

9. The Trinity - Atheism & the Four Horsemen

Tess Lambert, 15.04.2022

Youtube Video

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BsamcCk1VpU>

Dear Lord, I pray that you will be with us as we study. May we understand the world we live in on both sides of the curtain of the Great controversy. May we see what the world is divided over what it's fighting over. So that we also may more clearly see what heaven was fought over and the choices that your people have to have before them now. May we make the right decisions. May we choose not based on emotion and feeling but based on truth. I pray Lord that we'll make decisions that are selfless not selfish in Jesus name, I pray. Amen.

So, some are participating tonight and some are only listening in. So, there's a quite a mixture of people tonight who can speak or are in situations where they can't. So, I'll try not to get that mixed up at all. I understand the trouble with circumstances. I'm always trying to get to the point. I'm not trying to drag this out, but the problem is that, there are just key foundational points that need to be made first. And as we've been wanting to talk about the left wing, I think, we are gaining quite a lot by taking a closer look at the right wing and trying to understand, what is the difference even between the right wing and the left wing, because why does God care about what politics we subscribe to. And why did God make our politics change in 2018.

So, to really understand all of that before we touch on the left wing. We're digging through the right wing, understanding what motivates the right wing. What we have said motivates the right wing is this fight for freedom. Freedom above all else. Freedom over Equality.

And what mobilizes the left wing is also a belief in Freedom but a priority for Equality, when those both very important foundational principles collide.

The United States is the glorious land. It's rising in 1798. It is the King of the North, but Babylon is not the glorious land. Medo-Persia is not the glorious land. Greece is not the glorious land. Rome was never the glorious land. And the United States is. And why is that? And, I've said the United States is the glorious land when Rome wasn't, because of this belief, the founding of the nation on principles of freedom and equality.

What Obama referred to as their North star that they never quite reach but they're always striving towards, and if they kept striving towards that north star there would be no Sunday Law, there would be no collapse no shipwreck. But we know that they don't do well, and in trying to understand how the United States is shipwrecked, how it all goes wrong, we've stripped it back down to those two underlying principles of freedom and equality. And what happens when they collide, because they're constantly colliding.

The right wing sees freedom and equality collide and chooses freedom. The left wing sees freedom and equality collide and they choose equality. So, there is that phrase :

- "Give me freedom or give me death".

- "I will disagree with what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it". "Or your freedom to say it".

People mobilize around freedom. So we went and looked at the trucker protests in all of these truckers in Canada, in the context of covert mandates mobilizing to defend freedom, this is the mask-less rallies, this is the United Australia party that call for freedom. And I just wanted to make a point on how easy it is to hear a phrase like : "I disagree with what you say but I'll defend to the death you're right to say". It sounds so good when you take that concept and put it in this quippy little phrase. And when I first heard that, I thought : "well that sounds lovely. I think i would post that on my facebook wall". I think that I would want to live in a world that said : "I would will defend your right to say even things i don't agree with". But the way that is used, this one phrase it's actually incredibly toxic. The way that people glorify freedom.

We spoke about Hollywood. Hollywood's glorification of freedom. How Hollywood constantly in movie after movie after movie puts before the public, entertaining and world scenarios, where there's a deep state, a corrupt billionaire, behind the scenes trying to mass exterminate a lot of people. Scenarios like that, or a robot or to take away people's freedom for the greater good. And then you have the gun-toting American hero, who's going to kill a lot of people, and barrel his way through foreign countries or to save the world's freedoms. And i don't believe that focus that Hollywood has had that has nothing to do with the way especially middle aged and younger people in the United States today view their fight for freedom from George Soros for example, from the deep state taking away their freedom. For a lot of people I think, they are trying to live the Hollywood movie that they have seen glamorized over and over again. So, we see these

phrases. There's one other phrase that came to mind, as I was thinking during the week, that I think is a fundamental reason the world is messed up today. I'll ask you with those of their camera on, cannot if they want to.

Do you know the phrase, "People will not remember what you say, they will remember how you made them feel".

I see nodding. Can we take a moment to think how wrong that is. Like the priority isn't on what you say or what you do what people will remember about you is the way that you make them feel. What was the problem in the time of Christ? How did those nationalistic pharisees feel, when Jesus came? How did His message make them feel?

They didn't remember what He said. Nothing He said mattered. What mattered was the way Christ made people feel. And the problem is, He didn't make them feel very good. What was the problem with Ellen White? People stopped caring what she said. She wrote so prolifically because people weren't listening. If they hadn't listened to something she said, she probably would have had to say a whole lot less. But she keeps repeating herself because people didn't really care what she said, they cared about how, what she said or who she was made them feel.

Why won't a Russian nationalist in Russia today believe their own family members in Ukraine showing them photos of what Russia has been doing in Ukraine. If a Russian person who has idolized Vladimir Putin for all of this time, for all of these years, and built up this nationalistic model where Stalin was a hero, where their country is persecuted, where they are the victims, where Vladimir Putin is this great masculine hero, raised up to bring back their country's glory, after they were humiliated at the end of the cold war. And their personal identity is so much formed around that. And then they hear a report saying by the way:

- Vladimir Putin is a liar.
- Your military is weak.
- They're committing genocide and war crimes.
- And the majority of the rest of the world certainly in the United States doesn't like you right now.

Why won't they accept truth now? Because based on everything that's connected to their current belief system, it's not what news or information says to them, it's how that information makes them feel. These phrases are incredibly toxic and yet they're celebrated as beautiful. People put them as Facebook statuses. They think they're really good principles. When someone says something that makes them uncomfortable, they'll bring out that phrase and put it on their Facebook wall, and say: "People won't remember what you do or what you say but it's all about how you make them feel". It is, it is all about how people are made to feel, but it that's the fundamental reason why the majority of the earth is lost and will be lost. People today say: I'm only in this movement still, because of how leadership made me feel because. I felt loved or I felt accepted by members. And I think, that is so fundamentally selfish. When we lay out the problem with the world today. The extent of sexism and misogyny. What that is doing to women and LGBT people? Say there is this disease that is killing millions and we have a vaccine for it. I would hope, that we would not just support that vaccine because some people creating that vaccine made us feel good about ourselves or made us feel loved and accepted. We need to get to the point of, why we're in this movement. And these phrases sound nice, but they make me feel hopeless to be honest.

So, we can say: "People won't remember what you say but they will remember how you made them feel". People can say: They're in this movement because they've been made to feel good. I think then there's only a matter of time before they're not, because eventually, I will make people not feel good. That's unavoidable for me, I think. But also these phrases around freedom that celebrate it and champion freedom and freedom of speech. Yes, it's a fundamental and important principle of the glorious land. Eden is the glorious land. Ancient Israel through all of its problems. The United States as a country, and the earth made new. Freedom is a fundamental principle. But freedom and equality collide and they collide over the issues particularly of the civil rights, of those who are through the course of sin, through the history particularly of Eve and Cham, those who have been suppressed by society.

Christ's parable teaching was designed to make people feel uncomfortable. Quoting someone there. So, if Christ was designed to make people feel uncomfortable and all of society seems to agree that people don't remember what you say, they remember how you made them feel. Is there any question or any surprise, why Christ was crucified? If people think that is these phrases are positive without digging deeper, it shows, why you know, I can present camp meeting, after camp meeting, after camp meeting, and then I see someone status update, about you know a really great person when they acknowledge they don't know much, and it'll be these little phrases, and I realized, there's absolutely nothing I can say that can compete with essentially a meme. But, I just wanted to I did mention that in the context of reviewing the right wing versus the left wing: equality versus freedom. The glorification that is given to freedom. We have been targeting the right wing since 2018 and we've been doing that from a prophetic perspective and that has made people that parable teaching has made people

feel not right, it has made people feel uncomfortable not just in 2018 but in 2019, in 2020, in 2021. And you can bet, in 2022 it is continuing to. It makes people feel uncomfortable. But people need to get past how it makes them feel and look at what is actually being presented.

Freedom versus equality. Equality should win, that was the conflict in Eden. That was the choice that Adam and Eve were given. They were given the tree because it was a mechanism of voting between two political parties. In eating the apple it wasn't this minor moral decision of God said : I shouldn't but I'm really hungry and I'm kind of curious.

It was a system of voting. Satan presented an alternative type of government a type of government that would prioritize freedom over equality. And how did that make Eve feel ? Made her feel good. And she forgot, what Christ had said and only remembered how Christ and the angels who presented God's government to her, remembering how what they had said made her feel. And she chose the one that made her feel better. And Adam, however it's presented wasn't really that extremely different. He saw a system of voting and he just didn't want to think about it too much. He did it in haste because he realized the consequences of staying with Christ's government, what he would lose and he liked the way his current life made him feel.

So, over the last few years we have been targeting Christianity. We've been targeting Protestantism specifically somewhat Catholicism but we've been speaking to this (the Protestantism). That segment of Donald Trump's base. And I noticed a trend very quickly, where people thought, well all we need to do is criticize Protestantism, criticize Christianity and push away Protestantism and Christianity and embrace more of the secular world and the problem will be solved. It was this type of unspoken but growing belief in the Movement that Christianity was the cause of the problem and the whole of the problem. They saw Protestantism, which they see, I think, people have thought is the entirety of Trump's base and it isn't. But seeing Protestantism, Christianity as the cause of the problem and the whole of the problem. And in going into the right wing what i'm trying to prove is : that it's not the cause and it's not the whole. Especially saying : it's not the cause, but also trying to also illustrate that..., we also can't say that it's the whole of the problem.

And to do that, we went to the *Vox* article a lot of other articles as well. But the *Vox* article because I thought it gave a window into a very large segment of the right-wing base that is not Christian. And it spoke about the trinity. The right wing or far-right trinity in the United States. Who can tell me what the trinity was ? Marie, do you remember what the trinity was ?

Marie : No sorry, I can't remember

Tess : I think it'll come back to you when it's said. Katryne ?

Katryne : Libertarianism. Atheism and Men's rights activism.

Tess : Yes, Libertarianism and remember not the political party. These are not followers of the political party but libertarianism philosophy. And how libertarianism philosophy has impacted the republican party, which we're going to discuss more. Atheism and men's right. Thank you Katryne. Men's rights forums movement that entire base. Does that bring it back to, Marie ? Ring your belt ?

Marie. Yes thank you. Great. Thanks.

Tess : So, what I wanted to do was actually use the militia groups in the United States, as an example. Because, if we're going to talk about this prioritizing freedom, then I want to talk about Libertarianism as a philosophy. Because we read the quotes last week of a Republican saying : "The problem with my political party is libertarianism philosophy and that libertarianism philosophy entered and greatly impacted the republican party in the history of the civil rights movement, about 10 years before the libertarian party as a political party even formed".

So, I wanted to show the link between not Republicanism and not Protestantism and far-right militias in the United States. I want to show it between Libertarianism and the militia groups. We've read quotes that said : "there's that link". I read a few quotes that just stated as a fact, that there is a pipeline between Libertarianism and far-right leaders, leaders of the far right. And I wanted to... the far right is broad, only a very small percentage of them are in militia groups, but it does provide a window. So, I wanted to discuss the Proud boys - the Oath keepers, the three percenters and the somewhat more ambiguous and leaderless. What's that movement called, starts with a "B" ? Someone unmute and shout it out, if you remember. Thank you the Boogaloo movement. So, kind of want to discuss the four, but we're not going to do that today, because I got sidetracked this morning. For people who, because we have a few people who are new on, if what you can do, is, if you wish to ask a question or comment. If you can put your hand up in the chat section. So, if you go to the chat, you'll see that Kathryn just before, she put a "H". And that page just means a hand. So if you put a "H" in the chat and though your hand is raised, then I know that you have a comment or a question. So just to explain how where some of the operating. The way we operate in these

classes we don't just unmute and speak, because it's a little difficult to do that or over zoom instead people put a "H" in the chat. So, please feel free to do that if you would like to.

So, we were going to do militias and now we're not sidestepping, instead of discussing libertarianism, I want to discuss atheism. Now with some of these things, it's a class but it's a little difficult, because I have a selection of points I want to make in quotes that I've kind of collated but it is interactive. So if at any point you feel lost or you have a thought that you want to add or you would just like to repeat what I'm saying back to me, to make sure that you're on the same page, please just raise your hand. Otherwise, I might end up reading a fair bit tonight. And I know some people are just listening in anyway because of circumstances.

So, we're targeting the right wing and there is a large segment of the right wing that is younger. We see that at *Gamergate* but we also see that through Trump's inauguration, we see that through January 6. There is a younger group being appealed to than say : grandpa on his lazy boy watching Tucker Carlson. There is this rising movement in the United States that are more reflective of America's future, secular future. Right-wing secular future then of America's Christian past. And it's that segment that I'm trying to draw out and illustrate. They are, who I believe, we should be most concerned about. We've targeted Protestantism because that is where this movement comes under, that's where Adventism sits. But expanding out looking at this other portion of the right wing today. We saw what is described as the trinity : men's rights libertarianism but atheism.

So, I want to talk about atheism because if we are in a post-christian world which we have agreed that we are in. If the United States is also post-christian, then you would think that if Christianity was the cause and the whole of the problem that everything would be looking up, wouldn't it ? But I want to suggest why that's not the case and it's to a large degree because of this atheism. And I know some of you have actually sent me things, where atheism has been discussed. So, some of you might have some background into what is called new atheism.

The term New Atheism was coined by the journalist Gary Wolf in 2006 to describe the positions promoted by some atheists of the twenty-first century. New Atheism advocates the view that superstition, religion and irrationalism should not simply be tolerated. Instead, they should be countered, criticized, and challenged by rational argument, especially when they exert undue influence, such as in government, education, and politics...

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_Atheism

"New atheism became a term was coined in 2006 to describe the positions or the position held by many prominent atheists in the 21st century".

So, there's atheism of the 19th century of the 20th century but now getting into the 21st century, they saw changes within atheism as a collective as a movement. And with that change in the 21st century in 2006 the term was coined a new atheism. And this new atheism is much more, they don't like this word, but they're described as fundamentalists. The atheism of the 20th century of the 1900s, it was kind of like you were this person and you were also an atheist and you just didn't get involved in religion.

New atheism believes that there shouldn't be a toleration of religion. Instead religion and how they connect it to superstition and irrationalism should be counted, criticized and challenged by rational arguments. Especially when religion exerts undue influence in government. So, new atheists are much more activists than those of the last century in the century. Before this is atheistic leaders who particularly coalesced post 2001. And what they're fighting, is religions influence on the government, which for an Adventist we should agree with, that would be deeply opposed to Church and State. But remember, I said libertarianism is opposed to Church and State as well. And if Libertarianism has a role in the Sunday Law, if libertarian philosophy is a key driver for the Sunday Law, then we need to consider how we describe the union of Church and State in our dispensation. If any of that confuses or troubles, let me know.

So, new atheism. It's coined as a term in 2006. But it's about a group of particularly four men. There's four of them that kind of led the way. Really did lead the way into new atheism. And new atheism was a reaction to September 11.

In 2004, a book was published called "The end of faith, religion, terror and the future of reason". So, this was a very influential book attacking religion and saying that you know we need the future of reason. "The end of faith". And this book was written by a man named "Sam Harris". Does anyone know who *Sam Harris* is ? If you do, could you put your hand up in the chat ? I won't go to you to speak. But if you know who he is, just put your hand in the chat. I'm curious to know if people have heard of him. One of those names where... it's

kind of kind of blends in. This became, this book "*The end of faith religion, terror and the future of reason*" became a bestseller in the United States. And then, over the next couple of years a, few more books came out by atheistic authors. And in this book "Sam Harris" is very highly critical of Islam, especially hence or the part in it, speaking of terror, but also Christianity and Judaism. He was asked in an interview about the writing of his book. They said : "What got you to write that book in the first place". He said : "9 11". They say 9 11. He said : "I was writing it on September 12. On September 12, I was writing this book. It was my instantaneous reaction.

So, I want us to see that. What's coming up here this *new atheism* is a direct response to September 11. Because what they believe - writing at the Australian way - what they believe is that : religion is at the root of global conflict and the harm done in the world today. And he sees that September 11. He sees this as religion that did that. And therefore, he's going to start targeting religion. He starts writing a book it's published in a few years later in 2004 and there's also a flow of books then that also come out by these atheistic authors. People do challenge him on that, for example : the closest the world has ever got to annihilation was the cold war and that was not religious based. That was an atheistic country. So, if you want to see religion as the cause, then you really need to justify that with Stalin. You need to justify that today with North Korea. Vladimir Putin uses religion as a puppet. So, people challenge him on this, but he really is quite, they all are quite certain that religion is the fundamental cause of conflict in the world today.

Then in 2006, Richard Dawkins. Put your hand up in the chat if you've heard of Richard Dawkins. That's lots of people. People are putting their hands up. So, he's more well known than Sam Harris. And this is "The God delusion". So, that's also one of these books that come out in this history. And by 2006, people are actually giving a name to this kind of new wave of atheism. And a bit of a change within atheism.

So, in 2006, four leading and prominent atheists get together at one of their homes for a two hour unmoderated discussion. The event is videotaped and they title it : "The four horsemen".

So, this is 2007. And they title it the four horsemen, because there's four of them and they're taking it from Revelation "the four horsemen of the apocalypse" or what they think is a non-apocalypse. So, they title themselves the four horsemen. And I suspect they think that made them look quite cool as well. Two of them we already know. One of the men is : Richard Dawkins - they are still known today, as the *four horsemen*. They're still known today, as the four leaders, rational thinkers leaders of atheism in the 21st century.

Richard Dawkins was one of the men who met. The other man was Sam Harris who wrote this 2004 book. There was two more men :

- Christopher Hitchens.
- And one more Daniel Bennett.

There was a woman invited but she had to cancel at the last minute. Going to miss her mispronounce her name **Ayaan Hirsi Ali**. She was born in Somalia, she fled to the Netherlands to escape an arranged marriage and became involved in Dutch politics. She became an atheistic. Rejecting the Islamic faith. Became a vocal opponent of Islam especially concerning women. She was involved in the production of the film *Submission*, for which her friend *Theo Van Gogh* was murdered, when he was found murdered a death threat to her was pinned to his chest. So, she particularly with feminism in mind became a vocal atheistic spokesperson, quite against Islam. And these men also very much attacking Christianity and Judaism. But in the post 9/11 world, they have a particular focus on Islam. But, she's kind of considered now as a honorary fourth woman of the apocalypse - fourth horse woman. One of these men passed away, so she's kind of spoken about as taking his place in some way. And I'm going to read one of my favorite because a lot of what I have to say about them, is not pleasant. So, the last handout was Rachel. I think you were responding just acknowledging that you knew Richard Dawkins, but any hands up after that ?

I don't think there's been anyone wanting to speak yet.

This is from *The Guardian* and I just wanted to... I'm going to get into the positions that these men hold but I did think this point from *The Guardian*¹ was pertinent. "In many ways the conversation already seemed dated in its political preoccupations particularly in the idea proffered by Hitchens that "holy war" was the greatest existential threat to civilization and then *The Guardian* - the author kind of interjects and says: "There had been nothing holy about the cold war which brought us closest to the brink of planetary Armageddon; and North Korea now is not a theocracy but never mind".

And then one of the men's Hitchens says interviewing them : "I think it's us (these four men) plus the 82nd airborne and the 101st who are the real fighters for secularism at the moment. The ones who are really fighting the main enemy".

Hitchens announcers with armchair general relish the 82nd and 101st regiments were those that operated in Iraq and Afghanistan. So, what these men are saying is : the regiment in Iraq the regiment in Afghanistan and these four men are the three groups fighting for secularism fighting, against religion. And I think *The Guardian* article isn't very impressed with these men when it says : "The other horsemen agree eagerly that they are all very brave".

But they were in favor of the Iraq war. Some of their positions didn't date so well on that, but for them it was a fight for secularism, a fight against religion, because :

- Religion is what took down the twin towers.
- Religion is what wars have been fought over.
- Religion is what harms and kills people.

So, we could approach these men and new atheism from a few different critical perspectives, but you know... what perspective do we want to approach it from ? What do we want to find out their views on ?

Gender. Isn't that the perspective we're going to ? So, i'm going to approach it from the context of gender.

I'm going to start with Sam Harris. So just to remind us, atheism changes post September 11. it is a form of atheism more determined to impact politics and to change the world and to separate religion from politics.

We would agree with the third point of the point of that. And they defend themselves always with the thought that, this is rational thinking. So, if you take your mind back to that *Vox article* - the fellow that was interviewed heavily in that *Vox article* - he's speaking about *Gamergate*. He's speaking about Feminism, but what he constantly comes in with, what he constantly says to defend his worldview against others, against the left wing; is that his is founded on rational thought. Does that make sense Rachel ? Does that make sense ? Did you also get that from the *Vox article* ?

Rachel : Sorry. What was that question again, sorry ?

Tess : In that *Vox article*, and it's kind of in the context of *Gamergate* - what the man chiefly being interviewed. I forget his name. How he's constantly defending his position and those that are in the same boat as him ? Is that him, these men, they are the defenders of rational thought. They are the defenders of all that is rational in the world. And it is feminism and that's where those few paragraphs bring in religion, that this is all irrational. It's emotional, it's superstitious, it's irrational. Did you get this similar perspective from the *Vox article* ?

Rachel : Yeah, I do think thank you for explaining that a little bit. Absolutely.

Tess : You cut out right at the end sorry.

Rachel : I haven't even a technical problem. Yes, I agree with what you were saying

¹ In many ways the conversation already seems dated in its political preoccupations, particularly in the idea proffered by Hitchens that "holy war" was the greatest existential threat to civilisation. (There had been nothing holy about the cold war, which brought us closest to the brink of planetary Armageddon, and North Korea now is not a theocracy, but never mind.) "I think it's us, plus the 82nd Airborne and the 101st, who are the real fighters for secularism at the moment, the ones who are really fighting the main enemy," Hitchens announces with armchair-general relish. (The 82nd and 101st operated in Iraq and Afghanistan.) The other horsemen agree eagerly that they are all very brave.

<https://www.theguardian.com/books/2019/jan/31/four-horsemen-review-what-happened-to-new-atheism-dawkins-hitchens>

What the perspective that he was bringing – Max, I think.

Tess : It seemed that every time his views were challenged, his underlying defense was that he was part of a group of people, mostly men, who were not buying into the emotionalism of the left wing, that they were centered on rational thought. And that is why, you see this connection with the in that trinity with atheism. That they would see feminism as irrational, just as they see religion and a belief in God as irrational.

So, coming back to Sam Harris. I just want to screen share for a moment and show these men, just so we can connect faces to names. I'll take us to a photo of 2007.

This is the four horsemen and they're still known today as the four horsemen. This is in the 2007 meeting that they had that they recorded. So, going from right to left, we have on the far right :

- There is Sam Harris.
- Left next to him, I'm pretty sure that's Richard Dawkins, and I hope I don't get this wrong.
- The man next to him with the beard I believe is Daniel Bennett.
- And then the fourth left is Christopher Hitchens.

So, from left Christopher Hitchens, Daniel Bennett, Richard Dawkins and Sam Harris. Just, so we can put some faces to names. And now I'm going to just speak about Sam Harris. So, I will highlight him. He's quite the guru today. I guess the best way, I can think of describing him, would be the atheist Jordan Peterson. But I think many that I think their audience can often overlap.

Tess : *(Oh that's not that's my quote my computer updated and I'm having a few)*

That is a photo of Sam Harris, who we're about to discuss.

His influence today, I think is probably extending in some ways beyond especially what has been since 2001, with that generation continuing, current generation of younger mostly men. The same way you would see Jordan Peterson or Ben Shapiro but Jordan Peterson and Ben Shapiro are less targeting religion. But even if you're a Protestant in the United States today, you're highly likely to believe in evolution. So, the base for these men is quite broad and they have had extensive influence.

In 2014. So I think, I know that James did it. I think it was last week. I think you were going to do it soon Brendon. But one of you was going to soon speak on 2014 and all of the points that happened in 2014.

in 2014, Sam Harris was interviewed by Michelle Borstein of the *Washington Post*² and she asked him why are most atheists male. And Sam Harris answered her he says :

"I think it may have to do with my person slant as an author being very critical of bad ideas".

He speaks in a very philosophical way. So, I'm going to try and paraphrase it for my own sake as well as yours. So, he says that he's an author, and being an author it comes with a territory that you're very critical of bad ideas. And he says : "this, can sound very angry to people, people just don't like to have their ideas criticized".

I'll quote it directly so, everyone knows what's a quote and then I paraphrase.

"I think, it may have to do with my personal slant as an author being very critical of bad ideas this can sound very angry to people, people just don't like to have their ideas criticized. There's something about that critical posture, that is to some degree intrinsically male, and more attractive to guys than to women, he said. The atheist variable just has this. It doesn't obviously have this nurturing coherence building, extra estrogen vibe that you would want by default, if you want to attract as many women as men.

I won't paraphrase that. Kathrynne, you heard it. You didn't read it. I'd like you to paraphrase that.

Kathrynne : Us, males, we're really good at thinking rationally and critically and we're not the nurturing type. So, therefore because atheism tends to require an objective critical mind, it appeals to men more than women. That's how I see.

² **Washington Post** : "I think it may have to do with my person slant as an author, being very critical of bad ideas. This can sound very angry to people... People just don't like to have their ideas criticized. There's something about that critical posture that is to some degree intrinsically male and more attractive to guys than to women," he said. "The atheist variable just has this – it doesn't obviously have this nurturing, coherence-building extra estrogen vibe that you would want by default if you wanted to attract as many women as men." <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/local/wp/2014/09/12/can-atheist-sam-harris-become-a-spiritual-figure/?variant=95d42e19c24b03e7>

Tess : I think that's an accurate portrayal. Women have this extra estrogen vibe. So, they need the nurturing coherence building that he's suggesting. You would find in religion but atheism you have to be critical of bad ideas and that is intrinsically male. So, I want us to remember this is someone who does not believe in God or creation or the Bible, or religion. And he's talking about what is intrinsically male and intrinsically female.

Now there's a problem. There are many female atheists who are atheistic, because like that woman we spoke of. Fled Somalia. Fleeing forced marriage. Trying to find a home within the atheistic community, and they weren't very happy with what he said. So, he was quite criticized for that.

So, he responded to this criticism with a very long blog post, which i won't read all of because it's very convoluted and very long. It's titled : "I'm not the sexiest pig, you're looking for". And his strategy for disproving accusations of sexism was to engage in more sexist declarations in the time bigot strategy of saying : "It's not bigotry if it's true".

So, he kind of doubled down on it and he also one of his defenses. And I think Elder Terry considering Scott Morrison's comments and those comments made in the context of sexism in the Australian parliament. All of that comes, flooding back, when one of his defenses is : "I was raised by a single mother. I have two daughters most of my editors have been women and my first last and best editor is always my wife". They always go back to that. And for me, that is the gendered example of finding a person of color at a Trump rally, and making sure that he's on camera. You know putting him right behind Trump but slightly off center, so Trump doesn't block the view, because everyone needs to know that he's there. This is always the comes into the defense. I think, this was Scott Morrison's defense for why he handled sexism and abuse in Australian politics so badly. His kind of defense was : "I have daughters". And that's also part of his defense, as to why, he is not the quote sexist pig, you're looking for".

So, he didn't handle that very well, and a lot of women who are leaders in the atheistic community will have not forgiven him for that. These are the four leaders. You get lower down in people who are heavily involved and there are women. But these men are the four horsemen. They're known for that. So, that's Sam Harris and it does get worse with him.

If we don't have comments, I want to move on to Richard Dawkins. In 2011, Rebecca Watson, who is a prominent female atheist. In 2011, she was on a panel discussion, where she spoke of sexism and misogyny within the atheistic community. She's kind of a prominent female speaker on the subject of atheism and feminism. And she's had a bit to say about the misogyny that exists in that community.

In 2011, she was in a foreign country. She spoke at this panel. She went to a bar afterwards and hung out with a few people and they continued to speak. And then, at 4:00 am, she left to go to her hotel room. And she got into the elevator to go to a hotel room, and one of the men followed her into the elevator. And he said to her : "I like what you had to say - how about we keep talking, come back to my hotel room ?"

In her next blog post because she would post regular blog posts, she spoke about how her week had been, about the panel discussions, and in this eight minute blog post, for about 30 seconds, just kind of telling the story of how her week had gone, she mentioned what happened in this elevator and she said :

"I'm going to speak to the men, don't do that just please, don't do that. She says : I was in a foreign country. It was 4:00 am, I was alone in an elevator and I had just spoken for some hours of how easy it is, for me to be sexualized in this community. And don't just if you're going to understand what I'm saying, don't proposition me in elevators at 4:00 am".

And that was short what she said.

Richard Dawkins took to twitter. And I won't read his whole. It was a long post that he put out. But the first four words say : "Stop whining will you !" That's the tone and it continues in that fashion. The rest of it, is a description of how bad life is for women in Saudi Arabia in Islamic countries. How they'll be stoned for cheating on their husband. And he has said publicly before : "He just wants American women to shut up, because it's so much". You know. Stop speaking of. If someone, you know, inappropriately touches you at the water cooler at work, big deal. Look what it is like for women in other countries. So, he writes this blog post, making this twitter post, making that point, but it starts off with : "Stop whining, will you !" People don't take that well, as you might expect. And women within that atheistic community write to him and say :

"There is starvation in East Africa right now, you stop caring that creationism is being taught in american schools. If you're going to make an argument that it's worth somewhere else, stop caring what is taught in schools, just let them teach creationism and go and deal with what is worse in other parts of the world".

And he responds to that argument and says :

“No, I wasn't making the point. It wasn't about that. It's just worth in other parts of the world”.

And I want to read his second criticism of Rebecca Watson. Richard Dawkins says :

“The man in the elevator didn't physically touch her. Did an attempt to bar her way out of the elevator? Didn't even use foul language at her ? He spoke some words to her, just words. She no doubt replied with words. That was that, words only words, and apparently quite polite words at that. Rebecca's feeling that the man's proposition was creepy was her own interpretation of his behavior, presumably not his”.

So, stopping there for a second. She found the interaction creepy but that's just her interpretation of his behavior. Going back to quoting :

“She was probably offended to about the same extent as I, Richard Dawkins am offended, if a man gets into an elevator with me, chewing gum, but he does me no physical damage, and I simply grin and bear it until either I or he gets out of the elevator. It would be different if he physically attacked me”.

So, Richard Dawkins. This is, I'm only pulling out one. One example of actually I have a second. So, one of two examples, of how Richard Dawkins has responded to the #Metoo movement. This is 2011. the #Metoo movement hasn't even begun. So, you can imagine, how he is now. Many even atheists today were just wishing, he would be quiet.

But these are the four men who led atheism into the 21st century. These men more than any other have molded the thinking, the minds of the millions of men who hold to that far right trinity :

- Libertarianism philosophy.
- Atheism.
- And men's rights.

And atheism, it's broader than just what Richard Dawkins says. It's about evolution and it's about how men and women developed over millennial. So, his argument is that american women are making a big deal over nothing. And I also want us to see his other point in that quote. And this is something that shows also, the connection between atheism, the leaders of atheistic thought and Libertarianism. It is all about free speech. And remember this woman didn't ask for the man who propositioned her in an elevator to be jailed or to be punished. All she's asking is for them : “to stop”. So, him taking that - as an attack on free speech - shows the extent to which libertarian thought and the idea of freedom and free speech, has linked with the second part of the trinity.

You see all three parts of the trinity in that quote.

1. There is the atheism because it's Richard Dawkins and we'll get into why they're so misogynistic.
2. But you also see the men's rights.
3. And you also see the libertarianism because it's all about freedom of speech.

And it is these men, especially I think, Sam Harris more than we might realize, who from 2001, as a young men were trying to understand 911 in its context. Trying to understand the Iraq war and religion and society, as religion was losing power in the United States and secularism was growing.

A large proportion of young men were following this type of philosophy.

We have no thoughts or comments lots of people are listening today. I might get their thoughts next week.

But I want to go to a worse example. There's a few with Richard Dawkins. This is I think this is a little a little bit more recent. There is another prominent skeptic writer Michael Sherman - he's not one of the horsemen - but he is still prominent in the atheistic community. He's a writer and a couple of women came out and accused him of sexual harassment. And then a third woman.

- So, two women claimed that he had sexually harassed them.
- And then a third woman then spoke out and told a story that he had taken her to his room, while she was extremely drunk, and too drunk to consent. And that he had had sex with her. She had not wanted that to happen, but she had been drunk. And that is rape, even though people don't not everyone agrees with calling that rape. It's rape. She had not given consent.

So, two women accuse Michael Sharma of sexual harassment. A third comes out and tells the story of her being very drunk and what he did to her. And Richard Dawkins again talked to twitter. Quoting Richard Dawkins : He's speaking sarcastically :

“Officer, it's not my fault I was drunk driving. You see, somebody got me drunk,” he tweeted, comparing being forced to have sex with the choice to drive drunk”.

What he did, is he compared being forced to have sex with the choice to drive drunk. So, in other words : “if you get drunk and get behind the wheel of a car and crash, you're responsible for that”. This woman in getting drunk, he's saying : was responsible then for what happened to her.

Again, he did face some criticism. He doubled down by suggesting that rape victims are the real predators out to get men put in jail quoting :

“If you want to be in a position to testify and jail a man don't get drunk”.

So, in other words : the man is the victim. Because the woman got drunk and now she can testify and put him in jail. The article is critical of his position and says that :

For someone who is a supposed rationalist, Dawkins refused to even acknowledge the basic difference between making the choice to break the law and being the victim of a crime. But only for rape, of course. It's unlikely Dawkins would think it's your fault if you are standing there minding your own business, while drunk, and someone hits you for no reason. But if the assault occurs with a penis instead of a fist, in Dawkins' mind, suddenly the victim is the person at fault.

Again, this situation is no outlier. Dawkins has spent the past few years using Twitter as a platform to rail against feminists for daring to speak up about sexual harassment and abuse. He not only rushed to Shermer's defense regarding allegations of sexual assault, but rushed to Harris' defense regarding allegations of sexism, even though Harris' sexism is so off the charts it becomes downright comical.

Sadly, this contempt for women coming from the top trickles into the ranks, allowing everyday misogynists who happen not to believe in God feel justified in their hatred of women anyway. Subsequently, there's a thriving online community of people who live to harass not just women, but female atheists in particular...

https://www.salon.com/2014/10/03/new_atheisms_troubling_misogyny_the_pompous_sexism_of_richard_dawkins_and_sam_harris_partner/

Some of these articles I'm quoting from are written by not leading, because they're all men, but still prominent female atheists. Some of which have written books talking about their escape from trying to escape from the atheism community. Richard Dawkins sarcastically noted in his post that amazingly males have rights too. So, he seems very concerned about freedom and feminism as a weapon against, to target and imprisoned men.

Yes someone wrote about... it's quite libertarian. It sounds libertarian. It's all okay in the elevator until she gets physically attacked, because this man in the elevator, he has to have the freedom to speak, to proposition. Again even in that elevator you see equality - as a woman being treated with respect in society - equality coming to conflict with free speech. And I think Richard Dawkins would be the first to say :

“I might not agree with what he said, but I'll defend to the death, his right to say it”.

which is exactly what he just did. He took to twitter to defend this man's right, to sexually harass a woman. And again, she wasn't calling for this man's imprisonment. She was just asking for societal change. So, it gets worse if it can, I don't know if it's quite worth. Oh Marie, did I miss your hand ? Or have I missed people wanting to speak ? Was that a hand raised or was that for something before ?

Marie : Oh it was just from before, when you asked : Did anyone have any comments or questions. And I just put my hand up. Then, I was just, I keep thinking as you're talking about this freedom over equality. And the argument, I may not agree but “I'll fight you know till the death for your right to speak”. To me, it seems like just hypocritical to me. It just seems like hypocrisy. I don't know if anyone else sees it like, that but that's the way it stands out to me. Yes, very hypocritical. That was all.

Tess : I really want to get into that hypocrisy. Are you finished ?

Marie : Sorry.

Tess : Are you finished ?

Marie : Oh no. I was just going to say : it might be an unusual way to describe it, but that's just the way I see it. yeah

Tess : He wasn't defending her right to speak. There is a hypocrisy there, and I want to get into that hypocrisy especially when it comes to libertarianism. Josephine.

Josephine : I was just going to make a comment on Richard Dawkins's comment : "If you get drunk and you drive and you have an accident then it's your fault right". And then, he says something about the woman : "If you drink and you get harassed, then it's your fault". Obviously, that's not very rational thinking, to me, and I'm thinking about if a girl because this came up in a conversation recently, well she was teasing him. So, she didn't quite see it like that, but no wonder she was sexually harassed now. That's a woman defending a man for doing such a thing. I just didn't agree with that and I don't agree with Richard of course. It's sad that it happens that a woman you know and she's supposed to be Christian and she's supposed and but she's talking like an atheist.

Tess : It's not a thought process that's restricted to Christianity, because we've seen that over and over again within Protestantism and Adventism saying : "Well she just shouldn't dress that way". And now, you're seeing it reflected within the most prominent leaders of atheism in the 21st century. And you could say : "it's not rational". But in their minds it is. Because okay I drink. I get behind the wheel of my car, I drive and i hit a brick wall. I don't get out of my car and say : "I'm sorry officer but it's the brick walls fault. The brick wall shouldn't have been there. It was my getting drunk and getting behind the wheel".

No officer is going to blame the brick wall. So, when a woman gets drunk and is raped. It's kind of like turning the man into the brick wall. The brick wall can't help it. What is he saying about the man ? He's just saying the man can't help it. Why can't the man help it ? Because, he's the brick wall. A brick wall can't help it. If I get drunk and plow my car into it. So, if I am saying : "I am attractive and I don't think, I am, because I'm a woman in the 21st century and we're broken". But say I think i'm attractive and I get drunk and I flirt with a man. How does he then, become in Richard Dawkins mind the brick wall ? How does that become my fault and not his ? Because he's just a brick wall, a brick wall does what a brick wall does ? Josephine or anyone. I'm looking for hands. Kathrynne.

Kathryne : Mr Dawkins is really big on evolution. I think, he might approach it from this

Like perspective of men and their biology and i don't know. You know this animal side of them that, they can't sort of control.

Tess : Why did Sam Harris say : "there are more men than women in atheism ?"

Kathryne : Because they've believed in like cultural feminism - kind of thinking that there's this innate difference between the sexes. Men are inherently, maybe, like, I don't know... they've got their particular way of operating. I don't know what word to use.

Tess : I went back to Sam Harris and just used the words "women have the extra estrogen vibe".

Kathryne : Yes, so the men have got the testosterone and i guess if you can trust you yeah so they're just driven by the testosterone so they can't help it. Animal instincts take over the testosterone goes up and what do you think is going to happen ? What do you expect him to do ? He can't help it.

Tess : Yes. Lynn

Lynn : I was pretty much going to say a similar thing that you know they may consider like this view considers males to be logical and rational except when it comes to sexual stuff. Then, they can't help anything. Then, you know basically the testosterone takes over and clearly logic and rationalism go out the window. So, it's just basically an excuse that men can't help these things. And if women flaunt themselves then women are responsible for what happens to them. So, you know, the men are completely powerless apparently when it comes to that.

Tess : You have the extra estrogen vibe compared and contrasted with whatever makes a man as responsible as a brick wall, when he rapes a drunk attractive woman. And I think, it's relevant to tie that into their belief system.

- What is it about atheism that appeals to men's rights groups ?
- What is it about men's rights groups that appeals to atheism ?
- And what is it about libertarian philosophy that suits both ?

I know we're getting close out of time but, I want to spend a little time on Christopher Hitchens. Christopher Hitchens wrote an article in 2007 for *Vanity Fair* and i'm not joking the article is titled "*Why women aren't funny ?*" Apparently this was one of his favorite subjects to explain why women aren't funny.

And ironically enough, I perhaps maniacally laughed through most of the article. But I think that was not the type of humor that he was laughing at that he was describing. So Christopher Hitchens writes in 2007 an article "Why women aren't funny ?" - and i'm just going to read some excerpts of it. He says :

Now, why is this? Why is it the case? I mean. Why are women, who have the whole male world at their mercy, not funny? Please do not pretend not to know what I am talking about.

Why are men, taken on average and as a whole, funnier than women? Well, for one thing, they had *damn* well better be. *I will skip his swear words through this.* The chief task in life that a man has to perform is that of impressing the opposite sex, and Mother Nature (as we laughingly call her) is not so kind to men.

So, I would like you to pay attention to a couple of things as I read excerpts of this article.

First of all he says : "Don't pretend not to know what i'm talking about". In other words he's saying : "think rationally don't think emotionally". Where you think : "ah this isn't very good to talk about. Just think rationally and then stop denying, pretending you don't know what i'm talking about as if women are as funny as men". But also pick up on how he consistently places men as the victims in society, as the suppressed in society, as men who are suffering in society. It's men who have a hard lot in life.

- First of all : women have the whole male world at their mercy.
- Then also hard on men : mother nature is not kind to men. The chief task in life that a man has to perform is to impress women.

So, again he consistently says that women are the ones that hold the power in society. Men are the vulnerable ones the victims. Women have all the power because women choose a sexual partner and women do not have to try so hard. Because he'll tell us :

"Women have no corresponding need to appeal to men in this way (*by being funny*). They already appeal to men, if you catch my drift.

So, what he's saying is trying to explain why men are more funny than women. And he's going to give quite a few arguments for this. But one of them, is that men by the dictates of mother nature – evolution. Men's fundamental role in life is to impress a woman so he can have sex. So they can procreate and have a baby and continue the human race. Women don't have to try so hard to impress men because they have a body to use instead of a personality and a sense of humor apparently. He tries to save it from being sexist by saying that women do have a sense of humor because if they didn't, they wouldn't laugh at how funny men are and there are some good female comedians but quoting him :

"In any case, my argument doesn't say that there are no decent women comedians. There are more terrible female comedians than there are terrible male comedians, but there are some impressive ladies out there".

Male humor prefers the laugh to be at someone's expense, and understands that life is quite possibly a joke to begin with—and often a joke in extremely poor taste. Humor is part of the armor-plate with which to resist what is already farcical enough. (Perhaps not by coincidence, battered as they are by *motherfucking* nature, men tend to refer to life itself as a bitch.) Whereas women, bless their tender hearts, would prefer that life be fair, and even sweet, rather than the sordid mess it actually is.

There are so many layers of misogyny through this, I don't know where to start. But to pull out one.

- Men use humor as a defense mechanism to cope with life because they see life as it is.
- Women bless their tender hearts which doesn't endear him to me at all, would prefer that life be fair.

If you break that down, what he's saying is : that men see the world rationally and when they see it rationally as the sordid mess it is, they need humor as like a protective plate to cope with life. Women preferring life to be fair and sweet, don't need that protective mechanism. If this point directly contradicts a future point he makes, that women have to be far more serious because they are pro-programmed to try and keep a baby alive and that's so serious that they can't have a sense of humor.

Precisely because humor is a sign of intelligence (and many women believe, or were taught by their mothers, that they become threatening to men if they appear too bright), it could be that in some way men do not want women to be funny. (*The only thing he says i agree with*). Men want women as an audience, not as rivals. And there is a huge, brimming reservoir of male unease, which it would be too easy for women to exploit.

Again, what Christopher Hitchens does there, is he says maybe just maybe :

- Men find women threatening if they appear too bright.
- Men prefer to be the speakers to an audience.
- Men don't want women as rivals so it suits women to be quieter and not try to, you know, be fill that role.

But even that sexism, he immediately puts that into a context which says there's all of this male unease and that gives some women something to exploit. So, again who's the victim ?

- Men don't want women as rivals.
- Men just want women as an audience.
- Men want women to appear less intelligent.

That's something women can exploit. It's a vulnerability men have. So, again can you see how he turns men into the victims, and women to suddenly, even though he's just said they have to appear less intelligent to be tolerated in society, how we twist that around to again make men the victims. He goes into what Gina Rippon would heavily disagree with trying to explain brain function, to explain why men are more funny. But then he continuing. To quote :

For women, reproduction is, if not the only thing, certainly the main thing. Apart from giving them a very different attitude to filth and embarrassment, it also imbues them with the kind of seriousness and solemnity at which men can only google.

Men have to pretend, to themselves as well as to women, that they are not the servants and supplicants.

Women, cunning minxes that they are, have to affect not to be the potentates.

Here, he really doubles down on that position that women are the ones in control in society, and the patriarchy is a carefully orchestrated act, that men and women play.

Men pretend to be servants so men pretend to not be servants and supplicants. So, he says men are the servants and supplicants of women and it's all connected to the fact that women have power. He says, they have power because of their ability to reproduce. It's all connected to their physical attraction because apparently women are not physically attracted to men's bodies, but women have bodies that he, as a heterosexual man finds attractive. So, that gives women a power that he doesn't have. So, men have to pretend. And then, he can't just say women have to pretend, he has to slip in that they're cunning minxes. So, again women are kind of orchestrating this. They're still in control.

Humor, if we are to be serious about it, arises from the ineluctable fact that we are all born into a losing struggle. Those who risk agony and death to bring children into this fiasco (*women*) simply can't afford to be too frivolous. (And there just aren't that many episiotomy jokes, even in the male repertoire. *About Child birth and death – the death of a child*) I am certain that this is also partly why, in all cultures, it is females who are the rank-and-file mainstay of religion, (*so he's going to agree with Sam Harris in a way here*) females who are the rank-and-file mainstay of religion, which in turn is the official enemy of all humor. One tiny snuffle that turns into a wheeze, one little cut that goes septic, one pathetically small coffin, and the woman's universe is left in ashes and ruin. Try being funny about that, if you like.

So, it's a woman's connection to childbirth and children, that makes women incapable of the sense of humor that men are capable of. Because apparently a man's universe is not so shattered at the death of a of his child.

Oscar Wilde was the only person ever to make a decent joke about the death of an infant, and that infant was fictional, and Wilde was (although twice a father) a queer.

Remember this was 2007. This is one year before Obama was elected. This is not 1957 or 1897. This is 2007. Continuing to quote :

And because fear is the mother of superstition, and because they are partly ruled in any case by the moon and the tides, (*so women are ruled by moon and tides*) women also fall more heavily for dreams, (*for superstition*) for supposedly significant dates like birthdays and anniversaries, for romantic love, crystals and stones, locket and relics, and other things that men know are fit mainly for mockery and limericks. Good grief! Is there anything less funny than hearing a woman relate a dream she's just had?

For men, it is a tragedy that the two things they prize the most—women and humor—should be so antithetical. But without tragedy there could be no comedy. My beloved said to me, when I told her I was going to have to address this melancholy topic, that I should cheer up because "women get funnier as they get older." Observation suggests to me that this might indeed be true, but, excuse me, isn't that rather a long time to have to wait?

<https://www.vanityfair.com/culture/2007/01/hitchens200701>

That's the end of his article. That's how it ends. So, it ends again with him being the victim. Poor Christopher Hitchens ! Just sad that he has to wait for women to grow old before they finally develop a sense of humor.

I've only quoted portions of it and to be honest it was hard to decide what to quote and what not because the entirety of it is quotable to illustrate the misogyny that ran through 21st century atheism. We've quoted a tiny bit of what you will find on Richard Dawkins and Sam Harris. And all I need is one article by Christopher Hitchens.

The leading voices that were governing philosophical atheism between 2001 and through to the election of Donald Trump. So when you read that Vox news article, and they're addressing men in their 20s, 30s, 40s, 50s, who connect atheism to Libertarianism, to men's rights groups. Atheism did not, has not led to gender equality to anything progressive. Misogyny is deeply rooted within atheism. And an article to consider that something like this, even to make a comment about Oscar Wilde, calling him a queer, and suggesting that somehow, made him able to talk joke about the death of a child. *Vanity fair* is not a far right, or it's not a source I would go to find a news, but it's not out of the mainstream that they would publish this in 2007.

It does get, I don't think my laughing through reading it was emblematic of the sense of humor he wants women to have. So, we are due to close. So, we're going to review this, because I've just about finished what I want to say. So, I hope if you don't mind, I just say a couple more things to tie it up.

We're looking at the trinity. And I haven't come back to libertarianism. But, why with not America's past, but its future, do you find atheism linked with the far right ? Linked with a political stream that we have for years said over and over and over and over again, this is Jerry Falwell, this is Church and State, this is Evangelicalism, and it is. But they are just one portion of a surface of a culture that is subculture that exists in a broader culture that is the right wing.

They are kind of what is a given, if the world was to last a few generations, sinking into more the past and the future.

I want to finish with a couple of quotes. This one is an article : “How men's rights activists are finding unlikely allies in new atheism, Metoo the manosphere and the church of feminism³”. Because remember they do believe, they do link feminism with religion they think both are completely irrational thoughts. I'll read. They're gonna quote a far-right men's rights activist. He says :

“I have discovered women's sole biological reason for existing is to reproduce and nurture the young,

So, women reproduce, nurture the young. For men, is to reproduce, protect women and contribute to the grand project known as civilization.

So women contribute by having babies and raising them. It is men protect and to contribute to the growth of civilization. Continuing to quote :

“The claim that woman's capacity for reason matches man's is humorous.”

So, they're built on reason and their fundamental argument is that, because of how evolution developed two genders side by side. One gender is not programmed to think with the rationality that the other has, through what evolution developed.

The affinity between New Atheist and Manosphere values is clearest in the popularity of the phrase “The Church of Feminism.” Women are coming forward about the prevalence of sexual assault? They (*The Manosphere*) replies that the “Church of Feminism” is whipping up moral panic.

And that is one thing that Sam Harris tweeted. He shared an article coming, that was also shared on one of these Reddit, which you explained to us Rachel. Those Reddit men's rights communities. Sam Harris tweeted the same article, that had been shared there also, as they were saying on this forum, that, this is creating the Metoo movement - is creating a moral panic.

Feminists decry the prevalence of patriarchy. Richard Dawkins retweets a video comparing feminists to islamists.

The flipside of New Atheism and the Manosphere's valorization of rationality is that they necessarily identify their detractors as “irrational.”

So, if you believe in God, you're irrational. If you believe in Feminism, you're irrational.

For the Manosphere, the enemy is the hopelessly irrational woman. For New Atheism, the enemy is irrationality itself. But as the two groups' (*Men's rights and New atheism*) – But as the two groups memberships and rhetoric coalesce, New Atheism increasingly ends up firing at the same targets as blatant misogynists. (They end up saying the same thing). **As #MeToo continues to promote conversations about gender dynamics and rights, New Atheists might find that it's time to be clear about their ideological commitments—or else have those commitments decided for them by their base.**

<https://religiondispatches.org/how-mens-rights-activists-are-finding-unlikely-allies-in-new-atheism-metoo-the-manosphere-and-the-church-of-feminism/>

I have a couple of other points I wanted to read and make about how evolution develops this thinking. But I just want to close on that one sentence.

³ **How men's rights activists are finding unlikely allies in new atheism, Metoo the manosphere and the church of feminism** : “I have discovered women's sole biological reason for existing is to reproduce and nurture the young, whilst man's is to reproduce, protect his mate...and contributing to the grand project known as civilization,” one Red Pill blogger declared. “The claim that woman's capacity for reason matches man's is humorous.”

The point that this author is saying, is that if these particularly these leaders and the more current ones, the leaders of new atheism is just 21st century atheism today. If the leaders of atheism today, if they don't get clear about what their ideological commitments are, essentially where they stand on the culture war, on gender rights, on LGBTQ, on civil rights, on freedom versus equality. If they don't make clear where they stand it's not them, it's not these leaders who will decide where atheism sits. It's their base, and that is what is happening. That's the *Vox article* - that is all of the men who've been heavily influenced in their thinking, by modern atheism, by how modern atheism promotes and shares misogyny, labeled as rational thinking. It's that base that is deciding, that they also belong in the far-right community, in part of that trinity.

So, we'll close for time. But we'll come back and review. If you have thoughts or comments or questions, we will just touch on this next week. And finish up a couple of thoughts and then we're going to go back to Libertarianism. The other point of that trinity doctrine.

Who would like to pray to close ? Someone be willing to pray to close. Josephine, would you pray for us ?

Josephine : I didn't unmute yes. Sorry if you don't mind

Joséphine : I will. Shall we pray

Dear Lord in Heaven. We thank you so much for this vespers meetings. We thank you for the fact that we have learned so much. And it's like piercing into Orion. There's so much more light there, to see. And I'm so grateful for your teaching Lord. Thank you for the leaders and thank you for each and everyone that has attended the meeting tonight. And thank you likewise for the church members at large that will be viewing the videos. I Pray that they will appreciate the message and find it enlightening, an increase of knowledge and understanding for all of us. Bless those who participated tonight, whether they're listening or contributing. Bless the music, Mrs Bennett and thank you Lord. And we look forward to the Sabbath where we can be fed to the brim. And may we overflow. This is our prayer, in Jesus wonderful name. Amen.