

# EXPLORING FOREIGN POLICY

## TMW VESPERS

JUNE 24, 2022

ELDER TESS LAMBERT

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3Nt-OF\\_kKUI&list=PL6-Mv8H520RncgAIBdn\\_u3bAlt\\_kGZZhH&index=22&t=4248s](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3Nt-OF_kKUI&list=PL6-Mv8H520RncgAIBdn_u3bAlt_kGZZhH&index=22&t=4248s)

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

I want to start with a little bit of exercise that I wanted to do for some time now, but never had willing participants and the forum. So, I think we all know what I mean when I say word association, that game where someone says a word and you have to create a mental picture, and you have to let it be kind of organic, just hear the word, have a flash of a picture, and once you have the picture, you are not allowed to alter it. Do people know what I'm talking about? Does anyone not know what I'm talking about? If there's no hand, I'm going to assume that everyone knows what I'm talking about.

So, if I was to say some words and you were to have that mental picture, if I was to say, tree, and you picture tree, house, flower, God. So, maybe this would have worked a few years ago, a little bit better, but when I say God, what's the visual that's created? Don't answer that now. Don't go back in and try to alter the image once it rises. I'll keep going. Moon, book, frying pan, goddess. What I've wanted to do is to ask people, if you take the mental picture, you had when I said God, and the mental picture when I said goddess, and you put them side by side in your brain, calculate approximately the age difference between the two pictures. It's the age I want to see.

So, the picture of God, I'm not saying the Christian God, could be Thor as far as I care, but could be just God, and then the mental picture of the goddess. Did anyone not have an age difference? Does anyone want to play ball with me? Graham.

Graham – My mind went to when you said God, a picture of something we've seen from like Desire of Ages, you know where you get your pictures in Desires of Ages, this glow around Jesus in a robe. So, quite young, and when you said goddess, I had a similar young image of a like Cleopatra, or someone like that.

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

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

Elder Tess – Lynne. You had an age difference? How many years do you think?

Lynne – Well, the picture of God was like the white flowing beard type thing so very old, maybe 60s, 70s, or 80s. And then the goddess would have been probably 30s or 40s, so quite a significance in age difference, really. And, it wasn't what I wanted to think. It was like trying to let my mind just think it without correcting it.

Elder Tess – Yes. I understand. James, you had an age difference, and I'm assuming other hands as well were all indicating the age differences.

James – Similar to her but not so old. More, with God, younger, middle age, and the female, just a bit younger, maybe ten years or so.

Elder Tess – 20s and 50s rather than like 30s and 60s.

James – Yeah. Something like that.

Elder Tess – Was that same for you, Brodie?

Brodie – I think I had about a 50 years age difference in there.

Elder Tess – Katherine.

Katherine – Yeah, about 50 years for me as well; about a 30-year-old goddess and probably 80 for the older man on the throne.

Elder Tess – Now, obviously, no one did this to me without a surprise but investigating my own brain, I would say I have about a 40-year age gap between what just comes up when I think of God versus what comes up when I think of a goddess. And, that's not all Christian base. There's Greek mythology. That's just cultural. Unless you start thinking of a goddess and people think old woman, I think what they're doing, I think their brain is switched out goddess for a witch. But, when you keep it as God versus goddess, then what I've seen in my experience and other people I've spoken to, for the vast majority, about a 40, 50-year age gap between the mental picture of a goddess and a mental picture of God.

I wanted to do this, I guess just to make a point what we're doing, when we critique the terms that we use in this movement, when we critique language, where we call each other brother and sister, or someone an aunt, or he is an elder, even if he's not ordained, all of that language that has at its root, whether its subconscious or conscious, a gendered root, what we're doing as a movement and as leadership is, it is psychological warfare. It is mind games because the problem is not in the terms so much or the terms themselves. The problem is in our brain wiring. It's how we're wired and the issue with these terms is how that psychologically impacts with our in-built cultural biases. I don't think that how we picture a god as older is all Christian based. It's just cultural.

You could watch a Hollywood movie and get the same idea about a god and a goddess. But it also shows us what culture worships in men versus culture worship in women. It shows why the culture treats older women certain way. Why the culture tends to ignore the voices of older women whereas the voices of the older men as being associated with power and wisdom. It has so many deep-set cultural implications. So, it just fascinates me when people in the movement continue to feel attacked or to pushed back when we are asking them to stop saying brother or sister, especially when women say, please don't call me sister. I think it's so misogynistic and downright abusive to not listen to the terms that someone wishes to be called by. But what we're all doing is trying to fight that wiring in our brains.

Some people have asked me about the pronouns that we use for God. Can't we just say, goddess? Won't that fix everything, and I think this touches on why it really, really wouldn't. Because, if we just say goddess, all we're doing is moving away from the 60, 70, 80-year-old and moving into 20, 30-year-old version. It does not nothing to change our brain wiring to picture god as a female. All it does is give us a different culture, cultural version of what a god, goddess can be; young, attractive, jealous, but in a different way, probably a little bit manipulative, plays games, all of the cultural ideas associated with a goddess, of course the nurturing and all those aspects.

We end up with a Mary, you know, the young 20 something Mary. I suppose she wasn't that young. But we substitute that for a 60-year-old, gray hair, bearded, elderly male. I think we should consider why we're doing what we're doing with some deliberateness. It helps to change our practices but if we really know we're changing them, the fight we have with our own brain wiring, I think it makes it more powerful, and helpful. If someone slips up and calls me sister, that's ok, but if I've asked them not to, and I've explained the problem with their brain wiring, and they continue to, then there's a major problem in how much they think sexism is an issue in the society and within themselves. So, thank you for accommodating me.

We said a fair bit last week. We would have gone more into the issues of the left-wing than I initially intend to state, but I think we've gotten to the point where I'm being fairly explicit with what, I believe, the problem with the left-wing to be. There's also an article shared this week on feminism that laid out some of the reasons that the SL becomes inevitable when feminism fails amongst the democrats, amongst the left-wing. Obviously, that indicates a much larger problem with the left-wing if feminism is so unpopular. There's another article not yet shared but will be soon addressing feminism as well. Again, it touches on the left-wing failure. But I want to take a little bit of time and just go through a review, and you can stop me at any time. Just put your hand in the chat.

We have kind of moved off into tangents a number of times, and there might be things that we didn't really complete or points that you still have questions or thoughts over, and we can stop at any point and discuss those. We began with a question that was asked. We were meant to be studying 1888, but someone asked, how do you sift media? And, the focus was on generally the left-wing media, or the trustworthy sources. We weren't considering how to sift Fox news because we just don't bother. So, how do you sift the left-wing media sources? And, before

going much further, I wanted to prove, first of all, that we even needed to. So, I wanted to nail in that point that the left-wing needed to be sifted in the first place. If you going to need to sift media, then they must have issues. They must have problems that are endemic.

So, let's prove they have endemic problems and then analyze what those problems are so we can all spot them. The Gray Zone – proof of problems. The Gray Zone and Max Blumenthal, we went into that history. Then we left that for a moment and said, well, what does it mean to be left-wing in the first place and we defined, we went to the Midnight Cry (MC) and explained 2018, why we are left-wing. And then we attempted to define the fundamental difference between the left-wing and the right-wing politics. There's quite a number differences but we wanted to get to the fundamental root, especially when it comes to the social policies.

Defining the left-wing and the right-wing and the differences between the two, we discussed that the left-wing was equality over freedom, and the right-wing was freedom over equality. That doesn't easily work internationally if you have a country that doesn't even believe in giving the citizens the basic tenets of freedom. Then it becomes a little bit more complicated. But, when you have a country like the U.S. that embodies so many principles that, prophetically described as glorious, then you have to see the fight in a little bit more of a subtle way. Freedom is a good thing. It fought for freedom from the rule of Britain. The part of their history is the fight to have freedom in the first place. But, through that history, it's become more and more clearly a fight between these two bedrock principles. Because, when they collide, one has to take precedent over the other.

Obviously, we want freedom. You don't want a surveillance state like China has. Obviously, there are some privacies citizens should have. But they have to have a balance, and then when equality for a group who is marginalized, oppressed or comes under threat, then that priority has to supersede over the rest of the population's rights to freedom. And, this is what the left-wing and the right-wing often war over. Hopefully people watched what was put on the media broadcast from New York Times about the January 6. I don't know if you watched that and heard freedom, freedom, freedom, freedom. What is the right-wing fighting for? Freedom. We went into details and gave many examples; the truckers' protests. All of these examples to prove what they're fighting for is freedom.

I said it before and I'm going to state this more explicitly and in more detail in the future, but left-wing journalism in general can slip into the habit of being lazy, and it's so much easier to look at the Canada truckers, find the neo-Nazi flag and say they just want to suppress people of color. They're just white supremacists, neo-Nazis and leave it that simply. And, there are people there who are, but vast majority of them are not. They're fighting for freedom. If we can't see what that fight is fundamentally over, then we can't see how or why we disagree with them. And, if you can't see what you're disagreeing with you come into the danger of ending up in the same side. I think that's why so many democrats watch Tucker Carlson. They aren't actually even able to pick up on what he is saying because it's not as explicit as I think we've been led to believe.

So, seeing the battle between freedom and equality, equality and freedom, and we used the Supreme Court case to really prove that. To give one example out of many, and that's Masterpiece Cake Shop versus Colorado Civil Rights Commission. Civil rights prioritize equality. Masterpiece Cake Shop was all about their freedom. It ties back to a long history of this war between equality and freedom, and I touched on it, but you can really see it when it comes to the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Quite a lot of the opposition to the Civil Rights Act were by people who vowed that they were not racist. They were against government enforced segregation, but they were also against government enforced integration. The Civil Rights Act, it ended government enforced segregation but it brought in government enforced integration, most clearly seen in schools but also in many private businesses.

And, many people opposed the 1964 Civil Rights Act, Goldwater being one of them who was one of the foremost people who brought libertarianism into the Republican Party. Goldwater opposed the 1964 Civil Rights Act, and he did so with a lot of guilt on his conscience because he said he wanted racial equality, but he firmly believed in freedom over equality. The government should not be enforcing segregation. That was good that the Civil Rights Act brought that to an end. But the government should not enforce integration. So, the government should not force schools to allow in students of color. It should not force business owners, private business owners to serve non-white patrons.

So, it's been a long-term fight that has been ongoing between equality and freedom, but post second wave feminism, post stonewall, it has become even more and more explicit that this is what the fight is about. Then we went to Max, and he symbolizes a large part of that right-wing, even far-right ideology that is so popular today, and we looked at the statistics of how unpopular feminism is, and it's being replaced by something, and there's this popular, very much popular trinity, especially among young men, but it is a I said before, it is a younger demographic, and it's that trinity. We asked, what happens when you strive for absolute freedom? We looked at the VOX article and the trinity. And that trinity being, libertarianism, atheism, and men's rights, opposition to feminism. We haven't touched on the third one so much but we we've touched on the first and the second.

And, it was here that we went into libertarianism. Let's look at more pure freedom. You might notice a shift in our classes when we were doing all this. We were looking very much at domestic policy, but as we moved towards the left-wing to see the problems with the left-wing, we started to look more into the foreign policy; how do they handle Syria? How do they handle Russia? How do they handle China? How do they handle Libya? That isn't because those issues are separate. They're very much overlapping. It's just been easier to see. It's easier to see libertarianism if you look at the domestic policy. It's easier to see the problems with the left-wing and the views of The Gray Zone if you look at the foreign policy. But, all of these issues interconnect. It's not as if you have domestic policy and foreign policy. They are all really very much interconnected.

So, I wanted to actually stop here and just make a couple of observations about libertarianism. Libertarianism is that beautiful picture that if a society does have problems with equality, that it

does mistreat portions of the population, take a society that is sexist and patriarchal, libertarianism sells the idea, and I'll take it how members or former members of the movement sold this idea, if there are sexist members of the movement, sexist men primarily, but also women, that have been abusive, then we should not remove them from classes. We should not reprimand them. We should not accuse them. What we should do is allow everyone absolute freedom. Freedom to attend what presentations they want, to attend camp meetings alongside women that they have mistreated, we should listen to them and hear their side of the story, as if we don't, we should just prioritize freedom, be non-accusatory, and not ever enact discipline.

And then, as this freedom-conscious movement progresses, then through dialogue, through friendship, through community, those who have wrong views will learn. They will grow. They will change, and we can all just get along without punishing people or accusing people. And, it's been an appealing message for quite a few, for quite a lot of people. Does everyone remember what we've said about libertarianism? The message that sells versus the reality? Or, does anyone have any confusion or questions? We're not quite done with libertarianism because we're going to come back to it when we discuss the paleo versus neo-conservatism, but I just wanted us to remember the picture it sells that is so appealing. It appeals to me. It sounds beautiful until you look at human nature and reality.

I wanted us to take that picture which we've discussed libertarianism domestically, and in the context of the Civil Rights Act, and the idea that the government shouldn't force segregation or force integration but just create a free country where everyone can discriminate or not discriminate as they like, and then, you'll create social change through working together and dialoguing. Let's take that, what we've discussed domestically and consider it internationally. How does that then work with international foreign policy? And, I'm not saying that a libertarian would necessarily take this foreign policy position. There's a quite a spectrum, but I think there's a few things that we can learn when we picture that nice image and take it to foreign policy.

I wanted us to consider Germany's example. The Guardian long read was really good this week. I don't always read them because they're long read, but the Guardian did a long read this week on Germany's dependence on Russia, and as I read that long read it really stood out that Germany had that same beautiful picture as the libertarians sell in the U.S. And, it was interesting seeing that play out internationally in the way Germany has related to, not just Russia but China, especially Russia and China, the authoritarian countries in general. What Germany did right back in the 1980s, right back in the history when the Soviet Union was still in existence was that they had this belief, and they had a term for it, *vandal der candle* which translate as change through trade. What they really fought for, and this was, you can trace it right back to that history, but it's also been through the 2000s and right up until very recently, the belief that trade and dialogue can bring about social and political change.

So, through the history of the cold war, especially those last decades, Germany and the U.S. were on very different paths on how they wanted to handle the Soviet Union. The U.S., obviously with a lot of variety between presidents, but certainly by the time they get to Ronald

Reagan, they're wanting to be quite aggressive with the Soviet Union. They wanted to challenge them. There's a space race. There's an arms race. Germany had a different position. Germany held and has held until recently and still some today, this belief that doesn't work, and you can change authoritarian abusive countries through stepping back, letting them operate how they want to operate in the abusive fashion they want to operate but through trade and dialogue, bringing them into the global economy, bringing them into closer integration, through that, you will bring about social change.

And, there's a couple of reasons that Germany had that, took that position. I'm focusing on Russia, but if I use this as a quote from the Carnegie endowment, Germany's strategic gray zone with China, they say like other Western democracies including the U.S. Germany was convinced that China's authoritarian politics would morph into a free open and more democratic system through ever tightening economic ties. So, we don't punish them. We don't sanction them. We don't build up our own arms. We don't intervene. We don't tell them off internationally. We bring them in. We communicate. We make our ties closer.

And this is all analyzed in this latest Guardian's long read, and I just want to read a little of it. I will ask a question, and I'll come back to it in a moment. Why do you think that Germany had that position? Why do you think that they were so nervous to accuse another country? Quoting, "How did Germany end up making such a blunder? Some argued that Merkel should have seen that Putin was taking Russia in an authoritarian direction when he announced his return to the presidency in 2011. After Russia's invasion of Ukraine in 2014, Germany made no move to stop importing Russian gas, and although Merkel threatened to introduce crippling trade sanctions German industry convinced her to hold back, but some blame a more persistent misjudgement stretching back 50 years based on a fallacy that authoritarian abusive countries can be transformed through trade."

Why do you think that Germany has this kind of psychological position? Graham.

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

Elder Tess – I think, if that's as a complete answer as you want to give, I might go to Josephine and then, so I don't give my thoughts while people are talking. Is that ok? I would like everyone's feedback.

Graham – Yes. Of course.

Elder Tess – Josephine.

Josephine – I think it's because of the position they took in the world war. They were very aggressive. So now, they want to sit back and dialogue instead of, you know, attacking.

Elder Tess – I'll comment in a moment. Thank you. Moli.

Moli – I think it's because they had a very bad experience in the Second World War, and they don't want to go through it again. So, they would rather dialogue and solve the problems and instead of putting sanctions and discipline and all that.

Elder Tess – I think you've touched on what those kind of investigating the roots of Germany's hesitancy have said. The article quotes Thomas Urban. He's examined the psychological roots of Ostpolitik, they are really quite libertarian foreign policy and attitude, and he pin points two emotions in Germany's relationship with Russia: Nostalgia and guilt. So, nostalgia is, particularly, the memory of Bismarck who saw the alliance with Russia as an anchor of stability in Europe. So, it's going back to Pre-World War One where Bismarck was quite important for them, believed that you could keep stability throughout Europe through alliances, and there's still some nostalgia for that type of position even where country have differences and issues that if you just keep alliances, you can have stability.

But I think the deeper underlying one which I think Josephine particularly articulated is guilt. There is the feeling of guilt because in 1941, Germany attacked the Soviet Union and killed millions. It meant it was difficult to criticize the red army or the Soviet oppression since to do so means they were not recognizing the greatest crimes in history, particularly Germany's; heavy on Germany. And because of that, it made Germany blind to the black side of the Soviet Union. So, they're going back to the history of the cold war when the U.S. was taking an aggressive position in opposition to the Soviet Union, and Germany was much gentler. And, there's nostalgia, but there's also the guilt, and that guilt has blinded their view where not only are they unwilling to rebuke another country's human rights violations or another countries imperialism, they also had trouble seeing it.

And, they say how this has helped Putin's propaganda because Russia doesn't overall, the vast majority of it, doesn't have guilt for Stalin. They have rewritten their history. Stalin was a hero. The Soviet Union stopped Nazi Germany. Putin wants to take all the credit for Russia, the fatherland. They killed, the Soviet Union killed millions, but because Germany has carried the guilt of WWII, and the Soviet Union has not carried, especially Russia today, culturally, I know there are individuals who see things differently and many of those individuals have fled the country now, but as a country, they don't carry guilt for the history of Stalin, the history of the Soviet Union. That is what was worst in that history has been heavily rewritten.

But Germany is different. They haven't rewritten their history. Instead, they've created pillars to it; memorials to it. They've taught it in their schools and that's a good thing. That's what the U.S. is needing to do with its own history. You need to remember it. There needs to be a sense of cultural guilt of what has taken place in the past because it is impacting the present; because you don't want it to happen again. An arrangement that began as a peacetime opening to a former foe, so how Germany kind of opened up to Russia, has turned into an instrument of aggression. Germany is now funding Russia's war. In the first two months after the start of Russia's assault on Ukraine, Germany is estimated to have paid nearly 8.3 billion euros for Russian energy. Money used by Moscow to prop up the Ruble and buy the artillery shells firing



at Ukrainian's positions on Donetsk. In that time, the EU countries are estimated to have paid a total of 39 billion euros for Russian energy.

This is more than the double the amount that European countries have given to Ukraine to help defend itself. So, if Zelensky doesn't seem super grateful, as much as he has been given to help defend his country, Russia is given double that by the EU to pay for the Russian energy. And that is something that has been developing for decades. Nord Stream Two was an agreement between Germany and Russia for Russian energy that bypass Ukraine and further weakens Ukraine, makes it weaker in the face of Russian aggression. Germany signed on to Nord Stream Two in 2015, a year after Russia invaded Ukraine the first time. So, if Zelensky doesn't seem super grateful then, but why has Germany taken this position?

Quoting the historian Timothy Snyder. "For thirty years, Germans lectured Ukrainians about fascism. When fascism actually arrived, Germans funded it and Ukrainians died fighting it. So, Germany's beautiful picture, I want to describe it as libertarian picture. When you have an abusive country which I would bring in, I'm substituting for the idea of an abusive individual, when you have misogyny and abuse in a person, substitute that for a country, when you have that, the idea that through trade, through integration, they invaded Ukraine but don't make them uneasy. We'll sign Nord Stream Two. Putin's reasonable. He'll back down. We'll engage in dialogue.

Even in 2021, as he started preparing on the border of Ukraine and France and Germany are saying, dialogue will fix this. Dialogue will fix this. Putin won't invade. He's not going to do that. So much of that is this same kind of wishful thinking, that you don't need foreign intervention, that you don't need a military, but the integration and trade, that beautiful picture can solve these kinds of problems. And now, Ukraine is paying for it. And, the approach that Germany has taken towards Russia is under intense scrutiny. Not just intense scrutiny for what it's done in the last few years, but why did they sign on to the Nord Stream Two in the first place? Why did they take the approach of the last half century?

I think this has a lot of domestic lessons to teach us about the U.S. but also about how the U.S. should allow its past transgressions, the Iraq war as a recent one, and more historical transgression like slavery. How much should that effect the U.S. willingness to engage with foreign countries today? There was, I saw a little bit of Max Blumenthal speaking on The Gray Zone, and he was attacking the U.S. restriction on Chinese imports and at the very beginning of his attack against the U.S. restrictions on Chinese imports, he began by reminding everyone that the date he was doing this video was the anniversary of the U. S. invasion of Iraq, and the hypocrisy of the U.S. to take a hard line approach with China over China's mistakes even though he denies that China has made mistakes, but a hard line approach with China when they invaded Iraq.

And, this type of whataboutism gets brought into this left-wing/right-wing, isolationist/interventionist argument in the U.S., and I think we should look to Germany to kind of unite the three different topics we've been discussing; libertarianism, domestically, the beautiful picture versus the reality; America's own transgressions versus whether or not

intervention is necessarily a bad thing. And then consider, in the context of, not just Germany but Europe's slow response to rising human rights abuses in Russia. Does anyone have any questions or thoughts so far? Is that clear what we've done. We've taken the discussion we had on internal libertarianism, that beautiful picture, and kind of compared and contrasted it, mostly compared it, to how Germany approached the Soviet Union and Russia. Does that make sense?

I think it's an interesting lesson because when you deal with the left-wing so much of it is also touches on foreign policy, and so much is opposed to U.S. interventionism, and I've been asking the question, is that necessarily progressive? Is it right for America's guilt over Iraq to prevent it from intervening today, and is that intervention necessarily neo-imperialism, new imperialism. There was a third article that I wanted to share on exactly on this point. It was to be the third of the, the kind of the third addition to the last two I've already shared.

It was about progressives in the U.S. and their hesitancy to defend Ukraine. It says, acknowledging the U.S. failings does not mean ignoring Russian imperialism. The point he was trying to make in this article was that we can acknowledge the U.S. failings, but that shouldn't necessarily stop intervention today. It's not that simple. I'm not going to share that article because on rereading it, I had too many problems, and perhaps once we get further on in sifting, perhaps then I'll give it out and ask us to actually discuss what's wrong with it. But I don't want us to try and analyze what is wrong with it now. There were things that troubled me to the point I've decided not to share it.

So, at the moment, we just have those first two articles, and now please, reread them. So, I wanted to just touch on Germany when we discussed libertarianism because domestic and foreign policy are in many ways are overlapping. Then we discussed atheism, how it is disproportionately found in the far-right. So, of the trinity doctrine, we discussed libertarianism, and we discussed atheism, and by the time we've done that we'd made the first point that I wanted to make to help us unpack the left-wing's problems, and that was first point, that it is not church and state that are the problem. But, instead, it is culture which is why we have heard and discussed so much about culture war.

We made a kind of a secondary additional point to that where we said if it's, if it is this type of political culture war, how do we also then view the Great Controversy, and we said, made the point that the Great Controversy itself is also a war, a political war, a political election. So, that's kind of a separate point but it was important one. So, I'm going to add it in there. Great Controversy equals an election, and election between two political parties, two different ways of governing; equality over freedom or the alternative that was offered in heaven and then Eden, freedom over equality.

This is about as far as we got before we were forced to bring all this back in. So, we're back to the start again, and this is particularly what I wanted us to see in reviewing, that we went back to this point, we went back to The Gray Zone, but we expanded it to again prove that there is a left-wing problem. But we can do that once we have broken down this, and then we are building it back to discuss how we sift the media. How do we sift the true stream because we

shouldn't even be swimming in the wrong one? To help explain why The Gray Zone and the right-wing, really the far-right, seem to agree on so many things, we began to explain neo versus paleo-conservatism. And, this is where we will continue unless anyone has any thoughts or questions about what is on the board so far or where we've been. Can someone explain to me the difference between paleo and neo-conservatism?

Josephine – Old and new.

Elder Tess – Brodie.

Brodie – If I remember right, paleo means old and historical and original, and neo means new.

Elder Tess – So, paleo is old. Can you think of other times where you heard the word neo before?

Brodie – I think I have a mental blank.

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

Brodie – No.

Elder Tess – Brendon.

Brendon – In not sure where I have heard neo but I was just going to say a little bit more on the old and new. One is an interventionist, and the other is isolationist when it comes to foreign policy.

Elder Tess – I think that's the easiest way in one sentence to divide the two. It has a plethora of implications though. So, paleo, old is isolation, and you have told us that neo, new is interventionist. And, obviously we don't believe that all interventionist is neo-conservative, but I'll keep it like that for now. Anything else, Brendon?

Brendon – No. That's it.

Elder Tess – Josephine.

Josephine – I think I might have heard you wrong because I was thinking of the word new and some other word. Maybe, I'm way off the chart. I was thinking neonatal; neo-Nazi.

Elder Tess – Yes. That's exactly right. Do you have any other? Sorry, I interrupted.

Josephine – That's alright for now. I got those two.

Elder Tess – Neo-Nazi. Today, people who espouse Nazi ideology, it's not exactly like the Nazi ideology of the 1930s and the 1940s. So, rather than just refer to it as Nazism, or refer to

someone like that as a Nazi, it's now neo-Nazis, and that's quite possibly where you might have heard the neo term most frequently used. It's the same fascist ideology, but it's kind of a new manifestation of it. So, I just wanted us to see that we heard this (neo) quite a lot, and we might have heard it subconsciously, or not picked up on it, the neo, new, connotation. I think there's others as well but neo-Nazi is the one that comes to mind. Thank you, Josephine. Sharon.

Sharon – I was just going to say neonatal is the word we often use to refer to new born babies or even babies that are born prematurely.

Elder Tess – You know, I heard Josephine say neonatal, and I couldn't remember what it meant so I just concentrated on neo-Nazi. So, thank you, someone who knows what they are talking about to educate us. So, it's new baby. Is that too simple, the concept of new?

Sharon – Yeah. That's perfect.

Elder Tess – Moli.

Moli – I thought that paleo is sort of talking about conservative ideology, and neo is sort of a change, especially with the cultural...

Elder Tess – Sorry. I missed a word in there. You said paleo is conservative. What did you say neo was?

Moli – Neo requires change.

Elder Tess – So, they're changed? Requires change?

Moli – Especially a shift of ideology from right to left.

Elder Tess – These are both conservative in the context that we are discussing though. They're still both right-wing but different variations of the right-wing conservatism. I still think that your point is valid. I've not necessarily proven it yet. I suppose some people are questioning it, but I would say that paleo is much further right-wing. So, neo is less far-right. Paleo is what developed to the alt-right. Is that ok Moli? Are we disagreeing or I think I'm understanding you correctly.

Moli – No. we're agreeing.

Elder Tess – Thank you. Katherine.

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

Elder Tess – I'm not sure about the spreading of the culture so much because I think that there's a certain amount that should be spread. I suppose my hesitancy with this spreading

culture part is, are universal human rights cultural? And, if they're attempting to spread this universal human rights, they're not attempting to spread Western culture because universal human rights are not Western culture, which I know that you and I agree on, so I don't think that we're disagreeing there. Just the wording of spreading.

Katherine – So, then being conservatives, are you saying that they are concerned with the human rights of other countries, not just spreading their own culture? One sounds good and one sounds bad, but do you think that someone like George Bush was, well, his motivation was with the human rights than sort of Americanizing the world or the other countries? I have this picture of just wanting to dominate.

Elder Tess – If that's how you meant it, then I agree, but I think I would agree with both. I think George Bush was motivated by suppressing a country that he saw as a threat, that kind of need to dominate and have this invincible army and be the unilateral, most powerful country on earth was a motivating factor. I also believe that with the degree of arrogance and a degree of naiveté, they genuinely believed that just by toppling a government, they could bring equality, human rights, freedom, and a democratic government to Afghanistan. I think that was incredibly naïve and arrogant, but not necessarily a wrong motivation. So, I think I would agree with both points there. The problem is that if we look at Afghanistan as radical feminist, the misogyny in society in Afghanistan is easily seen through the Taliban but it's actually cultural.

I shared an article to prove that point, and again, I've been trying to nail culture and the universality of misogyny in culture for a long time. I shared an article on the media broadcast around August of last year of a woman who had worked for years in Afghanistan to fight for the rights, the basic rights for women, and her point was, the Taliban was terrible but the life without the Taliban was terrible too because the misogyny is cultural. And, the U.S. could not just go in and overthrow the Taliban because what they're fighting would be fighting in Afghanistan is culture. I don't think that's imposing Western culture on Afghanistan. What it should be about, if their motivations were all pure, I'm sure they weren't, would be about universal human rights.

What do you do when you have a country that is committing horrific human rights violations? Katherine, we agree, but I got off on a tangent. Can you repeat yourself, Katherine?

Katherine - The way I said it was, could we frame it as one of those groups, paleo? They're wanting to put a bubble around their culture, protect their culture, put a wall around, and they're trying to preserve their own culture, and let the rest of the world, we don't care, and the neo, can we say, they wanted to, the culture was still top to them but they wanted to spread it around the world. Could we say it like that?

Elder Tess – I think you pinpointed paleo quite well. It's that bubble around the culture, the preservation of it. So, yes. Brendon.

Brendon – I hope I can explain this question well enough. Just in what you were talking with Katherine, you've got, the group that brings in the SL is the paleo, the old or the isolationists,

and when we go back to where prophecy leads us, we would think, on the board, you would write and say, America would be the ruler of the ten kings as an example, and so they would dominate the ten kings, but how does that work when I look at the paleo isolationist because now the neo, the interventionists, are dead, and how does America now dominate the ten kings when they are isolationists, and they're not interventionists? How do we see that now? Are they now leading by looking inward, nationalism, then that spreads globally? Am I asking the question ok?

Elder Tess – You are.

Brendon – Because now, we're looking at something different. My original brain would have thought if America is the boss of the ten kings, that would make me automatically go, isn't that the neo? They're the interventionists. They're forcing the ten kings, but now we got this SL that's being driven by isolationists. They're inward looking. They're not really caring about what's happening to the ten kings. Am I saying that correctly?

Elder Tess – You are. I think that I would like to give a bit of history of paleo-conservatism and discuss a little bit more before answering though. The reason we're doing that is to assess the left-wing, and the part of the left-wing where I have the most problems with, the problem that's most explicit are very much, it's not the isolationists or the paleo-conservatives, but it's the hatred and the fear of colonialism that makes them also quite isolationists. And, that was not Hillary Clinton. Hillary Clinton was, if not the entirety of the solution, she was to a large extent, the start of it. She's the Clinton of Benghazi. She's not an isolationist.

So, I think the discussion of the isolationism and the motivation behind the different groups, we'll probably be discussing before I answer that question. I don't think all intervention is about domination. Motivations are becoming important. So, if you don't mind, we'll come back to that, and I'll give a little bit of history first. Josephine.

Josephine – I have a few words floating in my head. I just wondered if they fit into the discussion at the moment like a new manifestation, same entity, only worse. How does that have any connection at all with what we're talking about right now, and I'm thinking, you know, prophecy going back to Revelation, Daniel, 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> head. Maybe I'm digging around the wrong place.

Elder Tess – I'm not sure how to answer that right now. I can say it's a new manifestation of conservatism, but it's always been there. And, I think that sometimes it's just what was there before bubbling up again. Isn't that kind of the point? It hasn't, the deadly wound and then death, it comes back. I think that's worth considering when we look back at the Millerite history and, if this is the world today, and we believe that the SL test is global, then all of these become little countries.

And you have Ukraine, let's say you have China, and you have Russia, and you have Uganda, and you have France, and you have the U.S.A. If you were to take that, which is today, if you were to take that back and make that U.S.A, the Millerite history, then you have all of these

states. And, you would have Texas and Mississippi, and you would have New York, and you would have the seed of the government. The wrong side of the debate in the Millerite history, what was their excuse to attack the government, to secede from the union? How did they see the government versus their freedoms? Brendon.

Brendon – It was the state rights, and it was the government intervening and interfering with their freedoms to do what they wanted to do in their own states.

Elder Tess – What do you call that when far away government decides to intervene in your territory?

Brendon – I guess that would be imperialism.

Elder Tess – Imperialism. Colonialism. And, I get there's difference because it's one country, but it's similar. You can contrast it. There is a difference. They are under Washington to an extent that Uganda is not under the U.S., but it's the same issue. There's also that comparison. What Texas is arguing is, it is imperialistic for the government of, that's really the government, and they would argue it's like the government of the north. It's the northern states. It's not even their government. It's what the northern states have chosen to come over to our territory, and don't tell us Texans that racial rights are universal human rights. That is cultural imperialism. It's a similar argument to what has been discussed in the first article I shared by the UN human rights commissioner. What are some countries arguing?

They're not saying, it's ok, France, Islamophobic France because we know that racial rights are culturally interpreted. That's not an argument being made today. The argument being made today is that gender rights, rights for women, rights for LGBT people are not universal. It must be defined by cultures, internal cultures and that for, and they will say the West, because it usually works out this way, for the West to come into our culture and speak about, promote, try to force through universal human rights for women is neo or new colonialism; neo or new imperialism. That's the fight the first article was discussing. That's why it was given the title, very deliberately given the title, because they know what the core issue was that he was fighting.

Do not dare to tell me that women's rights are not universal. Do not dare to tell me that LGBT rights are not universal. Hillary Clinton's speech, what was the speech that she was famous for? I don't remember it exactly, but women's rights are human rights; human rights are women's rights. They are universal. That's what she was fighting for and by the time you get to 2016, that is what she's angry about. It's part of the reason she was the solution to the problem. Not many people, not many women, Ilhan Omar, even AOC, they are not thinking that way. They are not fighting for that. Therefore, they are part of the problem and not the solution.

So, when we talk about intervention, isolationists versus interventionist, this is why I'm being careful, because there is a genuine danger of imperialism and colonialism. We have an extensive history of that. But, when you have human rights violations, can the U.S., like Germany did, say, well, we have done some terrible things, and we have made some mistakes

in the past. Therefore, we should sit back and not be hypocritical and condemn another country for theirs. I want us to see that in the context of the Millerite history. Does that make sense, Brendon? There's contrast but there's comparisons.

Brendon – Yes. Thank you.

Elder Tess - I really encourage us to reread that first and the second article, especially the first. Ray.

Ray – I was just going to say basically the same thing that Brendon did.

Elder Tess – Your hand went up the same time, so I wondered. Is there anything you want to add onto that?

Ray – I was going to say they would have compared the government to the king of England.

Elder Tess – Yes. I want to suggest that it, paleo-conservatism is old conservatism because it was so much in existence back here. It was very much the government of the south. The government of Lincoln frightened the south so much because it was a change from what they had before. Old conservatism is isolationism and states' rights which is just an internal pocket of isolationism. What did the U.S. do the minute their revolution ended, and all of a sudden France needed help. What was their position? Sorry. We're isolationists. Deal with it yourselves, France. That is, while there were differences of opinions, the majority of that early history of the U.S. was more isolationist than what you find in a neo-conservative today, I would suggest.

Therefore, I think that when they call themselves paleo, because that's something they call themselves, not that it was given to them, they have a point. I think they have a point. They are the older and more original form of conservatism in opposition to Lincoln as forward as he was. Graham.

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

Elder Tess – I think that question is a very deep one. It depends, I think if we see it as a separate country in a way, but I certainly don't think that God has been anything approaching isolationist or anything approaching libertarian. I don't fully understand how the Great Controversy works. I think that we are, piece by piece, seeing behind the curtain and unpacking it. I don't quite get all the rules of warfare. I see that this country, this earth as a whole, voted for one government, for freedom over equality model that Adam and Eve voted for. Therefore, Lucifer became the king of this earth. It was his governmental model that was going to rule.

And then, I've kind of seen, viewed it as the godhead really kind of as a shadow government, as an opposition government. And, sometimes, the opposition government can publicly fight, but they don't have that much power. So, people ask, if God is real, why do such terrible things happen. Because he is the opposition government. You don't vote republican, then not be able



to afford medical bills and ask, why haven't you sorted out the healthcare system in the U.S.? They can't do very much.

So, I don't understand all of how the Great Controversy works, but as we get deeper into some of these subjects, a lot makes more sense. I think I predominantly viewed it as it really rather than God being a separate government, the godhead having a separate country, they are part of this country, but the opposition government. Perhaps there is another way, another parable to look at though that would go into this. I think it's too deep a question for me to want to comment without thinking of it more though. Is that ok?

Graham – Yes. Thank you.

Elder Tess – I do think that we can understand, even in just understanding WWI and WWII, as the moves of the current government in the office, why horrific things have happened, and under whose leadership those horrific things have taken place and questioned that under a government where God does believe in freedom, equality over freedom, but still believes freedom that when Adam and Eve, and the majority of this planet, vote for that type of government, when and how can God intervene, and when and how can he not.

So, I'll just give couple of points and then we'll close for time. I just wanted to give a little bit of history of paleo versus neo-conservatism, and as we've done coming back to this model, it's old. It's not a new concept, but it has become much clearer that there these two sides, and it's not all neat. Some people straddle both. Some people are 75% paleo, and 25% neo. It's always been that way. But, if we were to do just a little bit more of a recent history, going right back to the 1920s leading up to and then into the 1920s, you have these two sides versus expansion, progressivism, and a more isolationist, anti-immigration approach.

From what I have read, and I'm going to scan through few different sources, that I have read, paleo-conservatism was powerful in the 20s and the 30s, but the problem was everything else less extreme conservatism kept being so successful, other models kept on being so successful. The new deal was quite successful. Then you come to the 1940s, and you have WWII. And, as you would expect, the conservatives were split over WWII, whether to get involved, neo-conservatives, or to be isolationists and let Europe fight it out themselves, paleo-conservatives. The problem for the paleo-conservatives is that the U.S. did get involved, and WWII was won by the allied forces, and that made the neo-conservatism or interventionism in general, look really good. It made it attractive to people.

So, because intervention and the New Deal and the different forces of interventionism and progressivism were successful, paleo-conservatism, isolationism, extreme right-wing ideology never really gained enough traction to make a major impact. Then you come to the Civil Rights Movement, and the conservatives began to reject explicit racism. It became less popular to be explicitly racist. And, paleo-conservatism kind of slunk even more into the background. Then, when you come to the 1980s and the 1990s, their voices, paleo-conservatism that old school isolationist, anti-immigration, kind of xenophobic, far-right ideology, didn't have a major voice but it had some, especially under Pat Buchanan.

He's the most prominent apostle of the old right of paleo-conservatism in particular in the 1980s and the 1990s, and he did hold, Pat Buchanan, positions of influence in the, under the Nixon and Reagan administration. He ran for president in 1992 on an America First slogan that they say echoed the 1940s isolationist, those who wanted to stay out of WWII, and previewed Trump. So, paleo-conservatism under Pat Buchanan in 1992, America First. They talk about Phyllis Schlafly who was best known for defeating the women's equal rights amendment. She opposed the Vietnam War, an isolationist, a paleo-conservative. She opposed a bill of Clinton's humanitarian intervention in Bosnia, and most international agreements since; paleo-conservative; isolationist.

They list some other paleo-conservative writers such as Joseph Sobran who's a holocaust denier, Taki Theodoracopulos, anti-Semitic and racist. But, also by the time you get into the 1990s, paleo-conservatism, even though it's quiet it started to become a little bit more popular. So, if we were to trace the 1940s neo really has a lot of influence here because of the WWII, and it made intervention look good. It took down Hitler. Then you come to 1989, and between WWII and 1989, you have the cold war, and neo-conservatism, interventionism, is quite popular through that history. Even paleo-conservatives and even libertarians, kind of took the position, ok, isolationist except for against the Soviet Union because they're just so dangerous, and they're so bad, we need to fight them. So, it was even paleo-conservatism here was particularly kind of limited.

But, in 1989, the Soviet Union falls. And, what is left, really, to intervene in now? What great big threat do neo-conservatives have that they have as a type of excuse to intervene in the world? And, they say that around here (1989) you can kind of see, you can see the foreshadowing of the rise of paleo-conservatism. But what really took it down was you had 911, and then you had 2003, and you had the Iraq war. 2003, of course in that history, the Afghanistan war. 2008, you have the election of Barack Obama. 2009, he takes office. Just when the old right seemed on the verge of extinction, the world changed. First, George Bush's disastrous invasion of Iraq undermined the conservative support for the hawkish foreign policy that had been republican orthodoxy since Reagan.

Second, the 2008 financial crash and the sluggish recovery that followed undercut the enthusiasm among voters if not the elected officials for the free trade pacts that market conservatives promoted. So, trade is also involved in this isolationist argument. The refusal of the increasingly paleo-conservative house republican caucus to pass Bush's troubled asset relief program in late 2008 was in retrospect a harbinger of the fissures that erupted in 2016. Third, the prospect that whites would soon constitute a minority in an increasingly multi-racial polyglot society inspired this rise, resurgent rise in this fear of replacement.

So, 2008 but really 2009, there's a switch and we'll stop here for time, but this (2009) is where you find a switch, a switch between the neo to paleo. And, much of what we've discussed in the past talking about the Monroe Doctrine, we're going to start here (2009) next week, and I'll add to that, but much of what we're spoken about really fits into this history, 1989 to 2009. That's when it was under neo-conservatism. George Bush and his war hawks, that entire system of

the type of the republican government really died a death in 2009, and that is a prophetic marker. It's the increase of knowledge before the SL for a reason, an increase of knowledge before 2014.

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

Josephine – I don't mind. Gracious Lord. We thank you so much for the Sabbath day. We thank you that we can gather together as a group to study your word, to expand our minds, to search our hearts, to listen to the message you have given to your servant, and to embrace it. Thank you, Lord, for these exercises. It has taught us so much. We should count ourselves as very blessed to have instructions from above to help us to direct our footsteps, help us to navigate through the complicated history, complicated times which we are walking through. We look forward always to vespers because we know that our minds are going to be challenged. We bless you and thank you and give you all the glory. Bless everyone that's present here tonight, and bless your people all over the world who would be listening to the videos that's our leaders. Thank you for being with us and walking together with us through our history, through these times. In Jesus' wonderful name we praise you. Amen.

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