

19. Exploring Foreign Policy

Tess Lambert, 24.06.2022

Youtube Video

https://youtu.be/3Nt-OF_kKUI

24.06.22

- Q. Sift Media → L.W.
- Greyzone - PROOF.
- M.C. - 2018 Why L.W.
- Define LW/RW $\frac{E}{F}$ $\frac{F}{E}$
Masterpiece Cases v. C.C.R.C.
- "Max" → Absolute Freedom - "Trinity"
↳ Lib. / & Atheism / 3. M. R.
 - Libertarianism
 - Atheism

Neo

1. Church + State → CULTURE
G.C. = An election

- Greyzone - EXPANDED
- neo v. paleo conservatism
- How we sift Media - True Stream

U.S.A

Global

S.L.

[00:00:06.910] - Tess

Dear Lord, as we handle these sensitive subjects so close to the Sunday law, as we look at why this is a history of failure for feminism, we ask that you teach us. Teach us how to view current events, how to view politics. They are so central to the great controversy. May we understand correctly. Please be with us, teach us, guide us, and may we trust you. In Jesus name. Amen.

[00:00:49.590] - Tess

I want to start with an exercise that I've wanted to do for some time now. But never had willing participants and the forum. I think we all know what I mean when I say 'a word association'. That game where someone says a word and you have to create a mental picture. Let it be organic. Hear the word, have a

flash of a picture, and then once you have the picture, you're not really allowed to alter it. Do people know what I'm talking about? Does anyone not know what I'm talking about? If there's no hands, I'm going to assume everyone knows what I'm talking about.

[00:01:51.340] - Tess

If I was to say some words and you would have that mental picture. If I was to say tree, picture a tree. House. Flower. God. Maybe this would have worked a few years ago a little bit better. But when I say God, what's the visual that's created? Don't answer that now. It's without going back in and trying to alter the image once it rises. I'll keep going. Moon. Book. Fry pan. Goddess. I've wanted to ask people. If you take the mental picture you had when I said God. And the mental picture when I said goddess and you put them side by side in your brain. Calculate approximately the age difference between the two pictures. It's the age I want to see. The picture of God. I'm not saying the Christian God. It could be Thor for all I really care. But just God. And then the mental picture of goddess. Does anyone not have an age difference? Does anyone want to play ball with me? Graeme!

[00:03:55.210] - Graeme

My mind went to, when you said God, a picture of something we've seen from like Desire of Ages. You know, where you get your pictures there of Desire of ages, this glow around Jesus in a robe. Quite young. And when you said goddess, I had a similar young image of someone like Cleopatra or someone like that.

[00:04:31.630] - Tess

I think it's cheating to use Jesus, though. I'm not looking for the incarnation, but I see your point. I could see what happened there. I can't fight with what was the picture that arose. Whatever rose rose. Does anyone want to confess to having an age difference?

[00:04:56.430] - Lynne

I had an age difference. Sorry, I should have put it in the chat.

[00:05:02.010] - Tess

All good. Lynne. You had an age difference. How many years do you think?

[00:05:07.170] - Lynne

For God, the picture was like the white flowing beard. So very old. Maybe sixty's, seventy's, eighty's. And then the goddess would have been probably thirty's to forty's. Quite a significant age difference, really. And it wasn't what I wanted to think. It was like trying to let my mind think it without correcting it.

[00:05:40.490] - Tess

Yes, I understand. James, you had an age difference, and I'm assuming the other hands as well are all indicating the age difference.

[00:05:53.280] - Graeme

Similar to her, but not so old. With God, it's younger, middle aged. And the female are probably a bit younger. Maybe ten years or so.

[00:06:10.990] - Tess

Twenty's and fifty's, rather than like thirty's and sixty's. Was that the same for you, Brodie?

[00:06:28.950] - Brodie

I think I had about a 50 year age difference in there.

[00:06:36.250] - Tess

Katherine?

[00:06:40.610] - Katherine

Yeah, about 50 years for me as well. And a 30 year old goddess, and probably 80 for the older man on the thrown.

[00:06:53.070] - Tess

Now, obviously no one did this to me without a surprise. But in investigating my own brain, I would say I'd have about a 40 year age gap, between what comes up when I think of God versus what comes up when I think of a goddess. And that's not all Christian based, that's Greek mythology based, that's cultural. Unless you start thinking of a goddess, and people think of an old woman. What they do is, I think their brain has switched out goddess for witch. But when you keep it as god versus goddess, then what I've seen in my own experience and other people I've spoken to, for the vast majority, it's about a 40, 50 year age gap between the mental picture of a goddess and a mental picture of a god. I've wanted to do this, to make the point of what we're doing when we critique the terms that we use in this movement. When we critique language. Where we call each other brother and sister, or someone an aunt or he is an elder, even if he's not ordained. All of that language that has at its root, whether it's subconscious or subconscious or conscious, a gendered root.

[00:08:33.650] - Tess

What we are doing as a movement and as leadership is psychological warfare. It is mind games. Because the problem is not in the terms, so much, or the terms themselves. The problem is in our brain wiring. It's how we're wired. And our issue with these terms is how that psychologically impacts with our inbuilt cultural biases. I don't think that how we picture a god as older is all Christian based. It's cultural.

You could watch a Hollywood movie and get the same idea about a god and a goddess. But it also shows us what culture worships in men versus what culture worships in women. It shows why culture treats older women a certain way, while culture tends to ignore the voices of older women. Whereas sees the voices of older men as being associated with power and wisdom. It has so many deep set cultural implications. It fascinates me when people in the movement continue to feel attacked or to push back when we are asking them to stop saying brother or sister. Especially when women are saying, please stop calling me sister. I think it's so misogynistic and downright abusive to not listen to the terms that someone wishes to be called by.

[00:10:05.630] - Tess

But what we are all doing is trying to fight that wiring in our brains. And some people have asked me about the pronouns we use for god. Can't we say goddess? Won't that fix everything? And I think this touches on why it really wouldn't. Because if we say goddess, all we're doing is moving away the 60, 70, 80 year old for the 20/30 year old version. It does nothing to change our brain wiring to picture god is female. All it does is give us a different cultural version of what a god / goddess can be. Young, attractive, jealous, but in a different way, probably a little bit manipulative, plays games. All of the cultural ideas associated with the goddess. Of course, the nurturing, all those aspects. And we end up with a Mary, you know, the young 20 something Mary. And I'm sure she wasn't that young. But we substitute that for the 60 year old, gray haired, bearded, elderly male. I think we should consider why we're doing what we're doing, with some deliberateness. It helps to change our practices, but if we really know why we're changing them, the fight we're having with our own brain wiring, I think it makes it more powerful and helpful. If someone slips up and calls me sister, that's okay. But if I've asked them not to, and we've explained the problem with their brain wiring, and they continue to, I think there's a major problem in how much they think sexism is an issue in society and in themselves. Thank you for accommodating me.

[00:12:16.250] - Tess

We said a fair bit last week. We have gone more into the issues with the left wing than I initially intended to state. But I think we got to the point where I'm being fairly explicit with what I believe the problem with the left wing to be. There's also been an article shared this week on feminism that laid out some of the reasons that the Sunday law becomes inevitable. When feminism fails amongst the democrats, amongst the left wing. Obviously, that indicates a much larger problem with the left wing. If feminism is so unpopular. There's another article that's not yet shared but will be soon addressing feminism as well. And again, touches on left wing failure.

[00:13:09.100] - Tess

I want to take some time and go through a review. You can stop me at any time. Just put your hand up in the chat. We have moved off on tangents a number of times and there might be things that we didn't really complete or points you still have questions and thoughts over. We can stop at any point to discuss those. We began with a question that was asked. We were meant to be studying 1888. But someone asked, how do you sift media? And the focus was on generally left wing media or trustworthy sources. We weren't considering how to sift Fox News because we don't bother. How do you sift left wing media sources? Before going much further, I wanted to prove first of all, that we even needed to. I really wanted

to nail in that point, that the left wing needed to be sifted in the first place. If you're going to sift media, then they must have issues. They must have problems that are endemic. So let's prove that they have endemic problems and then analyze what those problems are, so we can all spot them. Grayzone proof of problems. Grayzone, Max Blumenthal. We went into that history.

[00:15:10.330] - Tess

Then we left it there for a moment and said, well, what does it mean to be left wing in the first place? We went to the Midnight Cry and explained 2018, why we are left wing. And then we attempted to define the fundamental difference between left wing and right wing politics. There's quite a number of differences, but we wanted to get to a fundamental route. Especially when it comes to social policies. So defining the left wing, the right wing, the differences between the two. We discussed left wing was equality over freedom. And right wing was freedom over equality. That doesn't easily work internationally. If you have a country that doesn't even believe in giving its citizens the basic tenants of freedom. Then it becomes a little bit more complicated. But when you have a country like the United States that has embodied so many principles, that prophetically they are described as glorious, then you have to see the fight in a little bit more of a subtle way. Freedom is a good thing. They fought for freedom from the rule of Britain. Part of their history is a fight to have freedom in the first place.

[00:17:16.960] - Tess

But through that history, it's become more and more clearly a fight between these two bedrock principles. Because when they collide, one has to take precedence over the other. Obviously we want freedom. You don't want a surveillance state like China has. Obviously that there are some privacy citizens should have. But they have to have a balance. And then when equality for a group who is marginalized or oppressed comes under threat, then that priority has to supersede over the rest of the population's rights to freedom. And this is what the left wing and the right wing often wore over. Hopefully people watched what was put on the media broadcast from the New York Times about January 6. I don't know if you watched that and heard freedom, freedom, freedom, freedom. What is the right wing fighting for? Freedom. We went into detail and gave many examples, the trucker protests, all of these examples to prove what they're fighting for is freedom. I've said it before, and I'm going to state this more explicitly, and in more detail. But left wing journalism, journalism in general, can slip into the habit of being lazy.

[00:18:47.580] - Tess

And it's so much easier to look at the Canada truckers, find the neo-Nazi flag and say they want to suppress people of color, they're white supremacists, neo-Nazis and leave it that simple. But the vast majority are very much not, but they're fighting for freedom. If we can't see what that fight is fundamentally over, then we can't really see why or how we disagree with them. And if you can't see what you're disagreeing with, you come into danger of ending up on the same side. I think that's why so many Democrats watch Tucker Carlson. They aren't actually even able to pick up on what he's saying, because it's not so explicit as I think we've been led to believe. Seeing the battle between equality, freedom, freedom and equality. And we used a we used a Supreme Court case to really prove that, to give one example out of many, and that's Masterpiece Cake Shop versus Colorado Civil Rights Commission. Civil

rights, prioritize equality. Masterpiece Cake Shop was all about their freedom. I had a quote, but I don't think I'm going to find it. It ties back to a long history, this war between equality and freedom.

[00:21:02.670] - Tess

And I touched on it, but you can really see it when it comes to the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Quite a lot of the opposition to the Civil Rights Act was by people who vowed that they were not racists. They were against government enforced segregation, but they were also against government enforced integration. The Civil Rights Act it ended government enforced segregation, but it brought in government forced integration, most clearly seen in schools but also in many private businesses. And many people opposed the 1964 Civil Rights Act. Goldwater being one of them, who was one of the foremost people who brought libertarianism into the Republican Party. Goldwater opposed to the 1964 Civil Rights Act, and he did so with a lot of guilt on his conscience. Because he said he wanted racial equality, but he firmly believed in freedom over equality. The government should not be enforcing segregation. It was good that the Civil Rights Act brought that to an end. But the government should not enforce integration. The government should not force schools to allow in students of color. It should not force private business owners to serve nonwhite patrons. It's a long term fight that has been ongoing between equality and freedom.

[00:22:47.020] - Tess

But post second wave feminism, post Stonewall, it's become even more and more explicit that this is what the fight is about. Then we went to Max, and he symbolizes a large part of that right wing, even far right ideology that is so popular today. And we looked at the statistics of how unpopular feminism is. It's being replaced by something. And there's this very much popular trinity, especially among young men. It's a younger demographic, and it's that trinity. We asked, what happens when you strive for absolute freedom? We looked at the Vox article and the trinity. And that trinity being libertarianism, atheism and men's rights. Libertarianism, atheism men's rights, opposition to feminism. We haven't touched on the third one so much, but we've touched on the first and the second. And it was here that we went into libertarianism. Let's look at more pure freedom. You might notice a shift in our classes when we were doing all this. We were looking very much at domestic policy. But as we moved towards the left wing to see the problems with the left wing, we started to look more at foreign policy.

[00:24:56.620] - Tess

How do they handle Syria, how do they handle Russia, how do they handle China, how do they handle Libya? That isn't because those issues are separate. They're very much overlapping. It's just easier to see. It's easier to see libertarianism, if you look at domestic policy. It's easier to see the problems with the left wing and the views of the Grayzone, if you look at foreign policy. But all of these issues interconnect. It's not as if you have domestic policy and foreign policy. They're all really very much interconnected. I wanted to actually stop here and make a couple of observations about libertarianism.

[00:25:49.410] - Tess

Libertarianism as that beautiful picture. That if a society that does have problems with equality, that does mistreat portions of the population. Let's take a society that is sexist, that's patriarchal. Libertarianism

sells the idea. And I'll take it how former members of the movement solved this idea. If there are sexist members of the movement, sexist men primarily, but also women, that have been abusive, then we should not remove them from classes. We should not reprimand them. We should not accuse them. What we should do is allow everyone absolute freedom. Freedom to attend what presentations they want, to attend camp meetings alongside women that they've mistreated.

[00:26:52.530] - Tess

We should listen to them, hear their side of the story, as if we don't. We should prioritize freedom, be non accusatory, and not ever enact discipline. And then as this freedom conscious movement progresses, then through dialogue, through friendship, through community, those who have wrong views will learn. They will grow, they will change. And we can all get along without punishing people or accusing people. And it's been an appealing message for quite a lot of people. Does everyone remember what we've said about libertarianism, the message itself versus the reality? Or does anyone have any confusion or questions? We're not quite done with libertarianism because we're going to come back to it when we discuss the paleo versus neoconservatism. But I wanted us to remember that picture itself that is so appealing and it appeals to me. It sounds beautiful until you look at human nature and reality. But I wanted us to take that picture which we've discussed libertarianism domestically, and in the context of the Civil Rights Act and the idea that the government shouldn't force segregation or force integration, but create a free country where everyone can discriminate or not discriminate as they like, and then you'll create social change through working together and dialoguing.

[00:28:46.500] - Tess

Let's take that, what we have discussed domestically and consider it internationally. How does that then work with international foreign policy? And I'm not saying that a libertarian would necessarily take this foreign policy position as quite a spectrum. But I think there's a few things that we can learn when we picture that nice image and take it to foreign policy. And I wanted this to consider Germany's example. The Guardian long read was really good this week. I don't always read them, because they're long reads. But the Guardian did a long read this week on Germany's dependence on Russia. And as I read it, it really stood out that Germany had that same beautiful picture as libertarians sell in the United States. And it was interesting seeing that play out internationally in the way Germany has related to not just Russia, but also China. Especially Russia and China. But authoritarian countries in general. What Germany did right back in the 1980's, in the history when the Soviet Union was still in existence, was they had this belief and they had a term for it, "Wandel durch Handel", which translates as "change through trade". What they really fought for. You can trace it right back to that history, but it's also been through the 2000's, right up until very recently, the belief that trade and dialogue can bring about social and political change.

[00:30:54.580] - Tess

Through the history of the Cold War, especially those last decades, Germany and the United States were on very different paths in how they wanted to handle the Soviet Union. The United States, obviously with a lot of variety between presidents, but certainly by the time they get to Ronald Reagan, they're wanting to be quite aggressive with the Soviet Union. They're wanting to challenge them. There's a space race, there's an arms race. Germany had a different position. Germany held and has held until recently and still

some today, this belief that that doesn't work and you can change authoritarian countries, abusive countries, through stepping back, letting them operate how they want to operate in the abusive fashion they want to operate, but through trade and dialogue, bringing them into the global economy, bringing them into integration. That through that, you will bring about social change. And there's a couple of reasons that Germany took that position. I'm focusing on Russia. This is a quote from the Carnegie Endowment. Germany's strategic Grayzone with China. They say like other Western democracies, including the United States States, "*Germany was convinced that China's authoritarian politics would morph into a free, open, and more democratic system to ever tightening economic ties.*"

[00:32:38.990] - Tess

We don't punish them, we don't sanction them, we don't build up our own arms, we don't intervene, we don't tell them off internationally. We bring them in. We communicate, we make our ties closer. And this is all analyzed in this latest Guardian's long read. And I want to read a little of it. I will ask the question, and I'll come back to it in a moment. Why do you think Germany had that position? Why do you think that they were so nervous to accuse another country?

[00:33:24.290] - Tess

"How did Germany end up making such a blunder? Some argue that Merkel should have seen that Putin was taking Russia in an authoritarian direction when he announced his return to the presidency in 2011. After Russia's invasion of Ukraine in 2014, Germany made no move to stop importing Russian gas. And although Merkel threatened to introduce crippling trade sanctions, German industry convinced her to hold back. But some blame a more persistent misjudgment stretching back 50 years. Based on a fallacy that authoritarian, abusive countries can be transformed through trade."

[00:34:03.830] - Tess

Why do you think Germany has this psychological position? Graeme.

[00:34:28.330] - Graeme

Is this something that they would have liked done to them during the Second World War? To come at it from a different way other than from discipline? Is that what you're getting at?

[00:34:45.330] - Tess

If that's as a complete answers you want to give, I might go to Josephine. I don't give my thoughts while people are talking. Is that okay? I'll take everyone's feedback. Josephine.

[00:35:03.850] - Josephine

I think it's because of the position they took in the World War. They were very aggressive, so now they want to sit back on dialogue instead of attacking.

[00:35:23.930] - Tess

I'll comment in a moment. Thank you, Moli.

[00:35:31.050] - Moli

I think because they had a very bad experience in the Second World War. And they don't want us to go through it again. So they want to solve the problems through dialog, instead of bullying, sanctioning and disciplining. And all that.

[00:35:55.510] - Tess

I think you've touched on what those, investigating the roots of Germany's hesitant, has said. The article quotes Thomas Urban. He's examined the psychological roots of Ostpolitics. They're really quite libertarian foreign policy attitude. And he pinpoints two emotions in Germany's relationship with Russia. Nostalgia and guilt. Nostalgia is particularly the memory of Bismarck, who saw the alliance with Russia as an anchor of stability in Europe. It's going back to pre World War I, where Bismarck, who was quite important for them, believed that you could keep stability throughout Europe through alliances. And that there is still some nostalgia for that type of position. Even where countries have differences and issues, that if you keep alliances that you can have stability. But I think the more deeper underlying one, which I think Josephine, you particularly articulated, is guilt. There was the feeling of guilt because in 1941, Germany attacked the Soviet Union and killed millions. "It meant it was difficult to criticize the Red Army or the Soviet oppression, since to do so means they were not recognizing the greatest crimes in history, particularly Germany. And because of that, it made Germany blind to the black side of the Soviet Union.

[00:37:41.920] - Tess

They're going back to the Cold War when United States was taking an aggressive position in opposition to the Soviet Union. And Germany was much more gentle nostalgia. But there's also the guilt. And that guilt has blinded their view, where not only are they unwilling to rebuke another country's humans rights violations or another country's imperialism, they also had trouble seeing it. And they say how this has helped Putin's propaganda. Because the vast majority of Russia doesn't have guilt for Stalin. They have rewritten the history. Stalin was a hero. The Soviet Union stopped Nazi Germany. Putin wants to take all the credit of that for Russia, the father land. The Soviet Union killed millions. But because Germany has carried the guilt of World War II. And the Soviet Union has not carried that guilt, especially Russia today. I know there are individuals who see things differently, and many of those individuals have fled the country now. But as a country, they don't carry guilt for the history of Stalin, and the history of the Soviet Union. What was worse in that history has been heavily rewritten. But Germany is different. They haven't rewritten their history.

[00:39:32.690] - Tess

Instead, they've created pillars to it, memorials to it. They've taught it at their schools. And that's a good thing. That's what the United States is needing to do with its own history. You need to remember it. There needs to be a sense of cultural guilt of what has taken place in the past because it's impacting the

present, because you don't want it to happen again. *"An arrangement that began as a peace time opening to a former foe..."* How Germany opened up to Russia. *"...has turned into an instrument of aggression. Germany is now funding Russia's war. In the first two months after the start of Russia's assault on Ukraine, Germany is estimated to have paid nearly €8.3 billion for Russian energy. Money used by Moscow to prop up the Ruble and buy the artillery shells firing at Ukrainian positions on Donetsk. In that time, EU countries are estimated to have paid a total of €39 billion for Russian energy. This is more than double the amount that European countries have given to Ukraine to help defend itself."* So Zelensky doesn't seem super grateful. As much as he's been given to help defend his country, Russia has been given double that, by the European Union to pay for Russian energy.

[00:41:04.370] - Tess

And that has been something that has been developing for decades. North Stream Two was an agreement between Germany and Russia for Russian energy that bypasses Ukraine and further weakens Ukraine. Makes it weaker in the face of Russian aggression. Germany signed onto Nord Stream Two in 2015, a year after Russia invaded Ukraine the first time. So Zelensky doesn't seem super grateful. But why has Germany taken this position? Quoting the historian Timothy Snyder. *"For 30 years, Germans lectured Ukrainians about fascism. When fascism actually arrived, Germans funded it, and Ukrainians died fighting it."* Germany's beautiful picture, I want to describe it as a libertarian picture. When you have an abusive country, which I'm substituting for the idea of an abusive individual. When you have misogyny and abuse in a person, substitute that for a country. When you have that. The idea that through trade, through integration. They invaded Ukraine. We'll sign Nord Stream Two. Putin's reasonable. He'll back down. We'll engage in dialogue. Even in 2021, as he started preparing on the border of Ukraine, and France and Germany are saying, dialogue will fix this. Dialogue will fix this.

[00:42:51.690] - Tess

Putin won't invade. He's not going to do that. Much of that is this same wishful thinking, that you don't need foreign intervention, that you don't need a military, that integration and trade, that beautiful picture can solve these kinds of problems. And now Ukraine is paying for it. And the approach Germany has taken to Russia is under intense scrutiny. Not intense scrutiny for what it's done in the last few years, but why did they sign onto Nord Stream Two in the first place? Why did they take the approach of the last half century? And I think this has a lot of domestic lessons to teach us about the United States, but also about how the United States should allow its past transgressions, the Iraq War as a recent one, and more historical transgressions. Slavery. How much should that affect the United States willingness to engage with foreign countries today? I saw a little bit of Max Blumenthal speaking on the Grayzone, and he was attacking US restrictions on Chinese imports. The very beginning of his attack against the US restrictions on Chinese imports, he began by reminding everyone that the date he was doing this video was the anniversary of the United States invasion of Iraq and the hypocrisy of the United States to take a hard line approach with China over China's mistakes. Even though he denies that China has mistakes. But a hard line approach with China when they invaded Iraq.

[00:45:02.360] - Tess

And this type of whataboutism that's brought into this left wing, right wing isolationist interventionist argument in the United States. And I think we should look for Germany also, to unite the three different topics we've been discussing. Libertarianism domestically, the beautiful picture versus the reality. America's own transgressions versus whether or not intervention is necessarily a bad thing. And then consider Europe's slow response to rising human rights abuses in Russia. Does anyone have any thoughts or questions so far? Is that clear, what we've done? That we've taken the discussion we had on internal libertarianism, that beautiful picture, and compared and contrasted it, mostly compared it, to how Germany approached the Soviet Union and Russia? Does that make sense? I see some nodding and no one is shaking their heads so far. That's okay. I think it's an interesting lesson. Because when you deal with the left wing, so much of it is also touching on foreign policy and so much is opposed to US interventionism. And I've been asking the question, is that necessarily progressive? Is it right for America's guilt over Iraq to prevent it from intervening today?

[00:47:02.230] - Tess

And is that intervention necessarily neo imperialism, new imperialism? There was a third article that I wanted to share on exactly this point. It was to be the third addition to the last two I've already shared. And it was about progressives in the United States and their hesitancy to defend Ukraine. It says acknowledging the United States failings doesn't mean ignoring Russian imperialism. The point he was trying to make in this article was that we can acknowledge the United States failings, but that shouldn't necessarily stop intervention today. It's not that simple. I'm not going to share that article because on rereading it, I had too many problems. And perhaps once we get further on in sifting, perhaps then I'll give it out and ask us to actually discuss what's wrong with it. But I don't want us to try and analyze what's wrong with it now. There were things that troubled me to the point I've decided not to share it. So at the moment we have those first two articles and please reread them.

[00:48:30.280] - Tess

I wanted to touch on Germany, when we discuss libertarianism. Because domestic and foreign policy are in many ways overlapping. Then we discussed atheism. How it is disproportionately found in the far right. Of the Trinity doctrine, we discussed libertarianism and we discussed atheism. And by the time we've done that, we'd made the first point that I wanted to make to help us unpack the left wings problems. And that was, the first point, that it is not church and state that are the problem, but instead it's culture, which is why we have heard and discussed so much about a culture war. We made a secondary additional point to that where we said, if it is this type of political culture war, how do we also then view the great controversy? And we said, made the point that the Great Controversy itself is also a war, a political war, a political election. That's a separate point, but it was an important one. I'm going to add it in there. Great controversy equals an election. An election between two political parties, two different ways of governing. Equality over freedom, or an alternative that was offered in heaven and then Eden. Freedom over equality. This is about as far as we got before we were forced to bring all this back in. We're back to the start again. And that's particularly what I wanted us to see in reviewing that.

[00:50:55.330] - Tess

At this point we went back to the Grayzone. But we expanded it to prove that there's a left wing problem. But we can do that once we have broken down this. And then we are bringing it back to discuss how we sift. How do we sift the true stream? Because we shouldn't even be swimming in the wrong one. To help explain why the Grayzone and the far right seem to agree on so many things, we began to explain neo versus paleoconservatism. And this is where we will continue. Unless anyone has any thoughts or questions about what is on the board so far or where we've been. Everyone's fine with that? Great.

[00:52:20.250] - Tess

Can someone explain to me the difference between paleo and neo-conservatism? I'm not entirely sure who's participating tonight, so I won't pull people out. Brodie.

[00:52:51.420] - Brodie

If I remember right, paleo means old and historical or the original, and neo means new.

[00:53:07.970] - Tess

So paleo is old. Can you think of other times you've heard the word neo before?

[00:53:28.450] - Brodie

I think I have a mental blank the minute I asked you that.

[00:53:35.370] - Tess

I knew you would, because that's what I would do. My brain shuts down when I have those kinds of questions. Do you have anything else to add there?

[00:53:46.370] - Brodie

No.

[00:53:50.730] - Tess

Brenden.

[00:53:56.590] - Brenden

I'm not sure where I've heard neo. But I was going to add a bit more on old and new. One is pro intervention, the other has an isolationist point of view, when it comes to foreign policy.

[00:54:19.710] - Tess

I think that's the easiest way in one sentence to divide the two. It has a plethora of implications, though. So paleo old is isolation. And you've told us that neo / new is intervention, and obviously we don't believe that all intervention is neoconservative. But I'll keep it like that for now. Anything else Brenden?

[00:54:56.330] - Brenden

No, that's it.

[00:54:58.850] - Tess

Josephine.

[00:55:06.910] - Josephine

I was thinking of the word new attached to another word. Maybe I'm wrong, but I had to think of neo-natal, neo-nazi.

[00:55:20.370] - Tess

Yes, that's exactly right. Do you have any others? Sorry, I interrupted.

[00:55:26.970] - Josephine

That's all right for now. I only got those two.

[00:55:31.170] - Tess

Neo-nazi. Today, people who espouse Nazi ideology. It's not exactly like the Nazi ideology of the 1930s and 40s. So rather than refer to it as Nazism or to refer to someone who is like that as a Nazi. It's now neo-nazis. And that's quite possibly where you might have heard the neo term most frequently used. It's the same fascist ideology, but it's a new manifestation of it. I wanted us to see. We've heard this quite a lot. And we might have heard it subconsciously or not picked up on it. The neo, the new connotations. I think there's others as well, but Neo Nazi is the one that comes to mind. Thank you, Josephine. Sharon.

[00:56:37.370] - Sharon

I was going to say neonatal is the word we often use to refer to newborn babies or even babies that are born like prematurely.

[00:56:54.370] - Tess

I heard Josephine say neonatal and I couldn't remember what it meant, so I concentrated on neo-nazi. Thank you. Someone that knows what they're talking about, to educate us. It's a new baby. Is that too simple? Is that new concept is new?

[00:57:16.250] - Sharon

Yeah, that's perfect.

[00:57:18.190] - Tess

Okay, thank you. Moli.

[00:57:24.290] - Moli

I thought that the paleo is sort of talking about conservative ideology. Neo is sort of a change.

[00:57:41.490] - Tess

Sorry, I missed a word in there. You said paleo is conservative. What did you say Neo was?

[00:57:48.810] - Moli

Neo, it says required change.

[00:57:55.230] - Tess

There's change.

[00:57:57.100] - Moli

Yeah, especially we shift our ideology from right to left.

[00:58:08.710] - Tess

These are both conservative, in the context we're discussing them. So it's still right wing, but they're different variations of right wing conservatism. I still think that your point is valid. I have not necessarily proven it yet, I suppose if some people are questioning it. But I would say paleo is much further right wing. So neo is less far right. Paleo is what developed into the alt-right. Is that okay, Moli? Are we disagreeing. I think I'm understanding you correctly.

[00:58:55.210] - Moli

No, I agree there.

[00:58:58.330] - Tess

Thank you. Katherine.

[00:59:02.590] - Katherine

It's a bit of a question. Would it be accurate to describe one of them as wanting to spread their culture everywhere around the globe and the other one is wanting to preserve their culture by building a bubble around it or a wall around it?

[00:59:23.450] - Tess

I'm not sure about the spreading culture. Because I think that there's a certain amount that should be spread. I suppose my hesitancy with the spreading culture part is, are universal human rights cultural? And if they're attempting to spread universal human rights, they're not attempting to spread western culture because universal human rights are not western culture. Which I know that you and I agree on. I don't think we're disagreeing there. Just on the wording of spreading.

[01:00:07.630] - Katherine

Are you saying that they were concerned with the human rights of other countries and not spreading their own culture? One sounds good and one sounds bad. Do you think that someone like George Bush, was his motivation more to do with the human rights then Americanizing the other countries. I had this picture of them wanting to dominate. I don't know.

[01:00:43.610] - Tess

If that's how you meant it, then I agree, but I think I would agree with both.

[01:00:50.150] - Katherine

Okay.

[01:00:50.600] - Tess

I think that George Bush was motivated by suppressing a country that he saw as a threat. The need to dominate and have this invincible army and be the unilateral most powerful country on earth, was a motivating factor. I also believe that with a degree of arrogance and a degree of naivety, they genuinely believed that by toppling a government, they could bring equality, human rights, freedom and a democratic government to Afghanistan. I think that was incredibly naive and arrogant, but not necessarily a wrong motivation.

[01:01:36.750] - Katherine

Okay, thank you.

[01:01:39.270] - Tess

I think I would agree with both points there. The problem is that if we look at Afghanistan as radical feminists, the misogyny in society in Afghanistan is easily seen through the Taliban, but it's actually cultural. I shared an article to prove that point. Again, I've been nailing trying to nail culture and the

universality of misogyny and culture for a long time. I shared an article on the media broadcast around August last year, of a woman who had worked for years in Afghanistan to fight for the rights, in basic rights of women. And her point was, the Taliban is terrible. But life without the Taliban was terrible too, because the misogyny is cultural. And the United States could not go in and overthrow the Taliban. Because what they're fighting in Afghanistan is culture. I don't think that's imposing western culture on Afghanistan. What it should be about, if their motivations were pure, and I'm sure they weren't, would be about universal human rights. What do you do when you have a country that is committing horrific human rights violations? So, I'm sorry. I think Katherine, we agree. But I got off on a tangent. My brain went off. I can't remember. Can you repeat yourself, Katherine?

[01:03:32.560] - Katherine

I said, could we frame it as one of them is paleo, they're wanting to put a bubble around their culture, protect their culture, put a wall around it. They're trying to preserve their own culture. And about the rest of the world we don't care. And about neo, could we say that though their culture was still top to them, but they wanted to spread it around the world? Could we say it like that?

[01:04:06.250] - Tess

I think you've pinpointed paleo quite well. It's that bubble around culture. It's the preservation of it. So, yes. Brenden.

[01:04:23.090] - Brenden

I hope I can explain this question well enough. About what you were talking with Katherine. The group that brings in the Sunday Law is the paleo, or the old or the isolationists. And when we go back to prophecy leads us, you would say that America would be the ruler of the Ten Kings as an example. And so they'll would dominate the Ten Kings. How does that work when I look at the paleo isolationist? Because the neo or the interventionists are dead now. And how does America now dominate the Ten Kings when they're isolationists and now they're not interventionists? How do we see that now? Are they now leading by looking inward, nationalism, and that spreads globally? Am I asking the question okay?

[01:06:07.750] - Tess

You are.

[01:06:13.290] - Brenden

We're looking at something different now. Originally my original brain would have thought, well, if America is the boss of the Ten Kings, that would make me automatically think, isn't that the neo? They're the interventionists, they're forcing the Ten Kings. But now I've got the Sunday Law being driven by isolationist. They're inward looking. They're not really caring what's happening to the Ten Kings. Am I saying that correctly?

[01:06:52.890] - Tess

You are. I think that I'd like to give a bit of a history of paleoconservatism and discuss it a little bit more, before answering though. Because part of the reason we're doing that is to assess the left wing and the parts of the left wing that I have the most problems with. Where the problems are most explicit... It's not the isolationist of the paleoconservative, but it's the hatred and the fear of colonialism that makes them also quite isolationist. And that was not Hillary Clinton. And Hillary Clinton was, if not the entirety of the solution, she was to a large extent the start of it. And she is the Clinton of Benghazi. She's not isolationist. I think the discussion of isolationism and the motivations behind the different groups would probably need discussing before answering that question. I don't think all intervention is about domination in that way. Motivations have become important. If you don't mind, I'll come back to that. But I'll give a bit of history first. Josephine.

[01:08:16.990] - Josephine

I've got a few words floating in my head. I wonder if it fit into the discussion at the moment. Like a new manifestation. Same entity, and he was. Does that have any connection at all with what we're talking about right now? I mean, prophecy, going back to Revelation and Daniel. Sixth head, 7th. Maybe I'm wrong.

[01:09:00.550] - Tess

I'm not sure how to answer that right now. I can say it's a new manifestation of conservatism. But it's always been there. And I think, that sometimes it's what was there before, bubbling up again. Isn't that the point? It has a deadly wound, a death and it comes back. I think that's worth considering when we look back at Millerite history. If this is the world today. We believe that the Sunday Law test is global, then all of these become little countries. You have Ukraine. I won't make it the biggest one. Let's say you have China, and Uganda, and France, and the USA. If you take that, which is today. If you were to take that back and make that the USA, Millerite history, then you have all of these states. And you would have Texas and Mississippi, and New York. And I don't think Washington gets state status, but you would have the seat of government. The wrong side of the debate in Millerite history, what was their excuse to attack the government, to secede from the Union? How did they see the government versus their freedoms?

[01:11:26.210] - Tess

Brenden.

[01:11:31.350] - Brenden

Well, it was state's rights. It was the government intervening and interfering with their freedoms to do what they want to do in their own states.

[01:11:42.030] - Tess

What do you call that? When far away government decides to intervene in your territory?

[01:11:52.150] - Brenden

I guess that would be imperialism.

[01:11:54.910] - Tess

Imperialism. Colonialism. And I get that there's a difference, because it's one country, but it's similar. You can contrast it. There's a difference. They are under Washington to an extent, and Uganda is not under the United States. But it's the same issue. There's also that comparison. What Texas is arguing is, it is imperialistic for the government, the government of the north. It's the northern states. It's not even their government. It's what the northern states have chosen. To come over to our territory and don't tell us Texans that racial rights are universal human rights. That is cultural imperialism. It's a similar argument to what has been discussed in the first article I shared by the UN human Rights Commissioner. What are some countries arguing? They're not saying, it's okay. France, be Islamophobic France, because we know that racial rights are culturally interpreted. That's not an argument being made today. The argument being made today is that gender rights, rights for women and rights for LGBT people are not universal, but must be defined by internal cultures. And they will say the west, because it usually works out this way. Because the west to come into our culture and speak about, promote, try to force through universal human rights for women, is neo or new colonialism, neo or new imperialism.

[01:14:00.350] - Tess

That's the fight that the first article was discussing. That's why it was given the title, very deliberately given the title, because they know what the core issue was that he was fighting. *"Do not dare to tell me women's rights are not universal. Do not dare to tell me that LGBT rights are not universal."* Hillary Clinton's speech, what was the speech you were famous for? I don't remember it exactly. Women's rights are human rights. Human rights are women's rights. They are universal. **That's what she was fighting for. And by the time you get to 2016, that is what she's angry about. Part of the reason she was the solution to the problem. Not many people, not many women, Ilhan Omar even, AOC, they are not thinking that way. They are not fighting for that.** Therefore they are part of the problem and not the solution. When we talk about intervention and isolationist versus interventionist. This is why I'm being careful. Because there is a genuine danger of imperialism and colonialism, an extensive history of that. But when you have human rights violations, can the United States, like Germany did, say, well, we have done some terrible things and we have made mistakes in the past, therefore we should sit back and not be hypocritical and condemn another country for theirs?

[01:15:39.290] - Tess

I want us to see that in the context of Millerite history. Does that make sense? Brenden there's contrasts, but there's comparisons.

[01:15:48.410] - Brenden

Yes. Thank you.

[01:15:51.230] - Tess

I really encourage us to reread that first and the second article. Especially the first. Ray. I just wanted to say the same thing Brenden did. Your hand went up at the same time. Is there anything you want to add on to that?

[01:16:38.510] - Tess

I want to suggest that paleoconservatism is old conservatism because it was so much in existence back here. It was very much the government of the south. The government of Lincoln frightened the south so much, because it was a change from what they had before. Old conservatism is isolationism and states rights. Which is an internal pocket of isolationism. What did the United States do the minute their revolution ended and all of a sudden France needed help? What was their position? Sorry, we're isolationist. Deal with it yourself, France. While there was differences of opinions, the majority of that early history of the United States was more isolationist than what you find in a neoconservatism today. I would suggest. Therefore, I think that when they call themselves paleo, because that's something they call themselves, it was not given to them. They have a point. I think that they have a point, that they are the older and more original form of conservatism. In opposition to Lincoln as flawed as he was. Graeme.

[01:18:11.050] - Graeme

My question goes back about 15 minutes. Does the intervention by God and Jesus in heaven of the revolt of Lucifer, and also then coming down to Earth and intervening there, and changing the culture of that place become a prophetic model for us?

[01:18:52.750] - Tess

I think that question is a very deep one. It depends, I think, if we see it as a separate country in a way. But I certainly don't think that God has been anything approaching isolationist or anything approaching libertarian. I don't fully understand how the great controversy works. I think that we are piece by piece seeing behind the curtain and unpacking it. I don't quite get all the rules of warfare. I see that this country, this earth as a whole, voted for one government for a freedom over equality model. That Adam and he voted for. Therefore Lucifer became king of this earth. It was his governmental model that was going to rule. And then I've viewed it as where the Godhead is a shadow government, as an opposition government. And sometimes the opposition government can publicly fight, but they don't have that much power. So people ask, if God is real, why do such terrible things happen? It's because he's the opposition government. You don't vote Republican, and when you're not able to afford medical bills, say, why haven't you sorted out the health care system in the United States? They can't do very much.

[01:20:43.500] - Tess

I don't understand all of how the great controversy works. But as we get deeper into some of these subjects, a lot makes more sense. I've predominantly viewed it rather than God having a separate country, that they are part of this country, but the opposition government. Perhaps there's another way,

another parable to look at it though, that would go into this. I think it's too deep of a question for me to comment on, without thinking of it more though. Is that okay?

[01:21:31.090] - Graeme

Yes. Thank you.

[01:21:34.810] - Tess

I do think that even in understanding World War I and World War II. As the moves of the current government in office, why horrific things have happened. And under whose leadership those horrific things have taken place. And questioned that under a government where God does believe in freedom, equality over freedom, but still believes in freedom, that when Adam and Eve and the majority of this planet vote for that type of government, when and how can God intervene and when and how can he not? I'll give a couple of points and then we will close the time. I wanted to give a little bit of history of paleo versus neoconservatism. And as we've done coming back to this model. It's old, it's not a new concept, but it has become much clearer that there are these two sides. And it's not all neat. Some people straddle both. Some people are 75% paleo, 25% neo. It's always been that way. But if we were to do a little bit more of a recent history. Going right back to the 1920s, leading up to and then into the 1920s. You had these two sides versus expansion, progressivism and more isolationist anti immigration approach.

[01:23:42.090] - Tess

From what I have read, and I'm going to scan through a few different sources that I've read. The paleoconservatism was powerful in the 20's and 30's. But the problem was. Everything else less extreme conservatism kept being so successful, other models kept being so successful. The New Deal was quite successful. Then you come to the 1940's, and you have World War II. And as you would expect, conservatives were split over World War II whether to get involved neoconservative or to be isolationist and yet let Europe fight it out themselves. Paleoconservative. The problem for the paleoconservatives is that the United States did get involved, and World War II was won by the Allied forces, and that made neoconservatism or interventionism in general look really good. It made it attractive to people. So because intervention and the New Deal and these different forces of interventionism and progressivism were successful, paleoconservatism isolationism, that more extreme right wing ideology never really gained enough traction to make a major impact. Then you come to the civil rights movement, and conservatives began to reject explicit racism. It became less popular to be explicitly racist. And paleoconservatism slunk even more into the background.

[01:25:39.270] - Tess

Then when you come to the 1980's and 1990's. The voices, paleoconservatism, that old school isolationist, anti immigration, xenophobic, far right ideology didn't have a major voice, but it had some, especially under Pat Buchanan. He's the most prominent apostle of the old right of Paleoconservatism. Particularly in the 1980's 1990's. And he did hold positions of influence under the Nixon and Reagan administrations. He ran for president in 1992 on an America First slogan. They say he echoed the 1940s isolationists, those who wanted to stay out of World War Two, and preview Trump. So

paleoconservatism under Pat Buchanan in 1992, America First. They talk about Phyllis Schlafly. She's best known for defeating the Women's Equal Rights Amendment. She opposed to the Vietnam War. Isolationist. Paleoconservative opposed Bill Clinton's humanitarian intervention in Bosnia and most international agreements since. Paleoconservative isolationist. They list some other paleoconservative writers Joseph Soberen, who's a Holocaust denier. Tacky Theodoropolis antisemitic and racist. But also by the time you get into the 1990's, paleoconservatism, even though it's quiet, it started to become a little bit more popular. If we were to trace the 1940s, neo really has a lot of influence here, because of World War II. It made intervention look good. It took down Hitler.

[01:27:47.060] - Tess

Then, we skip a lot of history, you come to 1989. Between World War II and 1989 you have the Cold War. Neoconservatism interventionism is quite popular through that history. Even paleoconservatives and even libertarians took the position, we are isolationists, except for against the Soviet Union, because they're so dangerous and they're so bad, we need to fight them. Even paleoconservatism here was particularly limited. But 1989, the Soviet Union falls. And what is left really to intervene in now? What great big threat the neoconservatives have that they have as a type of excuse to intervene in the world? And they say that around here you can see the foreshadowing of the rise of paleoconservatism. But what really took it down, was 911. And then 2003, and the Iraq War. 2003, of course, in that history, the Afghanistan War. 2008, you have the election of Barack Obama. 2009, he takes office.

[01:29:31.220] - Tess

"Just when the old right seemed on the verge of extinction, the world changed. First, George Bush's disastrous invasion of Iraq undermined conservative support for the hawkish foreign policy that had been Republican orthodoxy since Reagan. Second, the 2008 financial crash and the sluggish recovery that followed undercut the enthusiasm among voters, if not elected officials, for the free trade packs that market conservatives promoted." Trade is also involved in this isolationist argument. "The refusal of the increasingly paleocon House Republican Caucus to pass Bush's Troubled Asset Relief Program in late 2008 was, in retrospect, the harbinger of the fishes that erupted in 2016. Third, the prospect that whites would soon constitute a minority in an increasingly multiracial polyglot society inspired this resurgent rise in this fear of replacement."

[01:30:36.170] - Tess

In 2008, but really, 2009, there's a switch. And we'll stop here for time. But this is where you find a switch, a switch between neo to paleo. And much of what we've discussed in the past, talking about the Monroe Doctrine... We're going to start here next week, and I'll add to that. But much of what we've spoken about really fits into this history, 1989 to 2009. That's when it was under neoconservatism. George Bush and his warhawks. That entire system of type of Republican government really died a death in 2009. And that is a prophetic marker. It's the increase of knowledge before the Sunday Law for a reason, an increase of knowledge before 2014.

[01:31:32.520] - Tess

It is for the line of the priests, what 2019 is for the line of the 144,000. It's a significant marker. And what you're seeing is a change in the conservative movement between neocon and paleocon. And paleocon is where the deepest, darkest threat lies. It's paleoconservatism that gave birth in 2009 to the alt right. The alt right came directly out of paleoconservatism, and they pin its beginning to 2009. We'll stop here for time, but we'll start there again there next week and talk about its rise. Talk about 2009 and the rise of paleoconservatism and some more implications of that. The whole point of this is so that we can go into the left wing and analyze their mistakes. But if you have questions or thoughts, please try to remember them for next week. Josephine, would you mind closing in prayer for us?

[01:33:12.170] - Josephine

Gracious Lord, we thank you so much for this Sabbath Day. We thank you that we can gather together as a group to study Your Word, to expand our minds, to search our hearts, to listen to the message you have given to Your servant, and to embrace it. Thank you, Lord, for these exercises. It has taught us so much. We should count ourselves as very blessed to have instructions from above, to help us to direct our footsteps, help us to navigate through complicated history, complicated times in which we are walking through. We look forward always to vespers, because we know that our minds are going to be challenged. And we bless you and thank you and give you all the glory. Bless everyone that's present here tonight and bless your people all over the world that would be listening to the videos. Bless our leaders Lord. And thank you for being with us and walking together with us through history and through this time. In Jesus wonderful name we praise you. Amen.

[01:34:59.070] - Tess

Amen. Just one thought before we close, I guess a question to think of, during the week. Trump's election helped promote and facilitate the rise of authoritarianism worldwide. It wasn't the cause of it, or the sole cause of it. Countries carry their own guilt, but it played a part in it. If Trump is predominantly paleoconservative, which he is, how come his election had that international response? Keeping in mind that when we say authoritarianism. Authoritarianism, as a recent article made the point, is inextricably linked to abusive patriarchal culture. Just something to think about, to consider the 2016 through 2022 impact of Trump's election internationally. That's all. I hope you have a happy Sabbath. Thank you, everyone, for participating so much.