

## **THE FAR LEFT AND THEIR MULTIPOLAR VISION**

### **TMW VESPERS**

**06-03-2022**

#### **ELDER TESS LAMBERT**

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

Elder Tess – Amen. If you're unsure about somethings that we have discussed in the class, and you feel that we've moved on or we might not be going back to it, or for any reason, please communicate that. I don't want us to just keep moving on, and you have thoughts, questions, or comments about something that we've already been discussing. I don't think that it's very useful to move on. But, we are also kind of unintentionally doing a type of circular learning, I forget the exact term, but we are kind of coming back to points that we have covered before, to build upon them, and I think that that is useful. But, there's no use building upon a foundation that hasn't made sense. So, we can always step back into what has already been discussed.

I have felt a sense of frustration that I feel that there are loose threads, that there are things that I wanted to say or read, and they kind of get left behind because we get onto a point, and we head in that direction, and you kind of don't want to lose that momentum. We did that when we were discussing libertarianism, and then we went to the trinity, and then we went to new atheism, and we really needed to follow that momentum with new atheism and cover that subject, but we left some thoughts on libertarianism behind. We didn't get to talk about the militia group, and some of that, I think, is quite useful.

So, I've been thinking through the week of how to progress, and what I want to do, before we head further into culture, I want to go back and repeat and enlarge or review couple of things we did months ago, and then kind of bring it back around but from a slightly different direction. I'll explain more of that in a moment. Considering that this is kind of a bit of ad hoc, I might erase this side of the board so we have somewhere fresh to start with.

There's a lot of things that have happened during the last week that are awful and negative; a lot to cry about. I remembered a little too late that I never mentioned our election last

weekend and was wondering if anyone had any thoughts, questions, or comments on the election in our new government. I meant to bring that up last week actually, and I completely forgot. So, while I'm erasing, I'll give people time to think. Marie.

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

Elder Tess – By the norm, do you mean the right, kind of the right-wing swing? That global right?

Marie – Yes. Yeah.

Elder Tess – I think it's the characteristic of the culture war if we can see it that way. There are two sides, and there are victories, and there are losses. 2014 is a good example for that. They gave LGBT people gay marriage which really is built on freedom than equality, freedom to marry who they want. But then, they, with Hobby Lobby, not Hobby Lobby, the other one. What's the one that we kept putting on the board? Does anyone remember? Marie, Ray, do you remember the court case?

Ray – Was it the cake shop?

Elder Tess – Yes. The cake shop.

Ray – I just remember the cake shop, but I don't remember the actual name. Sorry.

Elder Tess – That will do. With that court case, it wasn't about freedom' it was about equality. That was kind of a win for freedom, but there was lost for equality, and it goes back and forth, but what you had 2008, election of Obama, you think the left is winning. The right-wing capitalizes off of that, they capitalize off the election of Obama, they play off the idea that they are the ones under threat, the great replacement theory is one example of that. But, there are many examples. The militia groups all mobilize around 2008, 2009 because they're playing off this idea that they are the victims; they are the ones threatened; not women, not the minorities, but them.

So, it hasn't always been the left-wing losing every fight. Obama was a victory. Then, you see the reaction to that. Gay marriage was a victory. You see the reaction to that. Me Too was a victory. This last week, we've seen the reaction to that. So, it does go back and forth, but you can see the general trend, and what it does, every single time the left-wing wins, it ups the anger; it ups the fear; it gives the right-wing something more to latch hold of; something more to use to portray themselves as the threatened. And, that's why I think when the media broadcast announced the legalization of gay marriage in Switzerland which was only last year, with that article announcing the legalization of gay marriage in Switzerland, we also put a warning: This is good news, but remember 2014, and what came after; the backlash.

And, when media watch did their segment, I quite like ABC's media watch, and when they did their one directly after the election, the very last kind of thought they left us with was, now we have a few years of watching, they didn't call it the opposition, they called it the resistance, and I thought that that was insightful language. It's not our new government and the opposition. It's our new government and the resistance.

So, there's hope, and I introduced the election because it was better news than we have in most of the things we could talk about to start with, but I think, to answer your question, Marie, there's victories and losses all through this culture war. Sometimes though, a victory can have negative consequences to how violent things become in the future. Does that make sense, Marie?

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

Elder Tess – You look at who is winning primary elections in the U.S. right now, they're not necessarily all Donald Trump's candidate. People want those who are, not necessarily better than the candidates that he is recommending, but those who paint it just in a nicer picture. They put that same right-wing conspiracy theory ideology that some of the candidates who Donald Trump is not endorsing are just as bad, but they are putting it in a nicer setting, and people are voting for them. So, I agree with you. Just putting the same thing in a gilded frame doesn't make it any better, and I think that they were naïve in, Scott Morrison was naïve in thinking that he could behave and speak the way he did to women, especially, but also to other communities, and his base would, he'd still be speaking to enough of a base that he wouldn't have any negative consequences to that. Brodie.

Brodie – I think that we are often a step behind the U.S. in Australia, and there are some similarities in this election. The first one is that people have reacted to an autocratic style of leadership as you've mentioned that Scott Morrison had a very right-wing style that really emulated Donald Trump in some ways. Another similarity is that our new government, it really has compromised. Leading up to the election, we saw that in its response to the religious discrimination bill. So, just as we expect to see compromise with the Democrat Party in the U.S., we see that here. And, another similarity is that they've been handed a bucket they can't fix. So, they're just band aiding a broken situation, but one of the key differences, perhaps is that our labor party, our new government, isn't really left-wing. It's more centrist. So, we don't have a true Democrat Party, do we?

Elder Tess – I think of the mainstream to know, which is why I voted Green, and I know some of you were speaking about that. When you looked at their position on gender, it was the best on offer. So, Green's, first and labor center, second, was the position that I took. They aren't the

left-wing party. They are obviously better than what was on offer. I think Biden and the democrats took a similar approach to win the election as well. But, I do think that Biden didn't necessarily try and disown the left with the energy that Albanese was trying to distance himself from left-wing. Those were few good points. James.

James – I don't know if anyone knows this or anything like that, but since I've been studying the seven mountains mandate and stuff like that, Scott Morrison is actually a part of that movement. He's actually a member, and there's a couple other high level, actually part of this seven mountains mandate.

Elder Tess – Ok. I didn't know of his closer involvement. I did think that he's speaking on the Sunday morning, I think at the stage at Hill song, was it Hill song, just after he lost the election, speaking about how all politicians, everyone in that role is called by God. He definitely did unite church and state in a way. Essentially saying in a video, he was only in that role because God willed it, and it was God's doing. It doesn't become hard to imagine that he had sympathies along those lines. I think anyone that takes their pastor on the plane to meet Donald Trump is someone to be a bit concerned about when you're approaching the Sunday Law (SL), you would think. But, I'd be interested to know what you're looking at there. It is interesting, and his ideology unfortunately, is not gone. We know that.

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

So, what I want to do is go back and pull together a few of the threads that we have left behind. I'll just illustrate a little bit of a plan. There's kind of two key points that I wanted us to make in these classes. One of them, we've already gotten to. We've already said this is not church and state. It can't be. We're in a post-Christian world. The test is global, but even within the U.S. itself, this is not church and state. That is not sufficient of an explanation when it comes to gender. Gender is the original, the deepest, and it didn't embed itself in Eden. In Eden, it didn't embed itself in religion. It embedded itself in culture, every culture, and it spread from then to now universally, and it is the culture that is at the root, at the heart of the problem.

We can change our glasses. We can change our tint of how misogyny is practiced, but the core ideology is always the same because it's not in the glasses, but it is in the eye. We're going to come back around to that, to discussing culture when we get to our second main point. But, if we were to go backwards, we started off with 1888, and I'm not interested in that now because it's not part of what we're currently looking at. It's not of this theme. But, if we were to go back to the beginning to tie off loose ends, someone asked the question, how do you sift the left-wing? And, I said, if we want to know what's wrong with the left-wing, we have to know what is wrong with the right-wing and the difference between the right-wing and the left-wing.

I've given a review of the steps we've been taken a few times now so that we don't lose touch with the thread with each step we've taken on this journey. But, I've over-simplified that part. We didn't straight away move from the left-wing to the right-wing. Instead, we spent at least one class, I think it was only one class, on the left-wing. We actually took a little bit of time in looking into the left-wing, not just the left but the far-left and said, if there's a problem and something we need to sift, let's go to the far-left and see what that looks like. What does that world look like? What do they believe? What so they say? And, it's there that I want to return to today. I want us to repeat and enlarge upon what we did with the far-left.

So, to give you a little bit of notice, I'm going to ask anyone in a moment to, and I might put a dot in the chat so I don't lose touch with where we were up to with questions and comments. I'm going to ask people in a moment to tell us what they remember from that class where we discussed the far-left, and then we're going to review that today.

So, if we have a political spectrum, and we say that is the center, and that is the right-wing, and that is the left-wing, someone asked how do you sift the left-wing? Now you'll notice that when, you may have noticed, some may have noticed, that when I share articles or sources, when I quote, I have never shared, and I have never quoted Democracy Now. There is a reason for that. When I sift, I read or listen to Democracy Now, and I have seen so much in there to sift, I no longer consider it worthwhile even watching it let alone the danger of sharing it, and having people imbibe what they get wrong.

So, I am sifting a lot in the left-wing, individual articles but also whole sources, whole sources that I just do not consider worthwhile following, especially if there are videos, especially if they're opinion pieces, especially if they're, not just videos but kind of news briefings like that or panel discussions. It makes it even harder to sift, but Democracy Now is one I pretty much sifted out entirely of anything that I watch or share, and there's reasons for that. We might even get to some of that today. But, someone asked how do you sift this? And, I said, oversimplifying, let's look at the right-wing. What's the difference between the right-wing and the left-wing?

So, we said that right-wing was freedom over equality, and the left-wing was equality over freedom. Now, you kind of need to be a functioning democracy to have that. Otherwise, it gets more complicated, and you go to somewhere like China where they don't really have either, but equality is certainly not, equality is certainly what the final goal is, and in a country that is meant to be democracy, you're meant to have equality. You can still have certain amount of freedom in an authoritarian regime if you're certain type of individual, but equality is not permitted.

So, we went into the right-wing. We looked at the right-wing, and we saw Max or the trinity. And, there were three things that we saw here. We saw libertarianism, and we got quite far along that journey, but we didn't complete it. I want to tie off those loose threads before we go further. Then we looked at atheism. We said about all that I want to say there, but I think it's

something that's going to need to be reviewed because it is very hard to change our Adventist wired brains that want to see everything through a church; everything through religion that has been so hardwired into us that even though at the moment I don't have much to add to that.

I think it's going to need to be something that gets repeated and repeated because it's here (libertarianism) that we can make such a strong point that this is cultural; that we are dealing with something cultural. And, last week, we added to that argument by showing Dawkins' position on the cathedral bells in Europe, and his supposed animosity towards religion, animosity towards religion, towards Christianity, hatred of Christianity, and yet his love of the Judeo-Christian West. Someone can love the Judeo-Christian West, and hate God and Christianity. It is possible. It sounds impossible, but it is possible to have that because the concept of a Judeo-Christian West is more rooted in culture than religion.

So, we can learn a lot from atheism and it need to be repeated. Then, we have, and I'm going to draw a bubble around this; men's rights. And, what comes under men's rights? So, there's kind of these three points. I've put a bubble around this one because on the trajectory we are following with these classes, I don't see a way to easily introduce this into the classes as part of what we're discussing.

So, what I'm going to do is at some point in the near future, we're going to have a single class, probably not a Friday night, maybe a Sabbath afternoon, at some other point in time, we'll have a stand-alone class on just this (men's rights), just this as it relates to the repeat of history, of course that being the Millerite, and how arguments about suicide and men's mental health, just to have one of the key arguments that people use inside this movement to make men's rights activist (MRA) arguments. There are quite a lot of them. This one seems to come up quite frequently, and I believe it's necessary to combat it, to show how easy it is to take a little bit of data, and while something might sound good, the end of the trial this week showed the result of that, the result of that sympathy, of mistaking who is the perpetrator and who is the victim. There is so much of that in this movement as I have stated, it has to be addressed. But, I believe that will be a stand-alone class and not part of this school.

Then, we need to come back around to studying the issue with the left-wing. So, we are, as I said, kind of, I won't draw it from there because that is being separate, we're going to come around circular teaching, come back around to the left-wing, what we are reviewing again today to understand, how do we sift this? And, all the while we're doing this, we need to keep in mind, culture.

So, I hope that makes a little bit more sense, and that it's a little bit of a plan of what we're going to do. Does that make sense to everyone? Is anyone confused? I just want to tie up some loose ends and review what we did months ago with the far-left. So, I've given some time talking about that, and if anyone has reviewed their notes, or they have a better memory than mine, does anyone remember what we said about the far-left? One other point before we begin. While we're doing that, this week, next week, I suspect it shouldn't take us more than

two weeks to review the left-wing and also going to finish off libertarianism. While we're doing that, to prepare us for dealing with culture, and to prepare us for dealing with the issue with the left-wing, there are few key articles.

These articles, I could just flood people with dozen articles a week and expect everyone to sift them and find the specific point or paragraph that is helpful, and I don't think that's a good use of anyone's time, especially when so many people are even watching these classes and not reading the media broadcast, and I don't understand the point of what people are doing if they're studying two streams of information in these classes, and then going and watching nonsense, to put it mildly during the week. It is defeating the purpose.

But, I'm not flooding with articles for a reason, and there are a few very key articles that, I like the VOX article, ones that should be read, then should be re-read, then should be copied and pasted and underlined and highlighted so the points aren't lost. We've already shared one in the VOX article. I've got about three or four others all ready to go that will help prepare us when we come to this (culture), when we are kind of coming back around and making our final arguments for the position that prophetically we should have as a movement.

So, in preparation for that, I'm going to start sharing those articles and asking people to read them and re-read them. And, I'll share the first one at the end of today's class and give a little bit of context for it. Back to the left-wing. What we're doing today. Does anyone remember, when we did that, attacked the left-wing? When we went to the far-left, we went right to here (extreme far-left). What will we find? Will we find the most progressive people on the planet? Will we find the people who believe in absolute equality? What will we find? And, we introduced one source of journalism, if we can call it that, and one journalist in particular, and then a couple of people who work for him. Does anyone remember any of those details? His name, the publication? Brendon.

Brendon – I believe it was Max Blumenthal. It's interesting you got Max on one side and Max on the other. Is that right?

Elder Tess – Yes. That's a good way to remember it actually. I hadn't thought of that.

Brendon – I'm not sure how much help I'll be moving forward. For now, I do remember his name. I do remember that his net belief ended up being on the far-right in agreement with, and I just can't remember specifically what that was, but I remember it, I just can't remember what the topics were, but he, in summary, he was in agreement with those on the far, far-right, but I just can't remember what they were. Sorry.

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

Josephine – I had the same name as Brendon. I know that we said that he's supposed to be as far-left as possible but he's actually, all his ideas are supporting the people on the far-right, more or less, and they're kind of praising him, for lack of a better word, that's the one that I've

chosen to sort of express what I remember about him. I think there's one other. Is that Norton? Somebody in that same area? Is that Ben Norton? Someone else. There's a good person I can't remember.

Elder Tess – Ben Norton. Yes. Thank you Josephine. Katherine.

Katherine – I think we just spoke a little bit about their ideas on foreign policy and American interventions over-seas. That is, I think, an area where the far-left was finding some common ground with the far-right. I can't remember a lot of the specifics, but I think you know, some subjects like Palestine and things. I'm not sure.

Elder Tess – Yes. I don't want us to leave us with the idea that the far-left and the far-right are the same. We're not necessarily going to come to an explanation today, a full explanation of why they are (the far-left) the way they are. Why the far-left have the disposition to have these views that they have because I think that the answer to that is in, is better built on a stronger foundation than me just stating it, and some of these articles are going to help build that foundation for us. So, I'm not necessarily wanting to give a full explanation today just in my words of why they are the way they are.

I would say that just like the left-wing is equality over freedom, and the right-wing is freedom over equality that even this far-left is coming from a completely opposite platform to say, Tucker Carlson or the far-right. But, as everyone seems to remember that they end up having a few things in common even though it's stemming from an opposite platform. Marie.

Marie – I'm just wondering by memory is it possible that it was a libertarian view that connected them to the right and some of their philosophies?

Elder Tess – I don't believe so. I haven't seen, it's an interesting thought because in looking at some of them, really in the last things I looked at but haven't investigated to the extent you could. Some of their positions on vaccines and lockdowns have been quite interesting, to say the least. But, I think that the point where they join with the right-wing is not so much on libertarianism. I might, not having more questions, I might just go into the reviews so that I make some point rather than just state what I think.

So, the web page that they have, the source, the Max Blumenthal operates is called The Gray Zone. This is the far-left, and it is the far-left. I'll illustrate that in a moment. It was founded as a blog in December of 2015 by Max Blumenthal. I'll list some of the key individuals. Max Blumenthal, you have already given us. And, Josephine, you had also said, Ben Norton. And there's just a couple we'll add to that who are involved in The Gray Zone project. And, there are others like The Gray Zone in the far-left, other publications, it's a wider, the problems that we're going to see illustrated.

They are prolific through the left-wing, and particularly through some sources in a watered-down fashion through Democracy Now which is why I said I don't watch them. You can see that tint, but we're going kind of like going to Roy Hollander. We're just going straight to where it is

in its most pure, awful form, and then if you were to look back, you would see it diffused through other sources as well. And, I'm going to start with seeing it in its most pure form which is really at The Gray Zone. And, there are few other publications like The Gray Zone, but it is probably the most widely read and the largest of its kind.

Max Blumenthal had a father, Sydney Blumenthal, who was also a journalist. He was, I believe, an aide to Bill Clinton. He was known by the Clintons, but his journalism always was a little bit problematic, and it became more and more problematic over time, and like the son, the son unfortunately is like the father. And, if you were to look at his father, also far-left, and also quite a number of problems with his journalism and his ethics as well.

So, The Gray Zone was founded as a blog in December of 2015 by Max Blumenthal. The blog was hosted on AlterNet which is also a far-left site, not quite as far-left as The Gray Zone, but it's still far-left. AlterNet hosted The Gray Zone, is a blog from 2015 to 2018, and in 2018, The Gray Zone became completely independent. Its news content is generally considered to be fringed, with its content ideologically centered around the website's desire for a multipolar world.

So, if you go over to the far-right, we've discussed this before, what kind of world order are they looking at? What was Reagan looking for? What was George Bush Sr. looking for? How do they want the world to look? Josephine.

Josephine – This is a new world order that they're looking for.

Elder Tess – What's George Bush Sr.'s definition of the new world order?

Josephine – Sorry. I can't remember.

Elder Tess – It might come back to you. Katherine.

Katherine – The U.S. is like, at the top.

Elder Tess – Yes. What would you call that?

Katherine – Unipolar

Elder Tess – Yes. U.S. at the top in that kind of unipolar position. So, that's George Bush Sr., that's Reagan, that's the right-wing looking for this unipolar world. Ray, was that what you were going to say? So, The Gray Zone come in, and they are far-left. And, what they are, not just discussing in a journalistic fashion, but what they are actually fighting for because they are quite activist, what they are fighting for is a multipolar world. They want that multipolar world. So again, I'm going to try to sell it. I'm going to try and say how it sounds good to us, and then I'm going to ask you whether or not you like that, and then, I'm going to tear it all down, if you'll let me.

So, they are all about a multipolar world. That is their central philosophy which means no great U.S. coming in and conducting regime change; no great U.S. interfering and meddling in foreign affairs; no great, what's it called, the war in industrial complex. They oppose, not just the U.S., but all Western imperialism. They completely oppose U.S. foreign intervention such as the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan but other forms of foreign intervention as well including conducting foreign influence campaign. And, they hold the U.S. responsible for their compromises, their hypocrisy, in their foreign policy.

Does that sound good? Multipolar world. Hold the U.S. and the West accountable for imperialism and colonialism? Have I sold it? I picked on Moli last time I wanted to sell something. Moli, does that sound good? Brendon, does that sound good? Just the picture. Not asking you to commit.

Brendon – I think it sounds reasonable, but I see some problems with that.

Elder Tess – What problems do you see?

Brendon – If, there's no intervention by some form of democratic country, the oppression of human beings will continue to get worse. There's got to be a check somewhere.

Elder Tess – The oppression of whom by whom, generally?

Brendon – Well, it would be the authoritarian regimes. They generally oppress women more than anyone. So, there needs to be a check on authoritarian regimes globally to protect the most vulnerable or women and other minorities.

Elder Tess – So, you're pro-regime change? What do you do if it's 2001, and you care about women, and the Taliban run Afghanistan? Can you see the problem?

Brendon – Yeah, I think I'll hand that over to someone else. I can see Barak Obama's challenges like when you're facing situations like this. It's just very complicated, but at the end of the day, you still got people being, human beings being persecuted like it's, you can't just stand by.

Elder Tess – I've known the movement has had a problem for a long time. These classes are, kind of me venting after a few years of being just gagged by Covid, but I've been tracing the movement issues within the left-wing, and they're not sifting for a long time, and at no point did that stand out more clearly to me the dangerous path we were on, the members were on, until the U.S. withdrew from Afghanistan. And, I saw individuals' response to the end of the Afghanistan war, and I thought we are in trouble as a movement. We're getting to the heart of why that was.

That's nearly a year ago that Elder Parminder and I put out on the media broadcast a statement that was accusatory and did upset a lot of people, was weaponized against us, where we said, what are people in the movement thinking? And that was a moment of panic for me because, just like you said, you draw it back, and you can already start to see a problem with that leftward argument. What do you do with some of these regimes? But, if you go to especially

the far-left, then the U.S. intervention, regime change, it's not just hypocritical, it's colonialism, and it's imperialism.

And then, they will do the comparison that we have done with the movement, and say, U.S. is no better, but is it? Are we meant to compare or are we meant to compare and contrast? Is there not a contrast for a reason? So, these are the difficult questions that we have to discuss when we get into the left-wing, and we won't have all the answers today, but we're coming back around. This is something that we're going to have to handle with care because so many members are down the wrong stream of left-wing because they're watching this, they're not reading the media broadcast, and then when I say people are adding their own, I know what sources they are listening to. They don't even realize just how much of this (the far left-wing) has become problematic. But, it's been an issue for a long time.

I'm kind of excited to deal with some of these things, and I just hope that people are willing to, like they did in 2018, change some of their thinking. Katherine, I think your hand was up in the midst of our discussion. Did I miss you at all?

Katherine – That's ok. It was just earlier on, just before Brendon spoke that I put my hand up as well. Just like he said, I was going to say, something to the effect of this idea of standing by, you know, the U.S. just standing by while abuse is going on in other nations and how that's a problem to just have this idea that they should just not help. And, the other comment that I wanted to make was that it reminds me, this philosophy reminds me of during the Millerite era, with the slavery issue, the idea that the southern states had that they didn't, they wanted to have their state rights, and they, you know, they didn't want the, they didn't want any intervention. They wanted to have a multiple country as well, and that wasn't right in that time period. Just seems like this is on the same thing but on a bigger scale.

Elder Tess – The more I look at the thinking back then, the more you can see that it's so similar to today in some ways, and I think, remember, that's our alpha history, the alpha history of the papacy, the world wars, and there is so much of that mind set as well that is worth tapping into to help us understand today. Thank you Katherine. I want to screen share just to make a couple of points. (A chart indicator from extreme far-left to extreme far-right) This is Democracy Now, not The Gray Zone. You can see where they sit on the right-wing/left-wing chart, and they are here, the left-wing (close to extreme). I'll discuss them more at the end. This is The Gray Zone, about as far-left as you can get (extreme left as extreme can get), just to prove that point so you can see it.

I will take you to their website. This is The Gray Zone independent news, and investigative journalism on empire. So, you can see what their particularly targeting, what the focus of their news and journalism is, is on empire; imperialism and that in the context of the U.S. So, they're very much focused on the need for a multipolar world and for the U.S. to back off. Just to scroll down, it'll give the masthead, Max Blumenthal, founder, editor in chief, and reporter. Ben Norton, assistant editor, reporter, and video producer. The two other names that I wanted to

include are Arron Mate and Anya Parampil, and they'll both come up. So, I've added them to our board.

That is The Gray Zone. So, in supporting a multipolar world and opposing U.S. imperialism, because they oppose empire, empire building, what they see is just modern colonialism, and U.S. interference in foreign affairs. They support that multipolar world. They also support Syria, the regime of Bashar al-Assad, probably more focused of their attention than anything else over the last years has been defending the regime of Assad, and they support the regime of Maduro in Venezuela. They support Vladimir Putin in everything including the current Ukraine war. So, to reiterate on the current invasion of Ukraine, they support Vladimir Putin and Russia. When it comes to the genocide of the Uyghurs population, Muslim minority population in China, they support China and the state government.

So, they support the regime of China, of Russia, of Venezuela, and of Syria. That is them supporting a multipolar world and opposing U.S. foreign intervention. That's just a few of them, the main ones that we would hear about in the news. Along this vein, the website has supported, I'm quoting, "has supported the government of Bashar al-Assad of Syria, publishing content denying that the Syrian government used chemical weapons against the civilians during the Syrian civil war. They maintain a pro-Kremlin editorial line. The website published pro-Russian propaganda during the Russian invasion of Ukraine including the debunked claim that Ukrainian fighters were using civilians as human shields."

"Nurma Julassic, writing in the index on censorship, described The Gray Zone as a Kremlin connected online outlet that pushes pro-Russian conspiracy theories and genocide denial. In March 2020, the English version of Wikipedia deprecated the use of The Gray Zone formally as a source of facts and its articles. So, if anyone wants to update an English with Wikipedia page, you're not allowed to use The Gray Zone because the English with Wikipedia recognized they are factually unreliable to the point they cannot be used as a source on anything.

I just want to give couple of more screen shares. The base of what they are saying, one of the main basis of what they're saying is that everything is Western imperialism. The U.S. has messed up this world to that extent. Everything new continues to be the U.S., the West meddling and interfering. Part of that, they believe, occurred in 2014 when you had the Ukrainian revolution of 2014. They believed that that was a U.S./CIA orchestrated plot which is also what Kremlin teaches, and then they believe that Zelinski is a far-right white nationalist neo-Nazi, and a lot of it is couched in such complicated language, and they bring defenses to it and arguments to it that becomes a little bit difficult to unpick.

There is truth to the fact that there is an issue with Nazism, and portions of the Ukrainian military. There is elements of issues the same way when you look at Navalny, Navalny is not a very good character if you didn't have to compare him to Vladimir Putin. If you compare him to Vladimir Putin, then yes, you would want Navalny let out and you would want him to topple Putin. If there was no Putin, and they had a democracy, you'd never want Navalny in power,

but there are some of these issues, but the way they use those issues, amplify them, add to them, twist them out of context, essentially means that at the end, they have a completely incorrect world view.

So, I'm just going to share screen and include some of their, what they say and what they do. This is from their Twitter feed, The Gray Zone. "U.S. agencies have trained and empowered Nazis and ultra-nationalists at home and abroad to fight Russians in Ukraine. The program follows the blueprint established by western intelligence agencies in Afghanistan and Syria." So, what they're saying that it was in Afghanistan and Syria, the U.S. trained and mobilized Nazis and fascists to oppose the completely and legitimate governments that they already had.

We've listed some of the main ones, but also when it comes to Nicaragua, from 2018 through 2022 and ongoing, there were protests against the Nicaraguan government. The government killed hundreds and injured thousands, and The Gray Zone said this was a justified response. The inter-American commission on human rights documented in detail the killings, torture, and threats made by the government towards demonstrators, but The Gray Zone said that these were justified response. They celebrated Daniel Ortega and parroted the Nicaraguan government claims that the protest movement was not legitimate but part of a Western-led international conspiracy.

So again, for them, the great demon, the great villain, is the West, is the U.S., and is what they see as Western U.S. imperialism creating a unipolar world. We looked at some of their sources when we did this because this is, some of this is repetitious, but I'm adding a little to it. We looked at some of their sources. I want to screen share, and I'll just show you Max Blumenthal because he might come up when you see someone brought on as a panelist in a discussion. This is Max Blumenthal. His face was familiar to me. I do believe that I have seen him before as well on some publications, but that is Max Blumenthal, founder of The Gray Zone.

So, to share their views, they have also united with a number of other individuals such as Paul Antonopoulos who created the site called South Front. Now, there is a Nazi site called Storm Front, and Paul Antonopoulos' name, his site, South Front to mirror, to really draw the same crowd as Nazi site, and when people went into Storm Front, the Nazi site, they found Paul Antonopoulos as a member and active on that site. So, you have someone who is acting, speaking out on a Nazi webpage. Antonopoulos said, "I think a white Australia is pretty much long gone now with the influx of Chinese, Koreans, and Sudanese. I believe all Whites should migrate to Victoria and Tasmania. Let the immigrants in other states kill each other, overdose, rape each other, etc. Don't get me started on the Jews."

So, Paul Antonopoulos, that's what he said on Storm Front. He created his own site modeled after it called South Front. It was shut down, and when it was shut down, Max Blumenthal said that the shutting down of this site was a coordinated attack on English language sites known for defending the Syrian government and presenting its perspective. So, Paul Antonopoulos, essentially a Nazi, also supported the Syrian government of Assad. And, when he was shut

down for creating essentially a Nazi site, Max Blumenthal defends him and says this is a conspiracy. This is a takedown of all those supporting Assad. It's a part of this Western cover-up.

That's one of the people he celebrates and supports. Both of them supported each other in saying that Assad never used chemical weapons. This is the CIA building support for their attempts at regime change. Max Blumenthal wrote a book. It's called the Management of Savagery. It's essentially a book blaming the U.S. imperialism and war machinery for the Syrian war. One of his sources for this book is a member of, works for the AfD which is the far-right anti-immigrant alternative for Germany party. And, he equated the suffocation of George Floyd with U.S. sanctions targeting Assad in Syria.

So, he said, just like George Floyd was suffocated, a knee on the neck, so U.S. sanctions are a knee on the neck of Assad and other governments. It is U.S. unilateralism and imperialism at work. Any comments so far? Does this bring it back? There's a bit more information, but this is what we discussed before when we went to the far-left. Can you see how they're starting from a different platform? This isn't about celebrating the U.S. The U.S. is not the hero here. The U.S. is the villain. But, you have Tucker Carlson defend Russia and Putin, and then you have Max Blumenthal defend Russia and Putin. This is what many of you were saying before. You see them come together. You see the far-right and the far-left, but I want us to see how they're starting from a very, not just different but opposite platform; opposite position on the U.S.; opposite position on foreign intervention.

Anya Parampil has been hosted four times on Tucker Carlson. Why does he like to host her? Their views unite. Her views on what? Immigration and Hillary Clinton. Ben Norton has particularly gone hard on supporting China in presenting the view that the Uyghur genocide is a carefully orchestrated U.S. conspiracy theory to, racist conspiracy theory to try and stop China from rising up and taking the U.S. place in the world; that it is part of the U.S. racist effort to denigrate and suppress China. In doing this, he has then taken the position as, this entire publication has that the Uyghur genocide is just didn't happen.

They don't deny that China has put a certain amount of the minority Uyghur population into work camp, but he has shared the views retweeted and endorsed the views of one Chinese Han which is the mainstream Chinese culture, Han supremacist justification for the genocide. This Han supremacist said, China is not enslaving Uyghurs in work camp. This is government affirmative action. Affirmative action is a good thing. What they are doing is they're deliberately not employing Han workers, the mainstream Chinese population, but conducting an affirmative action by hiring the unproductive, aka lazy, Muslim workers at the expense of the majority population. So, they're painting this as a positive action, as affirmative action.

Another quote from the same source. "The Turk is the eternal enemy of the Han genetic lineage and racial warfare is not only a historic but biological inevitability that serves both eugenic and pro-social purposes." It's quite positive about racial warfare, and again, it is that the Hans are

the true genetic lineage, the true Chinese. And, we also read his quote on women, Chinese female journalists where he said that Western people only want to hear women Chinese journalists because the Jews who are the ones making all the hiring decisions in the West, apparently, prefer pretty young things, Chinese women as journalists. These Chinese women pander to the boomer ideology of these Jews, and these Chinese women won't even have children which makes their Chinese parents cry, and these Chinese women are employed taking the jobs of Chinese men who tend to be more independent.

So, of course when you go down that line of thought what are you going to find? You're going to find misogyny. And, I use that quote as some evidence of that. But, I'm taking that as Ben Norton, but it's really the entire publication, and all of that left-wing stream within the stream of the left-wing that they swim in has much the same ideology against the Western imperialism. It sounds good, but then look what it is in reality. Let's come back and look at Afghanistan, and ask, if you were Obama, what would you do?

Just a bit more on Ben Norton. Quoting him. He says, "The New York Times engages in anti-China propaganda, that the New York Times is the mouth piece of the U.S. government that exists to manufacture consent for new wars and imperial conquests. All of these corporate media stories on China and Xinjiang are the same. They are weaponized disinformation in the new cold war on China brought to you by Western government, NATO, and the weapons industry to portray voluntary employment as dastardly Chinese forced labor. This New York Times imperial stenographer relies on anti-China expert from a war mongering think-tank. Another extremely dubious New York Times story on China's Xinjiang region originated with outlandish claims by the so-called Uyghur human rights project. A separatist group created, funded by the U.S. government regime change, a CIA cut out."

So, they blame NATO, the CIA. They say the New York Times is just a mouth piece for the weapons industry and Western governments. And, with all of that, they just deny the genocide outright. Now, Arron Mate, he was a producer and a writer for the Democracy Now where I started to make my point. We're looking at the extreme. When I watched Democracy Now, and I watched them handle the Afghanistan war, now they probably wouldn't have him on now. Max Blumenthal, Ben Norton, they're really unhappy with Democracy Now. Max Blumenthal used to be interviewed and speak on Democracy Now.

Some of these people used to be quite involved with it. As I said, Arron Mate was a producer and writer for Democracy Now. While their most extreme views you will not hear on Democracy Now, there is a flavor that still exists. It still exists, particularly when it comes to the U.S., and they start dealing with foreign policy. And, it's that, even before I knew any of this existed, I watched Democracy Now and picked up on it, enough that I gave up trusting them very quickly as a source of any subject, especially on foreign policy.

The Gray Zone isn't the only far-left source to take these positions. There's something called Counterpunch. Another called Popular Resistance. Another called LA Progressive. These are all

far-left publications. The same people who take pro-Beijing positions on Xinjiang often follow suit on China's ongoing crack-down in Hong Kong. Popular Resistance is one example. Again, far-left. Quoting them. "What is happening in Hong Kong is not actually a people's uprising for democracy but a tool for anti-China rhetoric and great power conflict, Western imperialism." Popular Resistance has repeatedly cited The Gray Zone in its coverage of Xinjiang and republished Haiphong's Black Agenda report article.

I want to start winding up with another quote from that same source. I just read from Bicoida story. "Left-wing support and equivocation for authoritarian regimes is by no means a new phenomenon. In the past notable figures such as Noam Chomsky and Alexander Cockburn have questioned the scale of atrocities committed by the Kama Rouge and Stalin. These positions have generally been rooted in anti-imperialism and a deep suspicion of America's dominance in global affairs." So, what they do in this article is they show the problem with The Gray Zone, the last two paragraphs I read were from them, they show what The Gray Zone but also other publications are doing now under the banner of multilateralism, and then they say this is not that new.

If you go back and look at Noam Chomsky, and I did, Noam Chomsky was much more careful in the language that he used. He was not quite so open, but it still existed. He was so against Western imperialism. His position on some of these issues of foreign governments, in light of what it's known today, is deeply problematic. This is more embedded left-wing problem than for us to just take Max Blumenthal. Like you said before, Brendon, this a Max and this is a Max. (The polar opposites) It's a symbol for a thinking that permeates farther than just the most extreme which is why I used Democracy Now as an example. Certainly not the only one.

"Many on the U.S. left take issue with a hegemonic position occupied by their country, but very few end up defending Assad's bombing of the Syrian people or Xi Jinping's mass incarceration of religious and ethnic minorities. However, publications such as The Gray Zone functions on a purely ideological level based on a desire for a multipolar world in which global, military, cultural, and economic power is distributed among multiple nation states and Western influence greatly diminishes. They been quick to argue on behalf of authoritarian regime such as China and Syria."

So, The Gray Zone functions on an ideological level. A desire for a multipolar world, a desire for a world in which the military, cultural, and economic power is more evenly distributed. And, when they do that, I think we should spend some time in our mind seeing how good that looks and then the reality which is what we've been doing for a while. See how good it sounds, and then look at the reality and start dealing with some of the harder questions. We want to criticize the U.S. war in Afghanistan. Sure. A lot was terrible, and they did a lot wrong, but it's easy to slip into a different camp and start making dangerous arguments.

So, as I said before this isn't a conclusion. We're not stating why they get things this wrong. Perhaps you can already start to form a picture of why they get things this wrong. This is just a

start of reintroducing the left-wing and the problem with the left-wing. We looked at the right-wing. We saw their position of freedom over equality. Part of that is their desire for a unilateral world. They want the U.S. to have awful lot of freedom at the expense of equality of other nations. But, when you look for the multipolar, if you don't keep a group on equality, you start to see what happens, especially on the equality of women.

We need to know what 2018 and not just 2018 but 2016, were designed to teach us because 2016 is the Increase of Knowledge (IK) for the Midnight Cry (MC), and 2016 was two elections, July and November; Clinton versus Trump but also Clinton versus Bernie Sanders. And, I would like to say just at that one point look at the people supporting Bernie Sanders over Hillary Clinton in 2016. There's some problems there. If we don't have any other thoughts or questions I will wind this up for now, and introduce the article that I wish to give us to read this week. Brendon.

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

Elder Tess – What I didn't go into in more detail, an important point that shouldn't be missed, is just how popular The Gray Zone is. Between December 2019 and early 2021, so by about 14 months, the main Chinese government news networks shared The Gray Zone articles over 300 times; over 300 times in 14 months, once every few days. They are extremely popular. Max Blumenthal is extremely popular on Russia Today on Sputnik, with Kremlin propaganda machines. He came out and fought and attacked when Russia Today was listed as a propaganda site in the U.S. He fought against that. He is extremely popular. He has been to Venezuela. He was given an award by Maduro in person. They are popular within these regimes. They've been to, they've traveled to Syria.

It's not just Tucker Carlson. Assad knows they exist. Putin knows they exist, and they're using this. What I want us to see is we can demonize Tucker Carlson all we like. We can see where they unite, but they are not saying the same thing. Tucker Carlson might like to have Anya Parampil on his show to say how bad Hillary Clinton is. They agree on that, but the reasons that they think that she is so bad come from a completely different opposite platform. And, I don't want us to lose sight of it. I really don't want people to start saying, well, the far-left and the far-right are the same.

If somebody asked me, are you a feminist or are you a men's rights activist (MRA), I would know; I would say, I'm a feminist. If someone asks, are you a left-wing or a right-wing, I would know; I am left-wing. But, I'm not just a feminist. Liberal feminism is not feminism. Cultural feminism is not feminism. They can call it feminism, but it is not. And, the more we get into understanding the culture, the more strong that point becomes. So, I don't want people to say, well, the left-wing and the right-wing are the same. But, I thought the MC was meant to turn us

left-wing. It was. We are the same way the increase of knowledge for the Sunday Law (SL) was meant to turn us into feminists and not MRAs. We need to be sure about what feminism is. Feminism has to be radical. Only true feminism is radical. It's the same with the left-wing.

If we're going to prioritize equality over freedom, then we need to be sure how we're doing that. And, that's what we're doing now. There's a couple of hands but I might wrap up for time. We're not doing this to have all the answers today. We're doing this to remind us of what we did before we ever went to talking about how we moved to the left-wing in the first place. This preceded us going back to 2018, and asking, why are we left-wing? Then, we went to the right-wing and discussed Max and the trinity doctrine all in the context of freedom over equality. We went into libertarianism. We're going to do that next week. We're going to look at the militia groups, have one look at libertarianism, unless something comes up, not heavily review atheism.

Then, I want to come back to this (the extreme far-left) in the context of culture with, I guess in our arsenal, a couple of articles that I really want you read. The first one of those articles, I will screen share. I will screen share the title with you. It's by the Raoul Wallenberg Institute. I just have a couple of things to say to explain this. Like the VOX article, it's one that needs to be read more than once. You can open it, and actually listen to it on YouTube. I'll explain that in a moment. (Opening up to the video) Raoul Wallenberg Institute. It is titled, "Do Not Dare To Tell Me Human Rights Are Not Universal."

Anna Lind was a politician in Sweden. She was assassinated, I think about 15 years ago, going back quite some time, and Anna Lind was assassinated by a man who had a hatred for politicians. She passed away. In her honor, this university in Sweden conducts a yearly lecture that's to be given by a distinguished scholar, politician, diplomat, or international top level civil servant. So, this is Lund University in Sweden. This is their once a year lecture. It's known as the Anna Lind lecture in respect, honor for the Swedish politician who was assassinated. She was assassinated in 2003, going back some time.

What I wanted to share is the lecture that was given in 2017. It was given by the high commissioner for human rights, Mr. Zeid Ra'ad Al Hussein. In 2014, he was appointed to be the U.N. high commissioner for human rights, and he served from 2014 to 2018. This particular lecture, he delivered in 2017, and that's him there delivering the speech in 2017. It's titled from something he says about halfway through where he says, do not dare to tell me human rights are not universal. And, I want us to see the context in which he is saying that. He was popular in the human rights community. If you want to, you can open and read or listen to his entire lecture here. It is quite lengthy to listen to because it has heavy introductions at the beginning, and then it ends also with questions at the end.

Many of the questions, I didn't find particularly useful. He is careful in what he says because, of course, people are speaking up and asking, how were you going to stop what is occurring in Syria, and I don't know how people necessarily expect him to stop what is happening in Syria.

But, if you do go in and listen to that, first of all, please read it. I think we learn more when we read and then when we reread, but if you do go and listen to it, someone asks a question, there's just a couple of questions that people ask him that aren't included in the transcript that you read that I think are worth listening to.

One of them is a fellow who asks a quite libertarian question but it's kind of like an international libertarian question along the lines of, not just libertarian but what is connected to libertarianism, the idea of a non-aggression, non-accusatory language, and he asks, why do you need these international courts? Why do you need to be attacking people? Why can't you just reason with governments and work with governments? It's the exact type of libertarianism that we've been fighting inside this movement, and I found it interesting to see that similar flavor of question asked to the human rights commissioner, and his answer is worth listening to; why they need law; why they need to be able to hold these governments accountable to essentially attack them.

I'm sure this man, the human rights commissioner, is not perfect. He is actually a prince, a Jordanian prince, but he became quite popular in the human rights community because he speaks simply and he speaks plainly. He speaks pointedly, so much so that Russia complained about him in the U.N. in 2016 because Russia did not like the way he was speaking about Donald Trump. He had serious concerns about Donald Trump's candidacy as you would expect for the human rights commissioner. He was known to speak quite plainly, and some people have been very concerned for his safety because of how plainly he spoke about human rights, including women's rights. And, if we could read that article, I will share it. I'll have Elder Terry share that on the vespers forum when we're done.

If we could read and reread the transcript of his speech, I think it would be worthwhile contribution to what we are discussing about culture. It's one of the few articles that I think are crucial to building upon what we are saying. Katherine, would you mind closing for us. I'm sorry I didn't get to the last hands raised.

Katherine – Everybody would like to kneel and pray. Dear God. There's so much going on in the world. There's so much going on even amongst ourselves as we try to grapple with all these nuances and details and complexities of the left-wing and the right-wing, geopolitics. So, we try to understand the issue of gender, and as we observe the world changing so rapidly and things progressing in ways that really confirm this message, and this is a very awesome time I think many of us feel the weight of the responsibility that we carry as a movement, and we just ask, please help us to understand what we're being taught. It does require a lot of rewiring in our brain, a lot of serious contemplation and serious dedication of spending time to read and reread and really spend time and give priority to studying this. I just pray that you remind us of that responsibility that each of us have. Thank you so much for presentations that have been given, for Elder Tess', with the study tonight and just ask special blessing as they continue to follow your guidance and transfer that information and knowledge to us. We just ask blessings

upon the leaders and all of us too. Thank you so much for this Sabbath that we have now too in order spend special time studying. I pray this in Jesus' name. Amen.

Elder Tess – I just want to encourage us before we close if I can try. We did all of this to make a one point. It was a lot of material and it makes everything sound complicated. We go through all of that and say, it's not church and state. And, I think it can cause this fear and I go through that just like you do of thinking this is all so complicated. But, when you come out of it at the other end, it is not. I'm hoping we can start to see that when you come out the other end and see that sexism is embedded in culture. And, that's why these four men are just so deeply misogynistic. When you see that, all of this is really just to try and help us change the wiring in our brain so when we say that it's culture and not Christianity, it makes sense.

It's changing those thought processes, but the conclusion is really is just that simple, to say that it is embedded in culture. Therefore, you don't need Christianity and if you grow up under these men, then you'll be misogynistic with, say a blue tint when you grow up. Islamic, you'll be misogynistic with a green tint. When you grow up Christian, you'll be misogynistic with an orange tint. Some glasses are worse than others. Some manifestations are more awful. Some comes out in different ways.

Some are impacted, of course, there is that element of being convinced of it because someone will give you a Bible verse, but just taking away, if anything, watching my friends leaving Adventism that I grew up, they didn't leave Adventism and become atheist, and become any less sexist than when they were Adventists. They might have been more ok with people doing different things that are not Christian, traditionally, not of them were less sexist. Not one was less misogynistic because it's not rooted in the glasses. It's in the eye.

So, I'm hoping that just using that as an example, we're doing the same thing with the left-wing. We're showing the complications of it so that when we show, hopefully the simple conclusion and when we come out the other end, we'll be able to identify the problem on our own more easily, and then we'll be able to try and undo the damage done in our own minds through the wrong left stream information. I only say that to make the point. It looks complicated but the conclusion isn't. The conclusion is really simple. And, I'm hoping that in the complications no one despairs. That's all I really wanted to add.

So, next week, maybe we'll review, touch a few things because there were some hands up, and I don't want to leave them unanswered. And then, we're going to tidy up libertarianism and the militia groups. By that time, I will have shared the three main articles at this stage that are the building blocks for what we will say about the left-wing. That's all. Thank you everyone, and Happy Sabbath. It's always a pleasure to be with you.