

CULTURE – THE SUNDAY LAW AND MARK 9:47

TMW VESPERS

05-27-2022

ELDER TESS LAMBERT

Dear God in heaven, we thank you for another week and leading into this Sabbath, we thank you for this day. Lord, this is time we also set aside now to understand your messages. Help us to understand how our cultures hurt women and help us to identify and understand and to pull these things out of our lives, out of our institutions, out of our families, of the movement. Please bless us all and strengthen us to communicate with each other so we can deal with this problem. We thank you for this opportunity and help us, and please be with our elders and please be with Elder Tess now as she leads out. We pray in Jesus' name, Amen.

Elder Tess – As usual, I'll start with a revision, but I want to do it slightly differently. We know that 2018 is the Midnight Cry (MC), but it's the formalization of a message. The increase of knowledge (IK) for that formalization, for the MC is 2016. And, in 2016, there's two political opponents. Both carried prophetic significance, and there's a choice between two political opponents. That 2016 election is externally the IK for the MC. Considering the reform line for the world started in just not long, already we're in the history of the IK for the church. It already carries global political significance, that 2016 political election.

So, I want to ask the question, if it has significance for the priests, Levites, and Nethinims, it's significant for the whole world that 2016 election, that history that we see is going to be so significant. These two political opponents are going to take us into two different ideologies. It's a prophetic choice. Question. Who are those two political opponents? And, there's two correct answers to that question. I'm looking for one specifically. But, 2016 election, two political opponents, and a decision that needs to be made. Who are the two opponents? Marie.

Marie – Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton.

Elder Tess – So, Trump v. Clinton in November. That's correct. I'm looking for another couple. A second correct answer. You can have another answer, Marie or open it up. I don't mind. November.

Marie – What about CNN and FOX news? Is that sort of what you're looking for?

Elder Tess – No. Two political opponents; two different ideologies. We can take our minds back to 2016, and eventful year. There was a fight, a fight, a claim of bias, a few conspiracy theories and a different election in the U.S. connected to the 2016 election. Graham.

Graham – Are you suggesting Nancy Pelosi v. Mitch McConnell?

Elder Tess – No. That’s another interesting fight. Any other thoughts? Katherine.

Katherine – Is it like to select who was going to run for president? Has it got to do with the Democratic Party like pre-selection process?

Elder Tess – July, 2016, the democratic national convention (DNC), lot of people unhappy, a lot of protests, a lot of anger. Who were the two that was fighting in July?

Katherine – Hillary Clinton, I guess, and was it Bernie Sanders?

Elder Tess – Yes.

Katherine – I think I remember seeing scenes from the DNC, people holding signs up and stuff like that, so kind of it’s coming back to me now.

Elder Tess – He was robbed, apparently. Before we ever get to November, there’s two political ideologies fighting within the left-wing. One is Bernie Sanders and the other is Hillary Clinton, and when we come out in 2018, and we bring in the battle of Ipsus, we are emphatic that Hillary Clinton represented in that parable story by Antigonous had to be the presidential nominee, should have been the presidential choice. We need to consider, not just the November election but the July one. Remember, we went down this track because the question was asked, how do you sift the left-wing? By the time we present gender equality in 2019, so 2018 is the MC, we say that we need to move from the right-wing to the left-wing. We say that our political ideology is directly connected to the great controversy fight. We need to switch political platforms, to put it simply.

By the time we get through to the end of 2019, we’re doubling down on Hillary Clinton’s prophetic role and bringing in the subject of gender equality. But, by the time we get to late 2019 and into early 2020, there’s a fight within this movement about the direction it’s going to take. It is a fight that has been described as a fight between liberal and cultural feminism versus radical feminism. I won’t expound on that now, but the old ideologies of conservatism, etc., but what I wanted us to see is that this 2016 election, we need to hold it as we go through these discussions and go through these articles. Remember why we’re doing this. We said, we can’t understand the problems with the left-wing unless we can properly define the issues with the right-wing. But, when the question was asked, how do we sift the left-wing, my answer was essentially, let’s not study Clinton versus Bernie Sanders, the problems with the left-wing. Let’s not touch that yet. Let’s make sure we understand the issues between Clinton versus Trump; Clinton versus the trinity. If we can understand what’s wrong with the right-wing, then we can bring it back to the left-wing and see the problems with the left-wing.

The problems with the left-wing are heavily connected to that which was demonstrated at the DNC in 2016, also part of the prophetic election. It’s the problem with, again, the names are just titles for ideology, and it’s the problem with Bernie Sanders. 2020, we’re already fighting within this movement, and those opposed to radical feminism in the direction that we’re taking, modeling a lot of their political ideology from who? The Squad – Alexandra Ocasio-

Cortez (AOC), Ilhan Omar and others. Question. If we are to take Ilhan Omar and AOC back to the 2016 DNC, who would they have been backing? Bernie Sanders or Hillary Clinton? Open question. Brendon.

Brendon – Bernie Sanders.

Elder Tess – Bernie Sanders. This is a 2020 issue but it's a 2021 and 2022 issue. There are people now who would pass November, they think, but they would never have gotten to November. Many people in the movement now would have failed July. They might think they've changed their political ideology from the right-wing to the left-wing. This is another way of stating the problem I'm trying to explain this movement has, members of this movement has, and I'm using different methods to demonstrate it. This is one other method. If we think that the November election was a test, so was the July one. And, if we look at AOC, and we look at Ilhan Omar and think they are representative of the stream that this movement should be floating in, that Bernie Sanders and his version of social justice is where this side of the great controversy should be modeling itself after, then we haven't even made it to November to fail November. We haven't made it past July 2016 yet.

So, when I say that the issues we're addressing now are connected to the MC, they're connected to the MC, they're connected to the 2016 election as well. So, we started with 1888. We veered from 1888 to try and explain how we need to sift the left-wing when someone asked how I sift the left-wing. Understanding the problems with the squad, with Bernie Sanders, with that entire definition, ideology of social justice that they support, is how I sift the left-wing. I don't want to expound on that now because it's going to take a little bit of time, and there's some really key and lengthy articles that I think we need to work through to do that. We're going to continue wrapping up our discussion of the right-wing. But, as we discuss the right-wing, as we work through the issues of libertarianism and culture, just keep in mind why we're doing this.

We're doing this because Elder Jeff did this (twisting the message to suit his views), but so did a whole lot of other people. The vast majority of the movement that was here in 2018 did the same thing. If they haven't left yet, I don't care. This (twisting the message to suit their views) is what they have and are doing, taking the message, understanding Ipsus, understanding MC, understanding radical feminism, understanding everything that I said, then cutting off the bit that they don't like, usually everything that actually relates to the test they face, manipulating it to put themselves in a more, to excuse their own sexism and then adding their own. And, this is how people end up not failing November; they end up failing July.

We have to keep this in mind. Hillary Clinton had to take down Bernie Sanders before she could take down Donald Trump. And, by 2020, which left-wing stream is the vast majority of the movement following? They are following the Bernie Sanders stream, and there's a reason for that. There is a reason that they preferred his type of messaging over Hillary Clinton. We then moved into the right-wing. What we're doing right now in discussing culture, first the trinity

and then moving into a discussion of culture, this is what had to be understood before we can go to the left-wing, before we can go and break down Clinton versus Bernie Sanders, domestic and foreign policies, etc.

Within an already democratic country, the difference between the right-wing and the left-wing is their preference for either freedom or equality when those two principles come into conflict, and we used a Supreme Court case to demonstrate that. There's many examples of that but, we chose one Supreme Court case because we really liked how clear that made the fight versus equality and freedom, versus equality or give me liberty or give me death. We went from there to the VOX article. What we said was, if the right-wing preferences freedom over equality, and yet we see the right-wing over and over and over again violate freedom by opposing gay marriage, for example, what happens when you just get better freedom? What happens when freedom just becomes more pure? That should be the ultimate right-wing, and isn't that a positive, isn't just proper, absolute freedom? That will oppose the war on drugs, that will defund the police, and will support gay marriage? Isn't that right-wing version of freedom better than what someone like Ted Cruz offers who constantly violates freedom over equality when it doesn't suit his religious principle or what the left-wing offers which is taking away people's freedoms to try and implement equality; big government.

So, looking at pure freedom, we went into libertarianism. We went into the VOX article, and we've discovered the trinity; libertarianism, pure freedom, combined with atheism combined with men's rights activism (MRA). And then, one by one we've been working through those to show how they are right-wing ideologies, how they can look logical, reasonable, beautiful, arguments that can be difficult to combat; all lives matter. Don't you agree all lives matter? Maybe I don't think all lives matter. Those arguments are hard to debate. So, seeing the reasonableness, the often just the beauty of their arguments and the world that they are trying to create, a world where men are freed from all of the ways they suffer because of gender stereotypes, a world where people are just educated, a world where churches and institutions raise the money from society that they need, a world where the government takes a step back and lets education and creativity flourish.

We tried to see the beauty of the picture that they are selling so that we can then see it in ourselves. And, that comes back to what we discussed last week, why are we doing this? A lot of good answers to why we are doing this, study into right-wing/left-wing and the trinity. The fundamental reason that I believe that we need to do this is because from 2018 to today, getting this movement to accept gender equality is a little bit like one of those puzzle games where you need to get the ball in the hole. Every time you twist it, it just goes down another road and another road. People's ability to excuse and find a way out of addressing their own sexism is quite incredible. And, I'm needing to dismantle every avenue they have out of that for their own sakes and for their own salvation.

So, we took on libertarianism, and we're taking on MRAs, and we're going to take on Bernie Sanders because it's all connected. We will take on the squad because it's all connected.

Libertarianism, the most dangerous stream of the right-wing disguised as beautiful. Bernie Sanders, a version of social justice that is much more suitable and comforting to many members of this movement compared to that which you would find in Hillary Clinton. It's a fundamental rejection of the MC. Men's rights arguments which are more prolific in this movement today than radical feminism. Finally, we addressed the Sunday Law (SL). How does this all impact church and state and our view of the SL as a fight over the union of church and state. And, essentially, what I concluded on in the few minutes we had left was saying that it is not church and state after all. It is culture. You need to substitute the word church for culture. Then, I'm hoping we can see that every piece of this puzzle falls into place.

Before we continue where we left off, just to review of my review, 2016, it's not just Clinton versus Trump. Before she ever gets to fight Trump, she fights Bernie Sanders. By the time people are confronted with gender equality, they've already rejected the MC because they're already choosing their own path of social justice, usually what they've not heard from prophecy or the message, but because we're going through this process, and it is fundamentally dangerous. They will leave just like Elder Jeff left if they haven't already. That's why we're trying to tackle this.

Jimmy Savile. I just wanted to spend a few moments on Jimmy Savile. I brought him up last week. I'm not sure if people have been able to watch the Netflix documentary for whatever reason. I did go and watch some YouTube documentaries. I didn't find there were any of them that I would recommend. I thought they were all extremely poorly done, to be honest, missed the fundamental point and which left you bending more towards conspiracy theories, I think, and completely missing the point. I don't usually recommend anything that requires a cost to watch, but at least the discussion of it, having it in people's consciousness, I think it's worthwhile. Did anyone go and watch the Netflix documentary since last week? And, if you did, you know that I'm going to ask you. Katherine.

Katherine – Yes, I watched it.

Elder Tess – What are some perspectives you took from it? Obviously the horrible, but that's not really the point.

Katherine – Yeah. I think towards the end they were kind of looking for reasons why this could have happened or how this could have happened? How the whole country could have been fooled kind of thing, but really I thought that the whole society had set up a situation where, it wasn't just you, Savile, but it was everyone who was implicated because you had like young girls that were from those institutions, and they just didn't think that anyone would believe them, and you know that if they spoke out, the police probably wouldn't have believed them, but so would have all of Jimmy Savile's fans.

And, that would be men and women that just the general public wouldn't have believed them either because who believe, who would believe these young girls that have been in trouble, you know, their voices were so, they just felt so powerless. So, that was really sad, and I just sort of

felt like everybody kind of carried the guilt in some ways for what had happened. I thought it was just obviously really heartbreaking to see people as adults talking about their whole, basically their whole lives have been really ruined by this, like it's, you know, for him maybe a short little thing but for them, it's destroyed their lives completely. I think they're still trying to come to terms with that.

Elder Tess – Thank you, Katherine. I think that hit on my main observations as well. Brendon.

Brendon – Yes, I saw it as well, and I agree with everything that Katherine just said, and maybe just another point that I found just really heartbreaking was there were victims that did come forward, and they were silenced. That was sort of roadblock even whether it was the police or even the BBC at the end, they didn't even want to go forward with the documentary that they had. So, they leaked it intentionally to another news source, and they carried forward with it. And so, you've even got multiple layers of institutions whether it's the police or media, and you can understand why all those victims, the girls and the women, they knew they weren't going to be believed because that was true. That's what actually happened.

Elder Tess – I found it really therapeutic to see the male journalist, the rage in his eyes on behalf of other people. That's what I'd like to see in this movement. That is encouraging, and that's what it finally took. Brave women and him being angry for the injustice they faced. I thought that was a little positive to take from a whole lot of negative. Katherine.

Katherine – The other interesting thing was about Margaret Thatcher and this whole idea of, you know, having funding for institutions like the hospitals and that weren't, they didn't need the government funding, so the way that set up a situation where Jimmy Savile ended up having a lot of power because there wasn't a sort of oversight that those structures that would have been in place if it was a government funded hospital, for example, something like that. It set up a really bad, unhealthy environment where he could just waltz around the hospital and do things and people didn't say anything because they wanted him to bring in the money, I guess, and yeah, it just, they're just bringing that idea of libertarianism into it as well.

Elder Tess – One of the main points I wanted to take from that documentary, two points. First of all, the libertarianism. That beautiful picture of just have big government step back, let people learn through education, let communities work together, let individuals or churches or community groups fundraise is it leaves a void of power, and when government steps out of that role of power, who fills it? Who oversees those that fill it? And, that's what Jimmy Savile did. There was a gap of power under a Margaret Thatcher style of government which enabled him to come in, take that power through being the avenue for these institutions to get funding, and that served as a type of protection for him.

But, the fundamental thing that protected Jimmy Savile from any type of consequences, from any type of restraint, was not his powerful friends, was not the government, and was not the royal family. This is where I feel like a lot of the other YouTube documentaries or presentations on this really failed. It's so easy to go into the sensational and just make this a case about a

terrible man and those terrible wicked elite deep states, and they start going down the conspiratorial route, and when they do that, they do this (straw man). It's Jimmy Savile and he's protected by Margaret Thatcher and Prince Charles. No, he's not. He's protected by this (the masses). He's protected by society, and when we do that, when we see that he's protected by society, all of a sudden, we are part of society, and we are part of the problem.

People want to see as the elites, as a deep state, as the powerful protecting him, but it wasn't. And, this is what we see again in this court case that I've shared a few articles about this week on Jonny Depp versus Amber Heard. I wanted to show someone the level of internet hatred for Amber Heard. So, I went on YouTube and I do not have a right-wing algorithm on my YouTube. I try and avoid influencing my algorithm in a way that's going to cause me to see contents that I don't want to live with on a daily basis. I do not have an algorithm that is going to show me those things more than anyone else. If anything, I try and avoid the disturbing and the violence and the right-wing, but it only took me a few seconds of scrolling through their short clips on youtube. A few seconds and it's there.

It's a clip of Amber Heard and Jonny Depp's court case, a completely conspiratorial, out of context, meaningless clip where supposedly from the other side of a quiet, huge courtroom, there's a look shared between Jonny Depp, and one of her legal team and they have to pan the whole camera because I can't get them both in the shot. There's no evidence that they're even looking at each other. They are far apart. It's meant to make her look bad, but there's absolutely no basis for it. And, it's set to a song and I'm sorry that my language is offensive, but I'm going to repeat it, the words of the song it was set to as they were, it's set to the tune of a man singing, "Thank God I had to slap a b**** today."

That is where the hatred and messaging is coming from, not because they had something true from her court case that genuinely put her in a bad light. That's the extent of the hate. That's only a one video of thousands and thousands and thousands and something that Saturday Night Live (SNL) and Late Night hosts and a lot of so called left-wing are a part of. You change that into a race song, and you have a white person sing it, and then you change the "b" word to the "n" word, and maybe we will start to feel a little bit of the outrage that we should already be feeling.

It's truly awful, but that one clip, that one tiny YouTube clip, one of thousands, had 57,000 likes, 57,000 normal people of the community like you and me that watched that, heard the song and thought, Yeah. 57,000 even isn't that many compared to many of the others that are just as bad or worse, but that's 57,000 members of society. Jimmy Savile was not protected by his deep state powerful, rich and famous friends, and he knew that. What he was protected by was society, and it's so easy to see the awful wicked person who becomes infamous for that. It's so easy to see Margaret Thatcher and Charles, and even the BBC, and see them all as doing the wrong thing. But, the only reason they did, the only reason that it came to that, was because society protected him.

That was the fundamental point that I wanted us to see if we're going to look at that case. It's not even really about him. It's about society. It's about culture, and when we see that we're part of that society, we're part of that culture, and now it's not 1967. Now, it's 2022, and now, it's Amber Heard and Jonny Depp. All of a sudden, we should see ourselves in the light that we view society back then, that we view the UK around that case and that issue. Only by getting to the heart of society and culture, can we start to unravel what this is all about. Moli.

Moli – I was just going to ask, is it culture that protected him?

Elder Tess – Yes. Yes. I think that is irrefutable. He was adored by so many, and when you watch that documentary, it is so obvious. He does not hide. Some of his sexual abuse is in plain sight, but it's met by laughter because it isn't even that society can't see that he is a predator. They can see he is a predator, but society just doesn't really care. They refuse to believe the victims, and the other point from the documentary is the powerful statement by the woman who was a television presenter in one of his interviews, going back decades where he is flirting with her, and she sits on the couch and simpers and coos and melts and gives him a kiss when he asks for one, and the male presenter eggs Jimmy Savile on.

And then, they interview her for the documentary, a much older woman, and you can see the pain in her eyes because she says, I hated it then, but society demanded a performance; my boss, my colleagues. But, it wasn't just them. It's society that expected her to perform a role which was as this flirty, short skirt wearing television presenter that Jimmy Savile could flirt with for the enjoyment of the audience. And, the way she was expected and she knew at the time that incident was painful for her at the time, and she was still knew that she had to do that because the viewers watching expected that of her.

That is the fundamental point that I'm wanting us to see. His powerful friends could do nothing for him except that society continued to view women, the way they did to view sexuality the way they did, to view powerful men, influential men the way that they did. Looking back, it's horrific, but society has not much changed as is evidenced by one little YouTube clip with 57,000 likes. That is one tiny evidence among many, many others. Remember, those women that kind of seemed to giggle as he handled them on public camera for millions to watch. Those women might have laughed, but they did not need to find white actors to play the slaves in *Gone with the Wind*.

When society says dance, you dance. That is how people operate. African-Americans, quite possibly the children of former slaves, acted the part of slaves on *Gone with the Wind*, something that massively represented the trauma, the horror of what had happened to their own people because society says, dance. And still, even under Amber Heard's article where she calls out domestic abuse, I went to the comment under her article, a dangerous thing to do even though I'm sure the *New York Times* or *Washington Post*, I can't remember which, has filtered out the terrible comments, still the comments saying, "What is wrong with women"

who do not speak out, who just don't immediately slap the man's hand away, who don't immediately tell him to stop.

The same sentiments that protected Jimmy Savile and allowed that to go on exist in society today to a much higher degree than I think that we are aware. So, I wanted to touch on Jimmy Savile. I wanted to bring up Jonny Depp and Amber Heard just to tie that in. When we are looking at the SL, and sexism in society, it is that. It is society. When we see it in the church it's because it's the bubble that we have come from, that we grew up, many of us, and in our minds, many of us still exist in. But, if you want to actually see the world, open up that bubble, it's not church and state that's doing that. It wasn't the church that protected Jimmy Savile.

I just want to quote him. I have two quotes from that documentary. The first one, he says that "the top in life is ultimate freedom, and that is when the battle starts because you have to be very strong to stand for ultimate freedom." He knew that the world that he had orchestrated around himself, building up the support of the public, gave him the ultimate freedom, and the rest of his life in continuing to abuse, in continuing to silence those who wished to cry out, that was his strength, fighting for his ultimate freedom. When he got his ultimate freedom, what happened to equality for hundreds, thousands, of mostly women and girls? He had his, freedom.

He had his libertarianism. Margaret Thatcher got her libertarianism. Let's let go of the beautiful picture and look at what actually happens in society when that beautiful picture is enacted. Second quote, quoting Jimmy Savile. He was an ardent Catholic. So, was his religion, his Catholicism, the cause of his misogyny and his abusive behavior? He says, "There are many sorts of gods. There's the god of my own god who is a god possibly molded to my own image, a little insofar as he suits me. My god is for me, and I reckon that I've come off the best because my god is a real great guy, a great sense of humor. I must catch him on his good days, I think."

What does that remind you of? My god is my own god. I molded my god in my own image. I created my god to suit me. What does that remind you of? Katherine.

Katherine – Apis Bull.

Elder Tess – Yes. He did not need to be Catholic. He did not need to be religious. He did believe in a god. All that he had to do was to try to blend his misogyny with his Catholicism, take whatever god Christianity offered, and do this (cut it up, twist it, and add his own to suit his belief). His god is not Pope Francis' god because he took whatever religion offered, cut it down, twisted it, added his own, and he was left with a god that would be ok that he was a pedophile, that he had hurt and abused thousands of women and girls, and his god would be ok with that. He created his own god, and he even says it.

This is what is happening, what has happened in this movement. I hear it all the time. People has said to me as explicitly as this: I miss the god that I knew before you started presenting, Elder Tess. I miss the god I knew before gender equality; before MC. Of course you do because

your god was made in your own image. You can say with Jimmy Savile, my god is a really great guy. My god is for me. There's the god, my own god who is a god possibly molded to my own image. That is why people miss their relationship with god before this message. They miss it because that god that they had never convicted them. He never had a god that told him that pedophilia was wrong. He never had a god that said that he would be judged for abusing women because he had a god that suited him. That happened before I started presenting. It has happened a lot since I started presenting, and people are still explicit enough to say, I miss the god I made in my own image.

That god never made them feel responsible. That god said everyone else is the problem, but not you; it's ok; it's not you. You can make this movement into a movement that suits you. You'll get to heaven and say, the leadership did not understand me; the leadership did not understand that my case was different; that my sexism was different; that my childhood was different; that I couldn't help being the way I was. I'll get to heaven and see a god that understands me, and when that happens, it's the same thing, but that means that we don't fundamentally change. This is the Apis Bull on repeat.

So, there are important lessons we can learn from that one singular case that don't necessarily just show us, oh, he's a really bad person. Jimmy Savile was a horrible human being. It's teaching us about culture. Not just about atheistic culture, but how people even treat religion. I don't care if Ted Cruz is Southern Baptist or Catholic or atheist. I don't even care if he believes in a god because it doesn't matter. All he has to do is take whatever he believes in, and mold it into the image that suits him. And, the image that suits him is dependent, not on his religion, but on his culture.

Coming back to the Politico article, I want us to spend a little bit more time on that article. Did we read, anyone go and read that article? Marie. Did I get your hand? Did I miss a hand?

Marie – No. I only just put my hand up. I was just thinking what you are teaching at the moment like last week, you asked, what was the purpose for all of this that we're learning, and to me it seems that this is the way for us to actually understand sin if we can grasp it the way that we are, that we are to grasp it for it to have the effect that it's got to have. It just seems to me that this must be an aspect of why we're learning all this because it's the sin that we need to understand.

Elder Tess – Yes, and then we need to see that sin is in us. It's not in the elites; it's not in the powerful friends of Jimmy Savile; it's not in the absolute most wicked that we see like him; it's in society, and therefore, it's in us. That is a fundamental point. Moli, I'm sorry I missed you.

Moli – I'm just wondering because now the media and his lifestyle is more exposed now than before, but I'm wondering, if culture can protect him. Will culture be able to crush him now that everyone else is sort of dead against that he's more exposed than anything else, the act he did? What limits does that take to handle them? Will it be able by culture to solve their problems?

Elder Tess – One of the articles that addressed the court case between Jonny Depp and Amber Heard said something like the following: Everyone wants to support the victim or victims until they personally know the abuser. They either are the abuser or they're friends with the abuser, or they know of and like or support a fan of the abuser. And then all of a sudden, they don't. The problem is that we have a culture, society now, they didn't grow up with Jimmy Savile. We've moved beyond him. I didn't know him growing up because that wasn't my generation. He was abusing for over 50 years, half a century of abuse, but I wasn't really part of cultural awareness for over that half century. He died in 2011. And, it was heavily UK based.

So, sure. After his death, when finally women speak out, but the problem is we weren't in love with him. He wasn't our Jimmy Savile. Now, for tens of millions of people, it's their Jonny Depp, and I'm not saying the cases are identical, but the response of the society is. It's not Jimmy Savile. It's their Jonny Depp. He belongs to them. They adore him. So, society can do that too late to people they don't love, but their fundamental approach to women and to abuse has not changed. What is meant to change with the Me Too movement is allowing women to speak up, and listening to them when they do and allowing them to be imperfect victims.

Remember one of the women who was ready to speak up and accuse Jimmy Savile. She had been in Broadmoor which means that we don't know what she did, but she had committed a serious offense. She had a tarnished track record. So, as a youth, as a child, she was sent to Broadmoor which is kind of like a psychiatric prison. And then, when she's an adult, and she's married with a child, she wants to speak out against the man that sexually abused her, and what does her husband say? Don't. Don't speak out because if you speak, our daughter, society will know your tarnished history. They'll know that you aren't perfect. They'll know that you did something to end up, they'll know that you were in Broadmoor to begin with.

So, she is silenced because she is not perfect. What happens when a serial killer starts targeting prostitutes? Case after case after case of the police failing to believe women who are prostitutes, who even can explain to the police what the serial killer looks like, and the police don't believe them because they're not perfect victims. It's a reoccurring case and society could do something about it, but society isn't. The Me Too movement had hope, and what we are seeing now is the backlash to the Me Too movement; the dismantling of the progress that had developed. It's easy to look at the Supreme Court, and say, wow. They are dismantling a lot of progress.

It's easy to see the Supreme Court as the wicked enemy. Society should concern us more than the society. It's society that hinders, blocks gender equality. The Supreme Court becomes a reflection of society, and I don't even think that it is the worst reflection that could be. The Supreme Court might dismantle some things. Society will dismantle the Me Too movement. It's happening as we speak. So, it could, but once they find a new man, and they love that one, they don't.

If we were to come back to that article, thank you for your comments. All good discussion points. How the culture war could break democracy. What we have is an eye. We have an eye, and we have a set of glasses. He kind of does it this way. I want to do it this way. I want to say that these glasses are politics, but perhaps more relevant to us right now is these glasses are religion. Where does sexism exist? Is it in the eye or is it in the glasses? Where is the sexism? Where is the misogyny? Brendon.

Brendon – In the eye.

Elder Tess – It's here (eye). I want to say that this is society and culture. Now, the glasses can be different. Someone could be Muslim; someone could be Christian; someone could be Buddhist; someone could be atheist. The glasses change, and with different glasses, you're going to get a different tint. It's going to manifest in a slightly different way. So, someone who is atheistic and sexist might look a little different to someone who is Southern Baptist and sexist. It changes the tint. Remind you that a new atheist, young woman said that she found that the new atheist glasses, the tint of their glasses worse than what you would find in religion. It's an awful tint, but it's just a tint. It's just a reflection. Where it actually exists is inside. It's in the eye.

That is the point that this article is making, not necessarily on sexism because again, the author of this article is wrong on his politics which shows in some larger arguments he makes about the fault of the left-wing, and when he starts building more of his personal opinion into his quite accurate political observations, it goes right off track. But, his observation is correct. He says that our politics are reflections of deeper, cultural disposition. So, what is deep is here (in the eye), and everything else is just a tint. It's a reflection of it.

On political matters, on here (glasses), you can compromise. But here (the eye) is where we "find our ultimate moral truths, and on ultimate moral truth, one cannot compromise. Conservatives see an existential threat." That's an important phrase: "They see it as an existential threat to their way of life, to the things they hold sacred." So, Hitchens is going to hear that personal is political, and atheist or not, that is going to be an existential threat to what he, atheist, Christopher Hitchens, holds to be sacred, his culture. He does not need the religious tint to manifest his sexism. He does not need religion to have an ultimate moral truth.

Quoting the interviewer, "There's a passage you wrote 30 years ago that seems relevant to this point. We subtly slip into thinking of the controversies debated as political rather than cultural." We as a movement slip into the idea that they are religious rather than cultural, but they are not. "On political matters, one can compromise. On matters of ultimate moral truth, one cannot." This is why the situation is so hopeless, to paraphrase him. What we found in 2018 was that what Elder Jeff, FFA, a large segment of the movement held as the ultimate sacred was not their religion. It was not this movement. It was not the Bible. It was not Ellen White. It was not the reform lines. If they did, they would have followed the sacred into truth. What they held as sacred was culture.

So, when the MC comes, Elder Jeff is going to say, you're attacking me here (the eye; culture). He ends up fighting back a year later once he's learnt to fight here (glasses) because he can't fight here (the eye; culture). He knows he can't fight here (culture). So, he takes a year to start making it a religious argument. When he makes it a religious argument, virtually no one leaves with him. We don't have a shaking in Africa. We don't have shakings in many parts of the movement. We don't immediately have shakings through the French world because he is fighting here (glasses). But, then as we keep presenting through 2019, late through 2020 into 2021, we are attacking here (eye), and every single time we do, that is where the fight develops. That is where people leave. Josephine.

Josephine – I'm not sure how to say this. So, this is individual, this Apis Bull that we're talking about tonight. It's individual as well as group?

Elder Tess – Yes. We can see that Adventism has done that. We trace that back and we can see that Protestantism has done that. But, I would argue that Dawkins, that individuals do that, and it tends to, a lot of them tends to be very similar. Those who are doing that in this movement are all coming to the same conclusions. They're all coming to this conclusion, the same conclusion that we don't have enough sympathy for men who are suffering. We don't, I don't want to say too much because I've got a lot to say in the future, but that we're not giving enough space and time to the subject of race. All of those arguments that, there's only a few that people tend to gravitate towards. We can say everyone has their own, but there aren't that many out there. So, they tend to, they tend to be all very similar, all of which excusing leave the individual able to not have to address themselves. Does that make sense, Josephine?

Josephine – Yes. Thank you. I see it coming for a while, but I just did not know how to express it, and, you know, when we covered that tonight and last week, yeah, the picture is forming more clearly in my mind.

Elder Tess – Individuals can seem to do that independently, but the arguments are very much, almost the same, that develop. Marie.

Marie – When you said that what society is doing is worse than the Supreme Court with abortion rights, it made me think of how we use to teach about the legislative and judicial and the executive, the three parts of the government that were going to be destroyed and that Hillary Clinton was the last bit of democracy, you know, that really, Biden is just time playing out, and democracy is destroyed. How does that with this culture? How do we see that picture and this picture and how can we combine the two of them if we can? Does that make sense?

Elder Tess – I'm not sure I understand your question.

Marie – I guess when you talked about the Supreme Court, and what society is doing is just so much worse, it just reminded me of the three parts of the government, and how basically, heading towards the SL, the three parts were slowly being picked off and destroyed. And, I guess, also too that we now apparently, there won't be a SL as such, like the SL will come, but

there won't be a law around that. So, I'm just wondering where they fit in this scenario of it being a cultural issue more than a religious issue, and the government being destroyed. How does that fit in with this?

Elder Tess – You filter society's sexism through Ted Cruz's glasses, and it can look really religious. I'm not bothered if we get to the SL history and it looks very Protestant, very religious. I'll still say the same thing because I don't think that it fundamentally is. When white, nationalist terrorist performs a terrorist attack and says that he's trying to scare all the non-Christians, all of the non-white people out of the U.S., do you think that he's trying to scare away Max? Do you think that terrorist is concerned about Max being atheist when he says he's trying to scare non-Christians out of the U.S.? I don't think he does. I don't think that he feels at all threatened by Max. I don't think that in his heart, he's concerned about falling drops in church attendance.

It's become, even the idea, and I'll use an example for this, even the talk about the Judeo-Christian West, is code for culture. I's not religious anymore. It hasn't been for a very long time. I want to share screen to, hopefully I can do this. I'll try to do this. I want to share screen to a photo of Richard Dawkins in front of Winchester Cathedral. Quoting him. "Listening to the lovely bells of the Winchester, one of our great medieval cathedrals, so much nicer than the aggressive sounding Allah Hu Akbar or is that just my cultural upbringing?"

So, Richard Dawkins. I thought he hated religion. I thought he hated the Judeo-Christian part of the West. I thought he was trying to dismantle organized religion. The problem is that Richard Dawkins loves his culture. He might hate God and the concept of God. He might hate religion, but he loves his culture, and at least at the very end of a terrible thing to say, frankly, islamophobic thing to say, at least at the very end, he thinks maybe that's my cultural upbringing. It is.

So, when a white supremacist says, I'm trying to scare non-Christians out of the U.S., I don't even believe that that is religious anymore. He's not trying to scare out Max. He's not trying to scare out Richard Dawkins. It's part of the culture war. It's part of what they see as the threat versus the culture they hold sacred, and I don't think they need God in that culture they hold sacred, and if they have God, they've done this (cut the message, twist it, add a little of you own, and make it to suit you). They've done as Jimmy Savile did. They've made god that suits them. It's not even the Protestant God. That's why Tucker Carlson can come out and say, I'm (Elder Tess) going to put words in his mouth because he didn't say that, but I can imagine him saying that. "My god isn't his god. He's racist. I'm not racist."

You can strip the glasses off. You can put them under water and scratch off the religious tint. It does not matter. You'll just get a different tint. You'll just get a different shading of the same fundamental problem which is why women leave organized religion because of the sexism, flock into atheistic communities, look around and expect to see gender equality and then are crushed when they find out it's worse. It's like, they thought that when they scratched religion

off of the glasses, they would enter into a society that would value them. Eden. Did Cain walk away from God and start treating his wives properly? No. Did Cain rebel against God and then understand gender equality? This is the point of radical feminism. It is the oldest, the deepest, the most set, the original, and the fundamental form of bias and discrimination; the most extensive and worst in extension and practice today.

That is how radical feminist understands gender equality, and it fits perfectly with our prophetic message. It started in Eden. It didn't wait for Christianity to get its shoes on to start influencing all of the nations that had gender equality to start being sexist. They already were. It didn't wait for Moses. Therefore, it has not come through Christianity. Therefore, it has not come through Protestantism. It hasn't even fundamentally come through religion. That tower of Babel; everyone there is fundamentally sexist. I don't care where they went. I don't care what religion they ended up turning to. I don't care what language they were given. Every single one of them brought sexism with them.

And, if we're going to look outside of our Christian bubble today at a global SL, we need to see that. We need to see that so we can relate to them, as some people said last week, so we can understand the SL, and then we also need to understand it so we can see it in ourselves, that it is not something that we can wash off of our glasses. What does Jesus say to do to your eyes if it causes you to fall? Moli. What do you do to your eye if it causes you to stumble?

Moli – Pluck it out.

Elder Tess – Pluck it out. Do you think that would hurt?

Moli – Not really.

Elder Tess – NO? You're braver than I am. I couldn't think of anything worse.

Moli – Culture is more hurt than that. What I'm asking is that, I could see that this culture thing is so sort of, it's a core things for everything, all our problems, and then where you cultivate from, is this attack side to patriarchy system?

Elder Tess – I missed the last sentence. Could you repeat that? I'm sorry,

Moli – I'm talking about the culture, how it is so sacred to us, that he can do anything and really is the main core of everything that we are facing right now. But, what I'm asking is that is this cultivate from patriarchy system? Is this the dark side of it?

Elder Tess – I believe so. Not everything in culture is sexist or wrong, but the vast majority of it kind of is. When you start stripping back the layers and look what the meaning is behind things. Look at the meaning behind the wedding ring. Look at the meaning behind a father giving his daughter away. Look at the meaning behind some of these things, behind calling someone Mrs. Husband's last name. It is sexist, and that is what we are trying to root out, and I think it's easier to rip our eye out than to rip sexism out, but we actually, in fact Jesus tells us to. This is what

hurts, and it really does hurt, and if someone tells you to tear out your own eye, you will do everything else but that.

You will try to find any other alternative to that. But, this is what people hold sacred. We had a larger fellowship in Australia who walks through shaking after shaking, and then I touched Zimbabwean culture, and I touched the dowry system, and where are they now? They are not here in this meeting. It isn't because of anything I said about religion. I touched culture, and I would say, I think you can defend saying, even the majority of Adventists today, I'm not worried about trying to convince them of what Ellen White believed or how to read the Bible, how to read properly. That's not what will be the blockage to Adventism because that is what for most people is not ultimately the sacred.

That's why the whole world is in a culture war. Look at the last week, look at the responses coming from the republicans and democrats, and lots of individual people when you have just another atrocity.

Moli – The hard thing about it is so much ingrained into everyone.

Elder Tess – Yeah. That's why it's 2022, and I'm saying the same thing and continuing to fight. It is ingrained, but it doesn't have to be. Our eye is built into our body. We can live without it. We can discard it. If your eye was going to kill you, you'd tear it out. If I knew that I'm going to die in 30 seconds unless I get my eye out, it's amazing what the human being can do when it has to. It's understanding that we have to. And, it's in stop finding, ceasing to find excuses to not. The preservation of culture and the defense of culture is the fundamental reason that 100% of this movement is not radical feminist today. It is a fundamental reason that people have left over and over and over again. People did not leave over an interpretation of Scripture. They left over culture because people just do not, to that extent, care what God thinks of what God says.

The root of the word culture, remember, is cultus, cult, cultivate. It's what we feed. It's what we treasure. It's what we love. It is what is sacred. It is what we coalesce around and find community in like a cult. It's the same thing. To separate someone from culture is like trying to separate them from a cult. They worship that. They treasure that. That is what this message is defining. That is what it looks like to take a stone, and throw it at a statue and destroy it. We're not destroying the glasses that that statue of Daniel 2 is wearing. We're destroying the statue itself, and how you do that, the only way to do that, is to destroy culture in whatever country, in whatever manifestation that we find sexist.

Culture, in one respect, is about that which is pure and that which is polluted. It's about the boundaries that are often transgressed and what we do about that. And, part of the culture war, one way to see the culture war, is that each has an idea of what is transgressive, of what is the violation of the sacred, and the fears and the resentments that go along with that.

Remember, he's just made the argument that this is not a religious discussion anymore. It doesn't have to be religious. It's not. For some, they will carry their religion. Maybe they're Muslim. They're going to put on a pair of glasses, and they're going to be sexist with that tint;

with that hue. But, he's saying it's not, these are, they aren't even really making religious arguments anymore.

So, Dawkins, Hitchens, Harris, they all have an idea of the sacred, the pure and the polluted; the sacred and the transgressive. Every culture has its view of sin. Again, he's using this outside of a religious context. They have a view of sin. It's an old fashioned word, but it refers to that which is ultimately profane and cannot be permitted; must not be allowed. The Hitchens and Dawkins, as much as any Southern Baptist pastor, the Me Too movement and radical feminism is sin. Gender equality cannot be permitted; must not be allowed. Understanding the things that underwrite politics, and I will add religion, helps us understand why this persists the way it does. Why it inflames the passions that we see in society.

That is as much of that article that I wanted to read. Sorry. Just a little more. "Politics becomes a proxy for cultural positions that simply won't brook any kind of dissent or argument." Politics can compromise, but post 1991, me speaking now, post 1989, 1991, because it became so set on particularly two kind of, with some variations in both, cultural ideologies that you can't compromise. This is why bipartisanship has died because it has become about culture, and not about politics. "Democracy, in my view, is an agreement that we will not kill each other over our differences, but instead we'll talk through those differences."

Now, he's going to take it back to our alpha history. "Part of what's troubling is that I'm beginning to see signs of the justifications for violence on both sides. If I could draw a parallel, it's not unlike the Civil War. There was a culture war for 30 years prior to the civil war. The Civil War was without question about slavery race over history, and the status of black men and women. And yes, the good guys won. The Civil War at the cost of four out of ten Southern males dying and one out of ten Northern males dying." People ask me today, don't you care about male lives? It's a difficult question to answer. Simple answer, of course we do. Complicated answer, it took four out of ten Southern males dying to end slavery. Would that mean that if you could, you would go back and keep slavery and start the Civil War?

You always have a culture war before you have a hot civil war. Before people start pulling out their guns, you have decades of this entrenchment into two cultural positions. Obviously, there is some variety within both. If you didn't, I wouldn't be having a go at Bernie Sanders soon. If you didn't, we wouldn't be talking about libertarianism supporting gay marriage alongside someone like Ted Cruz. There is variation between both. But, they are still entrenched cultural positions, and they will unite together when they need to, like on Jan. 6. You can see it in our alpha history, and now we see it in the omega history. And, it is not fundamentally about religion. It's about the cultural positions that have been taken.

That was the U.S., purely. It's a limited context. Now, it's global, and it is in a post-Christian world. So, global and post-Christian. It means that it is a culture war even more so, a hundredfold more so than it did in our alpha history. It did then, but it absolutely does now. I might close for time because I'm always going over time. Marie.

Marie – I was just going to say, it gives the picture of, it doesn't matter what platform you're on whether it's the Supreme Court or politics or conservative. The bottom line is that it's cultural; it's culture, and that it's almost like everybody is coming into concord with one another even if they don't realize that. That's just the picture I guess that I'm getting from this.

Elder Tess – I like that word, concord. And, they do not have to have concord on everything. There is a massive amount of variation within the right-wing, but if you were to approach any of them about proper gender equality, you're going to find concord. I don't care if they're Muslim, atheist, Protestant. I don't care what country they come from or what particular culture you find them in. It's going to be cohesive around the subject of gender. And, they might even be ok with gay marriage as long as you don't force them to participate in that or to have to support that by their business etc.; as long as you don't touch their freedom.

He explains, the last bit from that article, he explains that the Civil War didn't solve anything. Racism continued. And the reason that racism continued post-1865 was that it was embedded in culture, and Civil War can't change that; can't fix that. So, he says you end up with a struggle for civil rights. And then, he goes on to completely misdiagnose what the culture war is really about today and completely remove gender from the equation which I think is an aspect of his conservatism. I doubt that he sees gender equality the way that he needs to either which is the difficulty with sifting arguments. But, what he says in that article, first of all, it's 1991 that he starts identifying. That's a prophetic waymark. Second of all, it fits our message prophetically perfectly.

Post-Christian world, it fits with what we see with new atheism within the post-Christian world context. It fits with seeing this as a global test, and there are some important observations that he makes. Gender inequality, sexism, started in Eden, continued through the lineage of Cain as much if not more than those who followed God; all those who professed to follow God. It has always been that way. It found its way into every single corner of this planet regardless of whether they even met or had influence from the Christian world, and it is culture that the MC began to attack.

Elder Jeff understood that immediately. His eyesight into getting to the heart of what we were saying think was an aspect of him being the first angel. God gave him a prophetic visibility. In the end, culture was too precious, and it continues to be for people today because this (cut it up, twist it, add your own to suit you) continues to happen, because this says, you're the problem; your mindset, your world view, your culture. However that is manifesting itself, and so, we do what everyone else does, and you can't get through that way. You come out this end failing 2016 and 2018 more than anything. You can't come through this process, look back at 2016 and pass the test. You can't do this and come back to 2018 and do the test.

Seeing people today who if some aspects of the message were just forgotten by them for a moment, they would go back to 2016, they might not choose Trump but they would choose Bernie Sanders, and that is just as much, that is just as much a failure. We will get into the issue

of the left-wing. Next week, I want to double down on this point of culture one more time with some external proofs of how this manifests itself in three or four different scenarios. We will close for time. Brodie, would you close in prayer for us?

Brodie – Dear God in heaven, Lord, as we look at the world that we live in, and we understand our part of that, Lord, we long to see as you see. Lord, we want this change in us. We want to hate sexism, Lord. We want to, we want this new kingdom. We ask, Lord, that whatever it takes that you would bring this to pass in our lives. We ask, Father for your movement. Lord, we know that we are so close to the end, that there is not time. We ask that we would not dawdle in this work. Lord, we know that there are people that we will be in contact and right now with, Lord, that are dependent on our influence on the way that we reflect your character. And, we ask, Lord, that perfect that which concerns us. We thank you for your Sabbath, Lord. Please be with us in this hours. We ask in Jesus' name. Amen.