

# WAR WITH THE NEOCONS

## TMW VESPERS

06-10-2022

### ELDER TESS LAMBERT

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fxVWxINicbo&list=PL6-Mv8H520RncgAIBdn\\_u3bAlt\\_kGZZhH&index=20](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fxVWxINicbo&list=PL6-Mv8H520RncgAIBdn_u3bAlt_kGZZhH&index=20)

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

Elder Tess – Amen. I thought if people didn't mind to carve out a little space at the beginning of each week, maybe not every week, but probably most weeks, just a little spot at the beginning to say something that's disconnected from the classes we've been doing. Sometimes I come across something and it's, I just think it's worth sharing, worth saying. I had two for today, for this week that I wanted to address, just, I guess, a little bit of prelim, and then we'll get back in and continue with classes. I don't want though to take up half of the class with a separate subject. So, I might just do one of them and see how long it takes.

I want to remind people of a case that, in the media, it is commonly said that every single Australian knows this case. But, I'm not really sure how fair it is to say that. I know nearly half of the people in the community where I live, nearly half of the people here were not born in Australia. So, a case that occurred over 40 years ago, it's a little bit problematic to say that every Australian must know it. But, is there anyone here who doesn't know the name Lindy Chamberlain? If you could just put your hand up in the chat. If you don't know who Lindy chamberlain is.

One so far. Maybe you've heard the story, and the name passes your mind. So, maybe it'll come back to you, but I will explain a little background for you. I won't go into detail. It was a case from 1980. They were Adventists. I think he was an Adventist pastor. They were a young family. They had a number of young sons, and they finally had a baby daughter. She was about six weeks old. Azaria; Azaria Chamberlain. And, they went camping at Uluru. It's about mid 1980's, and they're camping at a popular camp-ground at Uluru. There are other people there camping at this kind of the center of Australia, and Lindy Chamberlain notices that a dingo has crept into the camp site and snatched her baby daughter, and she screams to all the campers, a dingo ate my baby.

So, maybe the court case, the entire nation was following what took place. In 1980 at Uluru, at the red heart of Australia, a two months old baby went missing from the local camping ground.

Her parents, Lindy and Michael Chamberlain claimed that Azaria had been taken by a dingo. Trackers and police searched the flat dusty area in patchy bushland but found nothing. Initially, the Chamberlains were believed but a week after the disappearance, police found the baby's jumpsuit bloodied and torn, and the media, without evidence, suggested that Lindy Chamberlain had murdered her daughter.

She was young, attractive, energetic working class, and she infuriated the media and the public from the start. She looked the cameras in the eye, she didn't break down, and she spoke in a resolute monotone. She snapped at reporters when they asked inappropriate questions. She wouldn't play the role of anguished mother in front of the cameras that was expected of her, and she refused to bow to baseless accusations. Newspapers, TV, and radio reports across the country incited the public to find Lindy Chamberlain's demeanor suspicious, and suggested her claim of dingo aggressiveness was without basis despite the fact that the local ranger had for two years been asking local authorities to initiate a call of dingoes that had become threatening.

They reported that she dressed her baby in black. The 60 Minutes interview with her was titled, "Did You Kill Azaria?" To calm media and public hysteria, the coroner of the first inquest announced on live TV, his findings that the Chamberlains were innocent, saying that he wanted to put to a stop to quote, "the most malicious gossip ever witnessed in this country." Unrepentant, the police continued their investigation, and the media held to its line that Lindy Chamberlain had cut the throat of her daughter. After a second inquest in a trial, Lindy Chamberlain was sentenced to life imprisonment for murder, although no body or weapon had been found and no motive established.

Protesters outside of the courthouse carried signs that read, "Don't shoot animals for human lies. The dingo is innocent." And, "Free her? No, hang her." Heavily pregnant throughout the trial, she gave birth in Darwin Hospital and was returned to jail. Meanwhile, a dingo took my baby became a punchline across the world, finding its way into scripts for the Seinfeld and the Simpsons. Today, we would say, finding its way into the scripts of Saturday Night Live (SNL). Three years after being incarcerated, police found by happenstance, evidence that proved her innocence. She was released immediately with accompanying shame-faced government apology. In the next trial, expert witnesses claim that the marks on the baby's jumpsuit were in fact consistent with the marks made by the teeth of a dingo.

Twenty years after Lindy Chamberlain was pardoned, another mother came under the media's attack. In 2007, Madeleine McCann went missing. In the beginning people were sympathetic. But it didn't take them long to turn on the mother. Madeleine's mother was too attractive, too thin, and she was suspiciously composed. Like Lindy Chamberlain, Kate McCann was criticized for not crying enough. When one reporter suggested this was because an abduction specialist had told her not to reward the kidnapper with a show of emotions, people suggested only a certain type of women could follow that advice. Baseless claims were made. Lindy Chamberlain called out the media in this time period for treating Kate McCann the same way she was

treated. She said in one interview, how can you apologize to me and do this again to someone else?

I want to read from another article. It is from 2020.

*“It marks 40 years since Lindy Chamberlain’s life spiraled into a never-ending nightmare. They say there’s not a person in Australia who doesn’t know this case.” I’m not so sure that is accurate.”<sup>1</sup>*

*“The truth in this case was less appealing to a pack of hungry journalists and a skeptical public fueled by gender bias. A dingo taking a baby from a tent in the middle of the outback became more farfetched than the possibility of her mother carrying out a convoluted ploy and murdering her child (cutting the throat of her daughter) a few feet away from several possible witnesses.”*

*“She was judged cold, callous, emotionless, and blank.”*

*“Of course, her quote became popular because the media and the public never perceived Lindy Chamberlain as a human. She was a monster- well before her trial even began. And, a quote uttered by a grieving mother was used (is still used) to mock and diminish a horrific accident. It became an iconic pop-culture reference.”*

*“When I think of how Lindy Chamberlain must have felt about this, I’m filled with a clawing sense of shame and heartbreak. How could we get this so wrong?”*

How could the public and the media, Hollywood, Seinfeld, the Simpsons, all take such a horrific quote and a horrific experience and turn it into a mocking pop culture reference? What were Seinfeld and the Simpsons back then, today’s Twitter, social media influences, and SNL.

*“The answer is simple, but it brings no solace: Lindy Chamberlain did not fit the bill for how a ‘grieving mother’ should look.”*

*“It didn’t matter that not a single skerrick of hard evidence pointed to her guilt. It didn’t matter that the apparent ‘blood spatter’ found in her car was actually paint splash-back mixed with iron oxide from her hometown of Mount Isa. It didn’t matter that she supposedly committed the murder, disposed of the body and wiped herself clean of blood in under ten minutes. It didn’t matter that several Indigenous elders and trackers living at Uluru bore witness to a fresh dingo track the day following Azaria’s disappearance. It didn’t matter that several bystanders (including one very emphatic one) vowed to*

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://womensagenda.com.au/latest/why-didnt-she-cry-how-lindy-chamberlain-became-the-poster-child-for-life-shattering-gender-bias/>

*have heard Azaria (the baby) cry out at the time she would have been snatched by the wild dog.”*

*“None of this mattered because Lindy Chamberlain didn’t cry enough. She didn’t scream enough, wail enough or show enough “feminine” emotion. For this reason alone, the police, the media and the public determined with rapid force that she was guilty.”*

She was considered a monster.

*“And it’s this very theme we have seen throughout time, and across countless cases. Women who don’t behave the way like we expect them to-women who break the norm-are very likely evil women.”*

They go, again, to Kate McCann; but not just Kate McCann, but Amanda Knox; ‘Foxy Knoxy,’ nicknamed *“by a frenzied media at the time, became the prime suspect.”* *“Her perceived lack of emotion exhibited later trial ironically underscored her guilt.”*

People respond to trauma differently.

*“Lindy Chamberlain may have escaped the majority of her life sentence in jail, but she completed it outside.”*

I personally know people, older people, older women who have experienced their own abuse, who say they will go to their death-bed, no matter what anyone says, no matter what any evidence suggest otherwise, they will go to their death-bed knowing that Lindy Chamberlain killed her baby. Nothing will shake them from that conviction because they saw her lack of emotions. Older women who have been abused took that position and continue to take it.

Forty years after losing her baby, she is still tormented by strangers on the street who recognize her and greet her with dingo howls.

*“It’s hard to believe that Chamberlain will ever find lasting peace. We have robbed her of that just as we have robbed thousands more women over the ages.”*

Lindy Chamberlain, one of many. Monica Lewinski: Now, late night comedians, social commentary, commentators ask, how did we ever treat Monica Lewinski so badly? They haven’t changed. It’s just 20 years later. Britney Spears, Amanda Knox, Kate McCann, just a few famous cases of many cases. And then, when you look at Amber Heard can we stand with the level of society with that kind of bias that hasn’t changed? If you go to the comment section, really dangerous to do, the top comments are along the line of from women. I don’t believe anything the media says about how the judgment of this court was wrong. I’m so glad that this was live streamed because I was able to see with my own eyes that she was manipulative and lying.

In the context of the women in cases I've just mentioned what do these people think they saw on camera that suggested that Amber Heard was manipulative and lying? What does a jury with the same gender bias that looked at Chamberlain? What did the mostly male jury think they saw, to say that she was lying, when a judge ruled she wasn't? Amanda Knox has since spoken out against the gendered nature of public shaming. They recognize what they are experiencing. The problem is, is the same commentators, the immediate descendants of the commentators who thought that it was funny to skewer Monica Lewinski, at minimum [are] silent today. There has not been a change.

I just want to compare it, and we won't go into him for time, but I want to talk a little bit about Steve Bannon. Maybe next week at the beginning, I want to just make some observations about Steve Bannon. One of the things that people writing about him find fascinating, I thought you might remember this story if I brought it up, it is a famous one. You hear O.J. Simpson mentioned by social commentators in a way that is kind of humorous. Ah, there's the fellow that killed his wife and got away with it. People have less visible disdain for him than they have for McCann. But Steve Bannon is a particularly interesting subject, and people who have known him and that have worked in Washington say, it's really incredible.

If you go to Washington, people hate what he stands for. Democrats, the left-wing progressives hate what Steve Bannon says and what he stands for, but they love him. They love the man. They find him charming, and it's something that they kind of giggle about over and over and over again. It's like, why do we like him so much? And, I think that it is worth investigating. It gets to the root of the gender bias; the women that are judged the way they are but also come back and look at someone like Steve Bannon. He is charming. They don't know why, but their heart feels warm when they see him and when they talk to him. He has many friends on the left-wing who don't agree with him but like being his friend because they just think that he's such a nice person to be around.

The most stupid decision other than the ruling by the jury in the court case with Amber Heard and Jonny Depp, the most stupid decision made was to have that live streamed, to have that put before a public who think that they can with their own eyes judge her guilt. That combined with social media created the witch burning and this modern-day stoning, so much worse than that experienced by all the women I just mentioned. It's worse, but for their decision to do that is, I think despicable. And, for people to be claiming their feminists, we're feminists but don't call dingoes for a woman that should be hanged. Nothing has changed in society. Social media is making sure that it cannot.

I wanted to remind people, before we begin, of Lindy Chamberlain, of a long legacy. These are just a few famous cases. There's a woman in the U.S., I think though it just managed to stay her execution. She was on death row for supposedly murdering her child. The main issue people found with her, the first responder said, she didn't show enough emotion, and for that, she was sent to death row. But people are trying to save her. The evidence does not point to her murdering her child. But, it's something that society, in that case, the first responders, the media, that juries do over and over and over again. And, we as a movement, cannot afford to

stand with the society. We could not have afforded if we were back in any of those cases to stand with society. I wanted to remind us of those cases before we begin, to just drive home that point about bias.

So, setting that aside, we can begin our review, getting back to where we left off last time. So, last week, I'll take one step back. We were able to get to one of the conclusions we need to when we looked at church and state, and we said, it's not church, fundamentally. It is fundamentally culture. So, that was an important conclusion that we came to. We have a lot more to say about that, but we left that alone for a second, and we came back to the left-wing last week. We wanted to comment, we wanted to draw the left-wing back into the story because we've been showing the problems with the right-wing, their preference of freedom over equality. We wanted to pull back.

And, as we identify culture as the problem, I'm kind of wanting us to address all the issues at once; kind of that spiral teaching method, because they are all related. They are all kind of interconnected. I don't think it'll really work if we just deal only with the right-wing, only with culture, only with the left-wing. They are too interconnected. So, we're addressing all kind of at the same time, and we're spiraling back around between them. We have the left-wing and the right-wing; equality over freedom and freedom over equality. We investigated the far-left. We used The Gray Zone as one example.

I wanted to give a few more examples today. [The Gray Zone] is the source, but under them we have particularly, Max Blumenthal and Anya Parampil, who actually is his wife. They are married now. Aaron Mate and Ben Norton. So, they are some of The Gray Zone crew, the main ones. And, we showed how they just kind of factually without fully delving into why, if we fully delve into why, we start going into the problems with the left-wing. We just stated factually and then used some evidence to prove that they have a, not just a tendency, but they support some awful authoritarian regimes, one of those being Maduro in Venezuela. I just want to spend one moment just to add weight to the point.

In Venezuela in 2019, they had an election, and it's widely believed this was a show election. U.N. high commissioner for human rights, someone we should all know by now for that period, Zeid Ra'ad Al Hussein, noted that his office had concerns that reports of extra judicial killings cast doubts on fairness stating this context does not in any way fulfill minimal conditions for free and credible elections. So, I wanted to mention him in context with that 2019 show election in Venezuela because we know him now. The E.U., the organization of American states the Lima group and countries including Australia and the U.S. rejected the electoral process. However, countries such as China, Cuba, Iran, Russia, Syria, Turkey and others recognized the election results.

I want to, if I can screen share, I'll try and screen share, and I want to play a little bit of Tucker Carlson for you. Just double checking. Can everyone hear that? No. We can hear it, but it's quiet. I'll try again. I'll turn my volume up. (Video of Tucker Carlson interviewing Anya Parampil)

Elder Tess – So, that’s the far-left for you. That’s the far-left on Tucker Carlson. That was Anya Parampil, the wife of Max Blumenthal, one of the four key operators of The Gray Zone. I just wanted to give one evidence. This is just one regime of all the regimes that they support, and they do. They travel to Venezuela. They travel to Syria, and they tell that story, and they’re coming from the base platform, different to Tucker Carlson, but a hate, a belief that the world’s problems are caused by colonialism and neocolonialism, new colonialism and U.S. imperialism, by the CIA, by the U.S. deep state.

Like she said, Maduro is legitimately elected. We quoted the U.N. high commission of human rights during that period who said that there was extrajudicial killing and all of the countries and agencies that rejected the results, all the ones that did, and we see them line up with these regimes because as she said, regime change will come through U.S. tanks and only U.S. tanks because people don’t want the opposition. That is fundamentally untrue. When you go into those countries as she did, Maduro would have them under his wing. He’d take them to the parts of the country that still have wealth. His cronies, they know how to work the system. So, they go and meet with Maduro. They meet with Assad. So, that was just to drive the point a little more: Venezuela, Syria, Russia, and China.

Question. Coming back to this line, let’s move away from The Gray Zone because they are only one example. Question. On this line in this context, where would you put Julian Assange? Have you had problems before now understanding Julian Assange’s politics? A lot of people do. I have. Until I understood this, I couldn’t understand Julian Assange. I couldn’t understand WikiLeaks. Does it make some sense now? Where would you place him? Katherine.

Katherine – Probably right up there with the others on The Gray Zone?

Elder Tess – So many that I have read, so many publications, are just confused by Julian Assange. They don’t know how to understand him. Julian Assange, WikiLeaks, their strong left/far-left, and yet he helped Trump get elected and has a deep hatred for Hillary Clinton. There were articles just confused, how did Julian Assange become, quoting one article, “The information kingpin of the alt-right?” How did he become Donald Trump’s hero?

So, Katherine. Yes. This is part of the context in which we can understand Julian Assange and WikiLeaks. So, there’s WikiLeaks, the international leaking sources, journalism, if you can call it that. There’s that international WikiLeaks, but Australia also had a WikiLeaks political party, kind of separate from the international WikiLeaks media. The Australian WikiLeaks political party, in 2013 sent, put together and sent a delegation to Syria to meet with Assad. Now, the international WikiLeaks media organization said, it had no knowledge of and did not approve of that delegation, but that delegation included members of Australia’s WikiLeaks party, and it included Julian Assange’s father. The delegation aimed at showing solidarity with the Syrian people and opposing Western military intervention in Syria.

John Shipton, Julian Assange’s father warps and CEO of the political party was among the number that on December 23, 2013, two years into the civil war, met with Assad. Internationally, WikiLeaks, the media organization, protested once they found out about this

because they said this would be spun without care. In other words, you shouldn't have because our media will use this against us. Not because the meeting with Assad, this violator of human rights was a bad idea but because they were worried about how the publicity would be "spun." The delegation included Shipton, WikiLeaks national council members, and Sydney University academic Tim Anderson and refugee activist, Jamal Daoud.

I just want to list couple of names. I'm going to put WikiLeaks (on the far-left), it's not quite as far-left as The Gray Zone which is [extreme left]. WikiLeaks, Julian Assange. Why is he so close with Vladimir Putin? Why do they like to operate their internet services out of Russia? Why do they not attack authoritarian regimes and only attack the U.S., and some other Western countries? Why is their reporting so bias? And, if they can access the information that they can, why don't, why aren't they targeting the genocide that is occurring in China? They have a focus, and that is The Gray Zone focus. I also want to mention Tim Anderson just as a separate individual because he will come up again.

The WikiLeaks party said the visit to Syria was to show opposition to violence and Western military intervention. Their fear is the same one that Anya Parampil expressed, that regime change will occur in Venezuela on the back of U.S. tanks. They want the U.S. to stay out, and in that they tacitly, sometimes quite openly, show support for these regimes. The WikiLeaks party was the first party in Australia to warn of deadly consequences if the Western military intervenes in Syria. They went further by questioning the credibility of the excuses of such intervention based on unsubstantiated reports of the Syrian army's use of chemical weapons against civilian citizens. That is what they all deny happened. They all, The Gray Zone takes the same position.

Tim Anderson has campaigned in support of East Timor, North Korea, Cuba, Venezuela, Palestine, and Syria. The civil war, he said, is a fiction created by the U.S. to destroy an independent nation. I want to mention one more. Glenn Greenwald. I do this to illustrate that The Gray Zone is not on their own here. It is a wider left phenomenon. Glenn Greenwald, commenting on the Jan. 6 insurrection. He said, "When it comes to melodrama, histrionics and exploitation of fear levels from the January 6 riots, there has never been any apparent limit, and today, the one-year anniversary of that three-hour riot, three hours, there is no apparent end in sight. Too many political and media elites are far too invested in this maximalist narrative for them to relinquish it voluntarily. The orgy of psychodrama today was so much worse and more pathetic than I expected, that the January 6 riot was some sort of serious attempted insurrection or coup was laughable from the start, and have become even more preposterous with the passage of time and the emergence of more facts."

So, Anya Parampil said that if Hillary Clinton hadn't conceded defeat in 2016, she wouldn't be walking free on the streets. Everyone would recognize it was a coup and yet when Donald Trump a few months after she said that on Tucker Carlson show, Donald Trump doesn't concede defeat, and he wages a legitimate coup, the far-left says, oh, that's psychodrama; that's melodrama; that's exploitation of fear. Why do they hate Hillary Clinton? There's a quote from the Atlantic, an article from the Atlantic titled, "Donald Trump's Defenders on the Left.



Why Some Progressives are Minimizing Russia's Election Meddling." When it comes to possible collusion with Russia Donald Trump's most interesting defenders don't reside on the political right. They reside on the political left.

Now, this article goes back to 2016 and Russia's meddling in the election. And, they're saying that the most interesting defenders of Russia and Donald Trump comes from the left-wing and not the right-wing. Sean Hannity and Newt Gingrich aren't defending a principle. They're defending a patron. Until recently, they were ultra-hawks. Now, to downplay Russia's meddling in the 2016 elections, they sound like ultra-doves. All that matters is supporting their ally in the white house. For the left-wing defenders like Max Blumenthal and Glenn Greenwald, by contrast, ideology is king. Blumenthal and Greenwald loath Trump. They're left-wing, but they loath hawkish foreign policy more.

So, they minimize Russia's election meddling to oppose what they see as a new cold war. It's a genuinely principled position. The problem is that principles are blinding them to facts. On Tuesday, on, again Tucker Carlson's show, Blumenthal laid out the progressive case against "Russia hysteria." When it comes to Russian's interference in the 2016 election progressives like Blumenthal are behaving the way many conservatives behave on climate change. Conservatives fear that progressives will use climate change to impose new regulations on the economy. And, because they oppose the solution, they claim there is no problem.

In fearing a solution, U.S. intervention on any level, the left-wing claims there is no problem with these regimes. That's roughly stating what we're getting to with the left-wing, but we need to become much more specific with that.

So, why, if they are so left-wing, why are they on Tucker Carlson? Do you have any thoughts? How can they find common ground with Tucker Carlson? Raymond.

Raymond – So, I don't know if this is thinking a bit differently, but I've seen a few, sort of graphs of recent times where they have been, traditionally, we've looked at a spectrum on a line like this, and they've started to depict it in a circle; and so, I'm sort of just wondering if the left-wing and the right-wing are a little bit like on the extremes or a little bit like that; and that they sort of, end up coming full circle. So, even though they might not have the same reasons, they end up with very similar or identical outcomes.

Elder Tess – I think as with every path we've taken in this movement, we are driven by prophecy; by prophetic message. And, the 2016 election has a lot to tell us, not just in the electoral process but in understanding that Hillary Clinton was, if not the entire solution, the beginning of the solution to the problem with the U.S., but it is global now. Not just domestically, but also in regards to foreign policy. What I believe people have done in this movement is when we said we need to move from the right-wing to the left-wing, those that said, sure. We'll move from the right-wing to the left-wing. But they got into the left-wing and then, like I said at the beginning, listed all the women they get that just aren't liked. Hillary Clinton is not liked.

Many progressives, democrats, people in the left-wing personally like Steve Bannon more than they like Hillary Clinton. It is gender related, and people in this movement, they got into the left-wing, and then they found all the streams that even if they don't explicitly oppose Hillary Clinton, enabled them to at least ignore her; ignore her as a person and also ignore everything that she stood for and was fighting for. I get that there's graphs now that illustrated in different ways. I think the problems they have is that graphs never seem to quite do it justice. My concern with that is, I really don't want us to lose sight of the fact that they're starting from completely different platforms, and as you said, and you did say this, Ray, I'm not saying that you said something wrong, you've recognized for different reasons, but those reasons are crucial.

They are opposite reasons between Tucker Carlson and Anya Parampil. They are very, very, very different platforms that they are starting from. And, my issue with the left-wing platform, my concern for this movement is not that they're watching Tucker Carlson and liking what they're hearing. My concern is that they're coming from this (extreme far-left) kind of platform. This isn't a Hillary Clinton platform. I think though that it's accurate that understanding, just if you don't mind, me complicating politics a little more, does bring us to our solution. Brendon.

Brendon – I'm struggling with this a little bit so please bear with me when I'm trying to explain this. So, the far-left support Putin or Maduro because they don't, let's just say an authoritarian regime, because they are so fearful of American imperialism or them interjecting or creating regime change or whatever they're, they're ultimately scared of American superpower, if I can say that. So, they will support someone like Putin. Tucker Carlson will, on that side, now we jump to the other side, Tucker Carlson on the right, will support Putin as well but for very different reasons, and reasons like, well, hang on, Putin looks very similar to me because, look at his stance on traditional values, family, LGBT issues. Whatever the traditional values look like. So, Putin, from a cultural point of view looks similar to the right. Are they the two platforms that we're looking at or am I missing something?

Elder Tess – I think, yes. I think we could add more to that, get more to the root, especially with Tucker Carlson which is the right-wing. What I think we need to do, but yes. Those are two different platforms. One side essentially hates the U.S. and blames it for the world's problems while the other side is coming from a seat of deep, deep nationalism. Those are very opposing views. And yet, the deep, deep nationalism and the hatred of what they believe is neo or new colonialism bring them to the same point where they look at Putin, and one side says, we need to support him because all the world's problems are created by CIA and the deep state and the U.S. and the war hawks. And, Tucker Carlson says, the right-wing says, from the seat of deep, deep nationalism, he stands for some pretty good things, but America first, America first, America first.

Don't get involve, but if I can reference an awful quote, “\*\*s () countries.” It's not coming from a point of, I hope we can start to see that's very, very different. Does that make sense, Brendon? Those are opposite platforms to come from.

Brendon – Yes. One despises the country, and one absolutely, I don't know if love is the right word, but nationalism, that's a better word. They're deeply nationalistic and patriotic. So, yes. They're totally opposing views. I can see that. Thank you.

Elder Tess – I think it is right to say that they love their country, but the country they envisage it should be; the part of the country that's their vision, not those leftist vision who are ruining it.

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

Elder Tess – Yes. And, the arguments, I've read some of their arguments today, going back some years where they saw that the global, it wasn't really an inter-American fight, it was a global fight between their conservatism, which they see Putin kind of as an embodying and a global fight against, they say the left-wing, the work all of those things when pushed for a definition when understanding it always comes down to gender. It always comes down to women's rights; LGBT etc. So, yes. Josephine.

Josephine – Perhaps my point is not as important. I just listened very briefly to an interview by Tucker Carlson, and Anya Parampil. I didn't listen to a lot of it, but at the beginning she was talking about the Ukraine/Russian war, and that it wasn't Russia attacking Ukraine but it was a result of what America did, the coup in Kiev, he was going along with it so in that few minutes that I had to see that I kind of thought, well, you got to be agreeing at some level or else you wouldn't be interviewing Anya. And, sorry I didn't go through the whole tape. I was just listening to that bit, but I came to that conclusion very quickly.

Elder Tess – Don't say that. Everything you say is important to us. I don't suggest that people suffer that much for the cause. You don't have to listen to all of Tucker Carlson. But it is good to get those, it is good to see it and hear it so we know what we're dealing with. It helps, I think, to sink in, but thank you for informing us. Sharon.

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

Elder Tess – If we were to draw up our reform line and the dispensation of the Midnight Cry (MC), it was in 2018 that we recognized that we needed to change, desperately needed to change from the right-wing to the left-wing if we can navigate the Sunday Law (SL) because the right-wing is what we said then is church and state. We're part of this (church). We were part this story. We were siding with Protestantism. But, the Increase of Knowledge (IK) of understanding that was 2016 and the 2016 election. So, we are right to move from the right-wing to the left-wing. That was important. And, I'm not questioning that at all. What I wanted us to see is that when we moved it wasn't just so simple to say Trump and Clinton. You can see that it was Trump versus Clinton, but we went quite far with that message.

We went quite far with the understanding the 2016 election prophetically through some prophetic stories such as the Battle of Ipsus. Some things we studied at that time, I know Graham has, probably more thoroughly than anyone I know, done the Battle of Ipsus. I think that's being recorded. And, we saw Ipsus, that Hillary Clinton could have turned the course that the U.S. was on. It's on a trajectory to the SL, and she could have turned that ship around. She could have stopped those events from happening. But she wasn't wanted; she was rejected. The point I'm making now is Hillary Clinton is hated by a lot of the left-wing. So, it's not just kind of like, it's not just enough to say that we're feminist. A lot of feminists are supporting Jonny Depp or people who say they are. It has become a term that many people coopt for their version. If we understand true feminism, then we don't get to say that.

So, it's not just enough to say we're left-wing, we have to know what that means. We have to know what the left-wing should stand for and where they struggle and fail. So, it's not enough to just move from Trump to Clinton. We have to actually side with Clinton, and there are other factions, other streams within the left-wing that people can follow that do not lead them towards gender equality. Does that make a little bit of sense?

Sharon – Yeah. That does make sense. I think I was looking at The Gray Zone and thinking that they were on the right, but, yeah, that makes more sense, I think.

Elder Tess – That's because the conclusions they come to often agree with the right-wing. So, we're not suggesting that we should be right-wing. In fact, kind of the opposite. We're saying, wow, we know what issues are here (Extreme left) because what's wrong with this is what makes them agree with the right-wing. So, it's just dissecting it a little more so that we get to the heart of what 2016 was designed to teach us. I'm hoping that through explaining conservatism a little bit more, I might ask you at the end or even after the class if it makes sense when I do that, explain conservatism, if that's ok.

Sharon – Yes, thank you. That's great.

Elder Tess – Marie.

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

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

Marie – I'm sorry then.

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

Marie – Yes. That's all I had to say.

Elder Tess – Graham.

Graham – I just had a quick question. In the past we have focused on, let's say a church and state relationship in America and a state over church relationship in, say Russia. So, the King of the North (KoN) and the differences that we see of the King of the South (KoS). This mindset we see throughout all of the world in the spheres of influence, is this something similar we're seeing here with this left and right-wing, far ideology? Instead of it being church over state, are we seeing culture over state and state over culture?

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

Graham – Yeah. No problem.

Elder Tess – Josephine.

Josephine – We don't have church as we first thought. We have culture, but culture, to me is like a form of a god; I am my own god, like an Apis Bull, like in Egypt. So, is that kind confusing everybody or confusing myself by saying that? Is your culture, you want to serve your own self? Self-exaltation? So, it is God? In your own mind?

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

The more we think about it, the more we should be able to see this, even this, in the Old Testament (O.T.). The hardest battle that God had was separating Israel from all the cultures that surrounded them. It was more than, never put up an idol to Baal, and I'm a jealous God. It was more than that. When they brought those idols in, they took in all the cultures of their family members that surrounded that kind of worship. You have those idols; therefore, you have those temples. You have those temples; you have temple prostitutes. You have layers of abuse begin. God wasn't just saying I'm jealous, and I don't want you speaking to another god. He's trying to get Israel to accept a culture that was meant to belong to a new kingdom that wasn't even found on this earth, and that required to identify the cultures that they lived in,

Egypt, all the cultures that surrounded them that embodied in their families, and reject those cultures.

The ones that they lived in, the ones that they came from, the ones that surrounded them, it was a cultural fight because it is going back to that time period, it's very much looking religious. It looked religious, I would argue, right until the 2000s, it still looked religious. But, it's not today. But, yes. Even when we look back, we should see that Apis Bull. What does Anya Parampil say? Where did she get fake news from? They manipulate news and culture to suit themselves.

But, not just to suit themselves. What the culture they love has taught them is right or wrong usually on issues that relate to women, gender, lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans, intersex, asexual, queer people, in that gender spectrum of issues, countries and cultures are saying, we will take the U.N. charter for universal human rights, and we will take that and mold it how we want it, but not how we want it. We want it how our fathers did, how our grandfathers did, how our great grandfathers did in a way that respects what we worship, what we hold dear which is not religion. It's culture. People worship their culture. That is why they will rather leave this movement, leave Christianity all together then have their culture questioned.

So, we're going to keep going over that point, hopefully getting more specific as we go along. I wanted to bring this to the right-wing again. If we look at conservatism, if I write conservative, if you would let me divide this up one more time. I want to quote Max Blumenthal. I quoted last week from a source called Coda story. I don't like all their articles. They are fairly left-wing. They are somewhere in [the left]. I also wanted to put the Young Turks here (extreme left). If you know the Young Turks, they're not as bad, but they're definitely bad. You still find this, quite a lot of conspiracy theories. They don't have a very clean record on factual reporting. They have few issues there.

So, there's quite a lot here (extreme left). So, I quoted Coda story which can do a little of the same. I haven't read their source much at all. But, on this one, they called out The Gray Zone for supporting Assad in Syria and these regimes. And they reached out to Max Blumenthal and said, we're publishing this story. Do you want to make a comment? Max Blumenthal wrote back to them and said, "We, The Gray Zone consider Coda story to be a NATO propaganda shop wrapped in a boring neocon, NATO propaganda shop wrapped in a boring neocon blog. So, we're not interested in any back and forth, but we do encourage you to run the following statement in the context of China. The Gray Zone does not favor re-education centers for anyone except smarmy, warmongering neoconservative fraudsters." Charming.

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

Moli – It's sort of a meat diet.

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

Moli – They want to base it on protein diet instead of carbohydrates.

Elder Tess – Do you know why they incorporate so much meat?

Moli – So that you don't put on weight.

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

Moli – Yeah. It was sort of the original diet?

Elder Tess – Yeah. What they think was, we have the Eden diet, and the evolutionist has the paleo diet. The evolutionist version of our Eden. One I much less want to return to. So, this is paleo which just means old, and neo means new. So, we have new conservatism versus old conservatism. And I want to explain the difference. Graham.

Graham – I was just mentioning paleo. That was all. You've already said it.

Elder Tess – I'm sorry I missed you. I'd like to hear it in your words. It's from the Greek root palaios meaning ancient or old. They use it somewhat tongue and cheek. It refers to paleo-conservative claim that they are the historic, authentic conservative tradition. And, in contrast to neo or new conservatism. They are the classical conservatives. They trace their philosophy to the old right republicans of the interwar period which influenced the U.S. not to join the League of Nations, reduce immigration with the passage of the immigration act of 1924 and oppose Franklin Roosevelt. They often look back even further to Edmund Burke, the anti-federalist movement stretching back to the days of Thomas Jefferson and John C. Calhoun.

I want to try to keep it simple because they go into so much language, but it's essentially a difference over what is most clearly seen with their foreign policy. Neo-conservatism is concerned primarily with foreign policy. In foreign policy, the neo-conservatives main concern is to prevent the development of a new rival. Many of its adherents became politically influential during the republican presidential administrations of the 70s, 80s, 90s, and 2000s. Neo-conservatism peaked in influence during the administration of George Bush when they played a major role in promoting and planning the 2003 invasion of Iraq. Critics of neo-conservatism have used the term to describe foreign policy and war hawks who support aggressive militarism or neo-imperialism, new imperialism, new colonialism.

Historically speaking, the term neo-conservative refers to those who made the ideological journey from the anti-Stalinist left to the camp of American conservatism during the 60s and the 70s. Neo-conservatives support a restoration of traditional gender roles and the strengthening of traditional families in order to adapt social structures to the free capitalism they demand. If you think neo, think George Bush, Donald Rumsfeld, all the people that surrounded them in the early 2000s. That was when neo-conservatism kind of peaked.

This is a fight between the interventionists and isolationists, and if you look them up online, they like to denigrate and use slurs against the other. A paleo will say that a neo is not a true conservative. They're actually a liberal, and the neo will call a paleo not a true conservative but actually a liberal. They are both conservative. It's just that the word liberal for them is a slur. So, they attack each other with it. But they are both strictly conservative. It's the difference between an interventionist and an isolationist. Paleo-conservatives found its resurgence pretty much as soon as the Iraq war started going downhill.

So, mid to late 2000, neo-conservatism starts to die death. Everyone's turned on it, and what starts to rise up for the first time in some decades is paleo-conservatism, and I want us to see, I'm hoping we can see this (paleo) is truly awful. Paleo-conservatives support restrictions on immigration, decentralization, trade tariffs, protectionism, economic nationalism, isolationism, and traditional conservative ideals relating to gender, culture and society. They tend to oppose abortion, gay marriage, and LGBTQ rights.

So, they're both conservative on issues of gender. The difference is particularly on foreign policy. Paleo-conservatism particularly became a term around the 1980s, and it was in the aftermath of the Vietnam War which further drew these two sides of conservatism apart; for the Vietnam War and against the Vietnam War. Chronicles, a paleo-conservative publication, promoted a southern traditionalist world view focused on national identity, regional particularity and skepticism of abstract theory and centralized power. So, they are against big government but also a powerful executive branch. George Bush made the executive branch really powerful. Neo-conservatives don't have such a problem with that.

Paleo-conservatives question the supposition that European culture and wars can ever be transplanted or even forced upon non-western cultures due to separate cultural heritages. As a result, paleo-cons are more distinctive in their emphatic opposition to open immigration by non-Europeans, and their general disapproval of U.S. intervention over-seas. One paleo-conservative wrote, "Republics mind their own business. Their governments have very limited powers, and their people are too busy practicing self-government to worry about problems in other countries. Empires not only bully smaller defenseless nations, they also can't leave their own hapless subjects alone. Empires and small governments aren't compatible either."

So, they say we are a republic. We are not an empire. Therefore, we mind our own business and don't intervene or care about what other governments are doing. We should be too busy governing ourselves then concerning ourselves with problems in other countries. They see neo-conservatives as empire builders, and paleo-conservatives as defenders of the republic. They point to Rome as an example of how an ongoing campaign of military expansionism can destroy



a republic. On issues that relate to capital punishment, hand gun ownership, an original reading of the U.S. Constitution, and anything related to gender, they are equally conservative.

Where the far-left and the far-right unite is with this hatred of U.S. foreign intervention, but it's not all conservatism that these (The Gray Zone) are attacking. They are attacking neo-conservatism. They're attacking today what is essentially dead. I'll just give a couple of more quotes, and then we'll have to close for time. Many paleo-con say that westerners have lost touch with their classical and European heritage to the point in danger of losing their civilization. Again, that replacement theory. It comes from this (paleo) branch. This (paleo) is Tucker Carlson which is why Anya Parampil and Tucker Carlson will get together and rave about neo-conservatism and U.S. intervention. But, paleo-conservatism is if anything worse, it's more to be feared. It's what died in the presidency of George W. Bush and started around 2009 to ascend.

They say that they have a concern for states' rights, local self-government, and regional identity. They say that regional identity used to be taken for granted everywhere in America, but the U.S. is no longer as it once was, a federal union of diverse states and regions. National uniformity is being imposed by the political class that runs Washington, the economic class that owns Wall Street and the cultural class in charge of Hollywood in the Ivy League. In 1995, New Dixie Manifesto, Fleming and Michael Hill, paleo-conservatives, argued that southerners are pelted with ethnic slurs, denied self-government and stripped of their symbols including the confederate flag.

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

Feminism is the greatest threat to the paleo-conservative. It destroys the family unit. What Tucker Carlson wants more than, he just wants the U.S. to stay out of the issue with Ukraine. It's not even that he's particularly in love with Vladimir Putin either. It's just like exactly what he said when he said, has Vladimir Putin ever hurt me? No. Has Vladimir Putin ever taken my guns away or accused me? Lied about me? No. So, why do I care what Vladimir Putin does. It's not necessarily love for Vladimir Putin, but he even states that there, he just doesn't want to care because he's an isolationist because "U.S. policy should end where the see water begins," to quote them.

They should not be interfering with foreign affairs. Those troops should be brought home. They need them on the southern border, don't they? They need their army on the southern border. They need their army in schools stopping school shootings, not in Afghanistan, not interfering

with as Trump said, worthless nations. But, if they're going to rebuild this republic properly, what they need is their traditional family values, their version of the family unit which needs, requires, women having babies and back in their place. Feminism, gay marriage, it all strikes at the heart of paleo-conservatism to a much more aggressive, in a much more fearful way to a paleo-conservative than a neo-conservative.

For some activists, lawmakers, and commentators, Carlson's decision to minimize Russia's imminent invasion and push back against critics of Russian president, Vladimir Putin, and he was siding with Russia and against the U.S., but that's a misread. Carlson isn't in favor of Russia over America or angling to aid Russia in dominating to controlling the U.S. He wants the U.S. to be like Russia, and in accordance with paleo-conservative and white nationalist principles, he has an aversion to foreign interventionism so American militarism can grow at home. They need it on the southern border. Tucker Carlson is a paleo-conservative, strict isolationist, and supports tariffs over free trade, anti-immigration, and anti-intervention.

If we wondered why the right-wing seemed divided over the Ukraine war where some were seeming to support Russia or saying let Russia do what it wants, it's because we've come from the George Bush era, and we still see it through George Bush sowing the seeds of democracy, intervention style Republican party and that's dead now. The voices of Tucker Carlson, the voices of isolationism. There's a VOX article from 2016 that is worth reading. It is titled, "Paleo-conservatism: The movement that Explains Donald Trump Explained." Paleo-conservatism, the movement that explains Donald Trump explained. It's worth reading rather than quote it for time. I think that I will just leave it there for today.

This is where we start to see, this is where it should start to make sense, I hope. When you come from the far-left, they have common ground with Tucker Carlson. And, when I say far-left, I want to make one point. Last week, we compared Max and Max. I just want to make one point. When we looked at Max of the right-wing, of the VOX article, he's here (mid-right), and then it's the Roy Dan Hollander that's the extreme [far-right]. When we talk about Max, this Max of The Gray Zone, he is the extreme [far-left]. So, I just want us to see that difference.

The Max of VOX, he was society; right-wing society, libertarianism, but he wasn't the extreme. We're talking about the extreme here, and when I mentioned sites like Democracy Now, the Young Turks, they're heading a little bit into more danger than whatever (pointing to the left), but even articles I see in The Guardian, articles in The New York Times, Washington Post, good sources that I use all the time, it's these arguments that we need to see, this is what we need to see because this (the middle left) is what we need to sift, to sift out what they're doing wrong. Brendon. And then, I'll give the new article to close.

Brendon – I'm not even sure whether this is even going to work, but I feel like I might be seeing problems already, but I'm going to say it. So, you've got that diagram there that sort of split your conservatives. You got your new and your old. You got your isolationists. You got your interventionists. And, on the other side, you got the left. The far-left doesn't want, they don't want to intervene, basically. Is that one way of saying it? They don't want to intervene because America shouldn't be doing anything because they're the problem. We hate America. Stay out.

You're the problem causing all these other problems. Whereas, Hillary Clinton, she's the interventionist who will intervene.

Elder Tess – I wouldn't call her neo-conservative, but she wasn't an isolationist, and she wasn't here (extreme left-wing). Libya, Benghazi, Kaddafi. That's her record.

Brendon – So, Hillary Clinton is a liberal, but she will intervene. So, she is opposite of the far-left there because she will do the opposite of what the far-left, The Gray Zone wants.

Elder Tess – I haven't stated, and I'm deliberately because I want to build up to it, I haven't stated exactly what I think they (extreme left) get wrong. I don't want it to appear that I have stated it so because I don't want to be misunderstood, but I haven't stated what I think they get, the fundamental issue that they get wrong. I want to build it with us understanding the political structure and then some, what I think are really important articles. What I want us to see is that Hillary Clinton was the solution, and she is not this (extreme left). And, it's not this (extreme left) that I think people in the movement are necessarily following, but it's articles in sources that I like that I know they are reading and agreeing with, and worse, far worse than that, it's social commentators, social media, comedians, late night hosts that people in the movement are listening to that they don't realize it's this (extreme left).

It's just like this Max (VOX) is not Roy Dan Hollander but you see the same mindset. The same mindset and issue exists in the mainstream of the left, especially once you come to Bernie Sanders camp. And, that's what I want us to get to because once we can see that we know how to sift the publications we keep. I'm not interested in watching the Young Turks. I am interested in reading the Guardian. Once I see what the problem is, I can then go to the Guardian, identify, oh, that particular author, I only like half that article because once they start giving their opinion piece, it reeks if this (the extreme left). And, you start sifting that out of the left-wing.

I'm hoping that becomes more clear over time. We're going to do a thorough revision especially of conservatism next week because I don't want anyone to feel left behind. So, I want to double check that we're all up to speed at the same place, and we'll do a revision and ask questions, make sure that we're not confused on what is done so far. We need to see conservatism is split between never-Trumpers, generally the never-Trumpers are neo-conservatives. This is the war within the conservative party. This side has won (paleo). George Bush Jr. had no time left for Donald Trump; he didn't vote for him. They are quite different, but it's paleo-conservatism that bred the alt-right. It is paleo-conservatism that says, let the countries do what they want, a message that appeals to the libertarianism.

It's libertarianism that's combined with this (paleo), and it's this (paleo) that created the alt-right in 2009 and militia groups, not the George Bush era. Not the Iraq wars era. So, they have a common enemy, and that's why Anya Parampil will meet with Tucker Carlson, because they have common ground even though they are coming from opposite sides. An article that I will give out, and Elder Parminder has been wonderful and already put it in pdf form. So, I will send out the pdf with an explanation shortly. I want to take this discussion of the left-wing and bring it to the subject of Israel versus Palestine. We know that the right-wing is obsessed with Israel,

but the left-wing, especially factions of the left, similarly as well, and this article starts to investigate why.

I will share screen. Open Democracy titled, "Singling out Israel: a perspective from the left." How did the struggle for Palestine gain such prominence on the left? The answer might tell us something about broader patterns of thought in left-wing politics today. It is fairly lengthy, but it is worth reading. It gets to the heart of what we are circling. We want to see the issues with the left-wing played out in how the many parts of the left-wing, the Bernie Camp especially, but various camps of the left-wing, why are they so focused on the rights of the Palestinians? It is a very interesting discussion. We'll close for time, and please write, speak up if you're confused because I do not want to move on if people are confused. We will repeat. Hopefully, it will all make sense. If you kneel with me, we'll close in prayer.

Dear Lord. We see in the prophetic message you've given us the answers to everything if we're willing to see them. Some of them might disagree with what we have built up in our minds, not just from right-wing sources but from left-wing sources. Some of them are extremely emotionally loaded discussions such as the Palestinian statehood, apartheid, Israel, and colonialism. Lord, I pray that you will help us see truth from error. Help us to see, as we had to in 2018, things that might not be appealing to us but are designed to change us, designed to help us confront errors that impact not just our life on this world, but the culture that you've always wanted Israel to enter. Our hope for a different world centered on a different form of culture. I pray Lord that you will help us to do that painful work, to rewire our brain, to challenge our emotions and our feelings as we see women represented online, in social media as we look out at how especially the left-wing handle issues of gender, that we will confront our own sexism and our own bias, and our own excuses, and be prepared for the kingdom that you are setting up because Lord, we want to be there, but we also want everyone in this meeting and our loved ones there as well. I pray this in Jesus' name, Amen.