted with ethnic slurs, denied self government, and stripped of their symbols, including the Confederate flag."

[01:16:59.610] - Tess

They take this internationally. They also take this regionally the need for the preservation of regional culture. Including in the south, that southerners are being denied their own identity, because of the intervention within the United States. The interventionism of Washington. "*The empire throws its weight around the world. the public minds its own business.*" But should the United States be minding its own business? I think we should ask Hillary Clinton and her number one foe, Vladimir Putin. Vladimir Putin did not want her elected because he knew that on the world stage she would not mind her own business. So do we agree that, while an empire throwing its weight around sounds bad, do we really believe that the United States should mind its own business?

[01:18:00.830] - Tess

"Feminism is the greatest threat to the paleo conservative. It destroys the family unit." What Tucker Carlson wants. He wants the United States to stay out of the issue with Ukraine. It's not even that he's particularly in love with Vladimir Putin either. It's exactly what he said when he said, Did Vladimir Putin ever hurt me? No. Has Vladimir Putin ever taken my guns away or accused me, lied about me? No. Why do I care what Vladimir Putin does? It's not necessarily a love for Vladimir Putin. But he even states it there. He just doesn't want to care, because he's an isolationist, because US policy should end where the sea water begins, to quote them. They should not be interfering with foreign affairs. Those troops should be brought home. They need them on the southern border, don't they? They need their army on the southern border. They need their army in schools, stopping school shootings. Not in Afghanistan, not interfering with, as Trump said, worthless nations. But if they're going to rebuild this republic properly, what they need is their traditional family values, their version of the family unit, which requires women having babies and back in their place. Feminism, gay marriage, it all strikes at the heart of paleoconservatism. In a much more fearful way to a paleo conservative than a neoconservative.

[01:19:50.290] - Tess

"For some activists, lawmakers and commentators, Carlson's decision to minimize Russia's imminent invasion and push back against critics of Russian President Vladimir Putin meant he was siding with Russia against the US. But that's a misread. Carlson isn't in favor of Russia over America or angling to aid Russia in dominating or controlling the US. He wants the US to be like Russia. And in accordance with paleo conservative and white nationalist principles, he has an aversion to foreign interventionism, so American militarism can grow at home." They need it on the southern border. Tucker Carlson is a paleo conservative. Strict isolationist. Supports tariffs over free trade. Anti immigration, anti intervention. If we wondered why the right wing seemed to be divide over the Ukraine war, where some were seem to support Russia or saying let Russia do what it wants. It's because we've come from the George Bush era. We still see it through this George Bush sowing the seeds of democracy intervention type of Republican Party. That's dead now. The voices of the Tucker Carlson. The voices of Isolationism. There's a Vox article from 2016 that is worth reading. It's titled *'Paleo conservatism, the Movement that Explains*

Donald Trump Explained. It's worth reading rather than quote it for time. I think that I will leave it there for today. This is where it should start to make sense. I hope.

[01:21:37.990] - Tess

When you come from the far left, they have common ground with Tucker Carlson. And when I say far left, I want to make one point. Last week we compared Max and Max. I want to make one point. When we looked at Max, of the right wing, of the Vox article, he's here. And then Roy den Hollander. That's the extreme. When we talk about Max, this Max of Gray Zone, he is the extreme. I want us to see that difference. The Max of Vox, he was society, right wing society libertarianism. But he wasn't the extreme. We're talking about the extreme here. And when I mentioned websites like Democracy Now, the Young Turks, they're heading into more danger. But even articles I see in The Guardian, articles in The New York Times, Washington Post, good sources that I use all the time. It's these arguments, we need to see this. This is what we need to see, because this is what we need to sift. To sift out what they're doing wrong. Brenden. And then I'll give the new article to close.

[01:23:10.870] - Brenden

Not even sure whether this is even going to work. I feel like I already see some problems. But I'm going to say it. You've got that diagram there that splits the conservatives. You got the new and the old. You got the isolationists, you got the interventionists. And on the other side, you've got the left. The far left doesn't want to intervene, basically. Is that one way of saying it? They don't want to intervene because America shouldn't be doing anything, because they're the problem. We hate America. Stay out. You're the problem causing all these other problems. Whereas Hillary Clinton, she's the interventionist who will intervene.

[01:24:24.330] - Tess

She's not a neoconservative, but she wasn't an isolationist. And she wasn't here. Libia, Benghazi, Gaddafi. That's her record.

[01:24:43.590] - Brenden

Hillary Clinton is the liberal. She will intervene. She's the opposite of the far left, because she will do the opposite of what the Gray Zone wants. I don't know what I'm saying here.

[01:25:10.030] - Tess

I haven't stated, and I'm deliberately because I want to build up to it. I haven't stated exactly what I think they get wrong. I don't want it to appear that I have stated it. Because I don't want to be misunderstood. I haven't stated the fundamental issue they get wrong. I want to build it, with us understanding the political structure. And then some really important articles. But we need to see that Hillary Clinton was the solution. And she's not this.

[01:25:47.430] - Tess

And it's not this that I think people in the movement are necessarily following. But it's articles in sources that I know they're reading and agreeing with. Far worse than that. It's social commentators, social media. Comedians, late night hosts that people in the movement are listening to. But they don't realize it's this. It's like this Max is not a Roy Den Hollander. But you see the same mindset. The same issue and mindset exists in the mainstream of the left, especially once you come to Bernie Sanders camp. And that's what I want us to get to. Because once we can see that we know how to sift the publications we keep. I'm not interested in watching the Young Turks. I am interested in reading the Guardian. Once I see what the problem is, I can go to the Guardian. Then you identify that a particular author you only like half that article, because once they start giving their opinion, it reeks of this. And you start sifting that out of the left wing. But I'm hoping that becomes more clear over time. We're going to do a thorough revision, especially of conservatism next week, because I don't want anyone to feel left behind.

[01:27:03.760] - Tess

I want to double check that we're all up to speed at the same place. We'll do a revision and I'll ask questions. I make sure that we're not confused on what he's done so far. But we need to see conservatism is split between nevertrumpers... Generally the nevertrumpers are neoconservatives. This is the war within the conservative party. This side has won. George Bush Jr. had no time left for Donald Trump, didn't vote for him. They are quite different. But it's paleo conservatism that bred the alt right. It's paleo conservatism that says let countries do what they want, a message that appeals to libertarianism. It's libertarianism that's combined with this. And it's this that created the altright in 2009 and militia groups. Not the George Bush era, not the Iraq Wars era. They have a common enemy. And that's why Anya Parampil will meet with Tucker Carlson, because they have common ground. Even though they're coming from opposite sides. An article that I will give out. And Elder Parminder has been wonderful and already put it in PDF form. I will send out the PDF with an explanation shortly. I want to take this discussion of the left wing and bring it to the subject of Israel versus Palestine.

[01:28:42.150] - Tess

We know that the right wing is obsessed with Israel, but the left wing, specially factions of the left are similarly as well. And this article starts to investigate why. I will share screen. Open democracy titled: *'Singling Out Israel a Perspective from the Left.'* "How did the struggle for Palestine gain such prominence on the left? The answer might tell us something about broader patterns of thought in left wing politics today." And it is fairly lengthy, but it is worth reading. It gets to the heart of what we are circling. We want to see the issues with the left wing. Many parts of the left wing, the Bernie camp especially, why are they so focused on the rights of Palestinians? It's a very interesting discussion. We'll close for time. And please write speak up if you're confused, because I do not want to move on if people are confused. We will repeat. Untill it all makes sense. If you kneal with me we'll close in prayer.

[01:30:20.970] - Tess

Dear Lord, we see in the prophetic message you've given us the answers to everything. If we're willing to see them. Some of them might disagree with what we have built up in our minds. Not from right wing sources but from left wing sources. Some of them are extremely emotionally loaded discussions, such as Palestinian statehood, apartheid, Israel, colonialism. Lord, I pray that you will help us see truth from error.

Help us to see things that might not be appealing to us, but are designed to change us. Designed to help us confront errors that impact not our life on this world, but the culture that you've always wanted Israel to enter. Our hope for a different world, centered on a different form of culture. I pray, Lord, that you will help us to do that painful work. To rewire our brains. To challenge our emotions and our feelings as we see women represented online in social media. As we look out at how especially the left wing handle issues of gender. That we will confront our own sexism and our own bias and our own excuses. And be prepared for the kingdom that you are setting up. Because, Lord, we want to be there. But we also want everyone in this meeting and our loved ones there as well. I pray this in Jesus name. Amen.