


Le Grand Cri (LGC) Ministry - France
Camp Meeting - 'The Increase of Knowledge'
October 2020


Tess Lambert – Part 6 – 30.10.2020
Changing the Spirit

1. Model of agriculture
2. Revolutions
3. Omega ancient Israel
4. Alpha modern Israel
5. ☩ as Priest




I keep going back and repeating the same thoughts. I do want to get to the questions. I only have two presentations after this, we haven't even finished the first question and we won't today. I do want to address the Sunday law. But the two questions as I said are woven together.

I've heard thoughts, being asked repeated questions from multiple people and some of these questions or thoughts are very important, so I want to spend the time to answer them. With a number of these questions, we're going to labor over it.




1. Model of agriculture
2. Revolutions
3. Omega ancient Israel
4. Alpha modern Israel
5. ☩ as Priest




Before we come back to our dispensation, a discussion of Concord, I want to review what we said about media literacy; how to identify a good source of information from a bad source of information. This is a problem across the world and it's a question we receive from every country, every ministry.


I shared yesterday about the **Crash Course YouTube series** and some people shared their testimonies in the comments that it helped them. For me that series was encouraging because when it comes to studying the external events of the Midnight Cry, and as that message covered a wide range of external events, I have confidence that the tools shared in that series were used and it gave me more confidence when we come to a correct understanding of external events. So I could only encourage that series.



1. Model of agriculture
2. Revolutions
3. Omega ancient Israel
4. Alpha modern Israel
5. † as Priest



Then I want us to talk about news organizations and look at a Media Bias chart. They're placing these sources of news on this chart in a way that is designed to show us how trustworthy they are.






ad fontes media

The Media Bias Chart ®

Version 6.0

Most Extreme Left Hyper-Partisan Left Skews Left Neutral (minimal, balanced, or centrist) Skews Right Hyper-Partisan Right Most Extreme Right



Type Key

- Most Reliable (Green dashed line)
- Mixed Reliability (Yellow dashed line)
- Somewhat Unreliable (Orange dashed line)
- Unreliable (Red dashed line)

Articles rated on a scale of 0-64 for reliability and -42 to +42 for bias.

Overall source scores reflect weighted average of article scores and shown on truncated scale.

Some sources moved up to +/-2 units for visibility

For precise scores, article data, and more sources, go to adfontesmedia.com




ad fontes media

The Media Bias Chart ®

Version 6.0

Most Extreme Left Hyper-Partisan Left Skews Left Neutral (minimal, balanced, or centrist) Skews Right Hyper-Partisan Right Most Extreme Right



This is neutral, it runs down the middle. Everything to the left of that is leaning towards the left and everything to the right is right leaning, socially conservative.

Type Key

- Most Reliable
- Mixed Reliability
- Somewhat Unreliable
- Unreliable

Articles rated on a scale of 0-64 for reliability and -42 to +42 for bias.

Overall source scores reflect weighted average of article scores and shown on truncated scale.

Some sources moved up to +/-2 units for visibility

For precise scores, article data, and more sources, go to adfontesmedia.com




ad fontes media

The Media Bias Chart ®

Version 6.0

Most Extreme Left Hyper-Partisan Left Skews Left Neutral (minimal, balanced, or centrist) Skews Right Hyper-Partisan Right Most Extreme Right



So this horizontal axis is about their political spectrum. This vertical axis is how they access information.

Type Key

- Most Reliable
- Mixed Reliability
- Somewhat Unreliable
- Unreliable

Articles rated on a scale of 0-64 for reliability and -42 to +42 for bias.

Overall source scores reflect weighted average of article scores and shown on truncated scale.

Some sources moved up to +/-2 units for visibility

For precise scores, article data, and more sources, go to adfontesmedia.com




ad fontes media

The Media Bias Chart ®

Version 6.0

Most Extreme Left Hyper-Partisan Left Skews Left Neutral (minimal, balanced, or centrist) Skews Right Hyper-Partisan Right Most Extreme Right



Original facts reporting and then it deteriorates as you go down. This is good this is reporting of facts across here, this is more reliable and becomes less reliable as you go down.

Type Key

- Most Reliable
- Mixed Reliability
- Somewhat Unreliable
- Unreliable

Articles rated on a scale of 0-64 for reliability and -42 to +42 for bias.

Overall source scores reflect weighted average of article scores and shown on truncated scale.

Some sources moved up to +/-2 units for visibility

For precise scores, article data, and more sources, go to adfontesmedia.com




ad fontes media

The Media Bias Chart®

Version 6.0

Most Extreme Left Hyper-Partisan Left Skews Left Neutral (minimal, balanced, or centrist) Skews Right Hyper-Partisan Right Most Extreme Right



There are some boxes here, this green box is most reliable we see that at the top in the middle.

Type Key

- Most Reliable
- Mixed Reliability
- Somewhat Unreliable
- Unreliable

Articles rated on a scale of 0-64 for reliability and -42 to +42 for bias.

Overall source scores reflect weighted average of article scores and shown on truncated scale.

Some sources moved up to +/-2 units for visibility

For precise scores, article data, and more sources, go to adfontesmedia.com




ad fontes media

The Media Bias Chart®

Version 6.0

Most Extreme Left Hyper-Partisan Left Skews Left Neutral (minimal, balanced, or centrist) Skews Right Hyper-Partisan Right Most Extreme Right



There's a very hard to see box that the color doesn't show well, somewhat reliable are these extreme positions that you find on the far left and the far right.

Type Key

- Most Reliable
- Mixed Reliability
- Somewhat Unreliable
- Unreliable

Articles rated on a scale of 0-64 for reliability and -42 to +42 for bias.

Overall source scores reflect weighted average of article scores and shown on truncated scale.

Some sources moved up to +/-2 units for visibility

For precise scores, article data, and more sources, go to adfontesmedia.com




ad fontes media

The Media Bias Chart ®

Version 6.0

Most Extreme Left Hyper-Partisan Left Skews Left Neutral (minimal, balanced, or centrist) Skews Right Hyper-Partisan Right Most Extreme Right



Type Key

Most Reliable

Mixed Reliability

Somewhat Unreliable

Unreliable

Articles rated on a scale of 0-64 for reliability and -42 to +42 for bias.

Overall source scores reflect weighted average of article scores and shown on truncated scale.

Some sources moved up to +/-2 units for visibility

For precise scores, article data, and more sources, go to adfontesmedia.com




ad fontes media

The Media Bias Chart®

Version 6.0

Most Extreme Left Hyper-Partisan Left Skews Left Neutral Skews Right Hyper-Partisan Right Most Extreme Right

(minimal, balanced, or centrist)



Type Key

- Most Reliable
- Mixed Reliability
- Somewhat Unreliable
- Unreliable

Articles rated on a scale of 0-64 for reliability and -42 to +42 for bias.

Overall source scores reflect weighted average of article scores and shown on truncated scale.

Some sources moved up to +/-2 units for visibility

For precise scores, article data, and more sources, go to adfontesmedia.com

I have a couple of concerns about this but in general it's probably doing a good job. We should be aware of why these news organizations are in this position, I'll give some examples. You can see why Trump attacks the media if my arrow is neutral most would be judged to be skewing towards the left. Just an observation, as soon as a news organization skews right, their factual reporting drops off a lot faster than left. I think you can see that just from the chart.




ad fontes media

The Media Bias Chart®

Version 6.0

Most Extreme Left Hyper-Partisan Left Skews Left Neutral Skews Right Hyper-Partisan Right Most Extreme Right

(minimal, balanced, or centrist)



Type Key

- Most Reliable
- Mixed Reliability
- Somewhat Unreliable
- Unreliable

Articles rated on a scale of 0-64 for reliability and -42 to +42 for bias.

Overall source scores reflect weighted average of article scores and shown on truncated scale.

Some sources moved up to +/-2 units for viewability

For precise scores, article data, and more sources, go to adfontesmedia.com

A couple of observations, you see down here CNN and MSNBC, you might be surprised to see them heading into unreliable territory. Why would that be the case?




ad fontes media

The Media Bias Chart®

Version 6.0

Most Extreme Left Hyper-Partisan Left Skews Left Neutral Skews Right Hyper-Partisan Right Most Extreme Right

(minimal, balanced, or centrist)



Type Key

- Most Reliable
- Mixed Reliability
- Somewhat Unreliable
- Unreliable

Articles rated on a scale of 0-64 for reliability and -42 to +42 for bias.

Overall source scores reflect weighted average of article scores and shown on truncated scale.

Some sources moved up to +/-2 units for viewability

For precise scores, article data, and more sources, go to adfontesmedia.com

I want us to see this little clarification here, this is MSNBC and CNN TV. This is not the news you would look up online. So example, you have CNN television here, CNN web news is in the reliable, most reliable portion. So there is a difference between CNN and CNN.




ad fontes media

The Media Bias Chart®

Version 6.0

Most Extreme Left Hyper-Partisan Left Skews Left Neutral Skews Right Hyper-Partisan Right Most Extreme Right

(minimal, balanced, or centrist)



Copyright © 2020 Ad Fontes Media, Inc. | Methodology, licenses, and usage information available at adfontesmedia.com | Twitter: @adfontesmedia

June 2020

15

I want us to consider why you would find MSNBC TV so low down here? If you go to their media bias fact check that we discussed yesterday, you could go to that web page, it'll discuss their history, it shows where they use strongly emotional headlines which can tend to risk being clickbait. They have filed a number of fact checks but most of the reason they're filing these fact checks is because this being TV news organizations represented here, they tend to have *so-called experts* come in and speak, political pundits. Looking at the definition of pundits because they're not just political people, *an expert in a particular subject who is frequently called upon to give their opinions to the public.*




ad fontes media

The Media Bias Chart®

Version 6.0

Most Extreme Left Hyper-Partisan Left Skews Left Neutral (minimal, balanced, or centrist) Skews Right Hyper-Partisan Right Most Extreme Right



Type Key

- Most Reliable
- Mixed Reliability
- Somewhat Unreliable
- Unreliable

Articles rated on a scale of 0-64 for reliability and -42 to +42 for bias.

Overall source scores reflect weighted average of article scores and shown on truncated scale.

Some sources moved up to +/-2 units for visibility

For precise scores, article data, and more sources, go to adfontesmedia.com

So these are 24-hour news channels and there isn't 24 hours worth of news so they're going to ask these experts of different political views to come on and speak and give their perspective and opinion on what is happening. And their opinions and perspectives may not be factually correct. Then when you have their employees having to extend or stretch out the news, they can tend to be less careful about what they say. They can make lazy mistakes.




ad fontes media

The Media Bias Chart®

Version 6.0

Most Extreme Left Hyper-Partisan Left Skews Left Neutral Skews Right Hyper-Partisan Right Most Extreme Right



Type Key

- Most Reliable
- Mixed Reliability
- Somewhat Unreliable
- Unreliable

Articles rated on a scale of 0-64 for reliability and -42 to +42 for bias.

Overall source scores reflect weighted average of article scores and shown on truncated scale.

Some sources moved up to +/-2 units for visibility

For precise scores, article data, and more sources, go to adfontesmedia.com

[Politifact | Bad math at MSNBC: Bloomberg's ad spending wasn't enough to give every American \\$1 million](https://www.politifact.com/factchecks/2020/jun/18/msnbc/bloomberg-ad-spending-wasnt-enough-to-give-every-american-1-million/)

And this page gives an example of that, where they were reporting on the political candidacy of Bloomberg, he spent 500 million on advertising. The US population is 327 million people, so the news anchor says he could have given every person in the United States a million dollars and still have money left. It was a lazy comment with bad math. If you divide 500 million by 327 million, every person gets about \$1.20, not a million dollars. So it's laziness and trying to stretch the news out that causes them to make silly mistakes. That's why you would find MSNBC so low on the trustworthy level.




ad fontes media

The Media Bias Chart®

Version 6.0

Most Extreme Left Hyper-Partisan Left Skews Left Neutral Skews Right Hyper-Partisan Right Most Extreme Right



Type Key

- Most Reliable
- Mixed Reliability
- Somewhat Unreliable
- Unreliable

Articles rated on a scale of 0-64 for reliability and -42 to +42 for bias.

Overall source scores reflect weighted average of article scores and shown on truncated scale.

Some sources moved up to +/-2 units for visibility

For precise scores, article data, and more sources, go to adfontesmedia.com

If you take the opinions of political pundits carefully and be careful of the lazy comments of some of their hosts, you will find the reporting actually quite reliable. You can see that easily here with CNN.

Some of these sources are subscription, the New York Times, The Washington Post, you see them shared frequently on the media broadcast because they are good sources. But there are others: ABC, Vox, The Guardian, non subscription sources that are highly reliable.




ad fontes media

The Media Bias Chart®

Version 6.0

Most Extreme Left Hyper-Partisan Left Skews Left Neutral Skews Right Hyper-Partisan Right Most Extreme Right

(minimal, balanced, or centrist)



Type Key

- Most Reliable
- Mixed Reliability
- Somewhat Unreliable
- Unreliable

Articles rated on a scale of 0-64 for reliability and -42 to +42 for bias.

Overall source scores reflect weighted average of article scores and shown on truncated scale.

Some sources moved up to +/-2 units for viewability

For precise scores, article data, and more sources, go to adfontesmedia.com

I wanted to make one other observation, the first was an explanation of why you might find something like CNN and MSNBC down here, unreliable. Left leaning people have criticized 24-hour news channels for a long time.




ad fontes media

The Media Bias Chart®

Version 6.0

Most Extreme Left Hyper-Partisan Left Skews Left Neutral Skews Right Hyper-Partisan Right Most Extreme Right



Type Key

- Most Reliable
- Mixed Reliability
- Somewhat Unreliable
- Unreliable

Articles rated on a scale of 0-64 for reliability and -42 to +42 for bias.

Overall source scores reflect weighted average of article scores and shown on truncated scale.

Some sources moved up to +/-2 units for fact reporting due to proper sourcing and a clean record.

For precise scores, article data, and more sources, go to adfontesmedia.com


I want to discuss Common Dreams, you'll find it here on the left, it's quite out on its own left and up, it's just in the box of somewhat reliable. If you were to look up their fact check page, it's seen that they lean strongly left but a factual search showed they hadn't filed a single fact check. They couldn't find a single article that had failed on its fact checking. So on this chart they put it as somewhat reliable but on the media bias page they're rated high for factual reporting due to proper sourcing and a clean record. So there are limits with charts.



ad fontes media

The Media Bias Chart®

Version 6.0



Type Key

- Most Reliable
- Mixed Reliability
- Somewhat Unreliable
- Unreliable

Articles rated on a scale of 0-64 for reliability and -42 to +42 for bias.

Overall source scores reflect weighted average of article scores and shown on truncated scale.

Some sources moved up to +/-2 units for visibility

For precise scores, article data, and more sources, go to adfontesmedia.com

I just want us to consider where we would stand. If we were to take prophecy, would we see prophecy is having a media bias where it immediately approaches Donald Trump as Hitler? I would suggest yes. That just immediately places us in a left position where we view Donald Trump through that lens. So if we say Donald Trump is Hitler, first of all there's a danger that that sounds very emotional, I think we would argue it's just a factual recording of prophecy.




ad fontes media

The Media Bias Chart®

Version 6.0

Most Extreme Left Hyper-Partisan Left Skews Left Neutral (minimal, balanced, or centrist) Skews Right Hyper-Partisan Right Most Extreme Right



Type Key

- Most Reliable (Green dashed box)
- Mixed Reliability (Yellow dashed box)
- Somewhat Unreliable (Orange dashed box)
- Unreliable (Red dashed box)

Articles rated on a scale of 0-64 for reliability and -42 to +42 for bias.

Overall source scores reflect weighted average of article scores and shown on truncated scale.

Some sources moved up to +/-2 units for viewability

For precise scores, article data, and more sources, go to adfontesmedia.com

If you were to go back to prior Civil War times and you were to find a northern newspaper that posted an emotionally titled article about the evils of slavery, and then you were to see a southern newspaper that wrote an emotionally titled article about how escaping slaves were impacting the financial stability of white families, that's two media biases, two emotional headlines. Would you look at both of them the same?




ad fontes media

The Media Bias Chart®

Version 6.0

Most Extreme Left Hyper-Partisan Left Skews Left Neutral Skews Right Hyper-Partisan Right Most Extreme Right

(minimal, balanced, or centrist)



Type Key

- Most Reliable
- Mixed Reliability
- Somewhat Unreliable
- Unreliable

Articles rated on a scale of 0-64 for reliability and -42 to +42 for bias.

Overall source scores reflect weighted average of article scores and shown on truncated scale.

Some sources moved up to +/-2 units for viewability

For precise scores, article data, and more sources, go to adfontesmedia.com

No, despite them both having a bias, one is reasonable one is not. One you still may face confidence in and one you will not. We have to be careful with emotionalism. But I do not have a problem if a news source has a left-leaning bias. Sometimes you see these organizations bring in right leaning commentators writing right leaning opinion articles so they can appear more balanced.




ad fontes media

The Media Bias Chart®

Version 6.0

Most Extreme Left Hyper-Partisan Left Skews Left Neutral Skews Right Hyper-Partisan Right Most Extreme Right

(minimal, balanced, or centrist)



Type Key

- Most Reliable
- Mixed Reliability
- Somewhat Unreliable
- Unreliable

Articles rated on a scale of 0-64 for reliability and -42 to +42 for bias.

Overall source scores reflect weighted average of article scores and shown on truncated scale.

Some sources moved up to +/-2 units for viewability

For precise scores, article data, and more sources, go to adfontesmedia.com

So the Washington Post will have one particular writer who defends Trump on the pandemic, defends on Trump on racism. So this news source seems to be more center and less left. I'm not so concerned about the media bias, there is a concern with the emotionalism where it can manipulate feeling. What we should be careful about is their fact-checking record if they're using information correctly.




ad fontes media

The Media Bias Chart®

Version 6.0

Most Extreme Left Hyper-Partisan Left Skews Left Neutral Skews Right Hyper-Partisan Right Most Extreme Right

(minimal, balanced, or centrist)



Type Key

- Most Reliable
- Mixed Reliability
- Somewhat Unreliable
- Unreliable

Articles rated on a scale of 0-64 for reliability and -42 to +42 for bias.


Overall source scores reflect weighted average of article scores and shown on truncated scale.

Some sources moved up to +/-2 units for viewability

For precise scores, article data, and more sources, go to adfontesmedia.com


You don't need a very large amount of news sources. There's a number in that box that I already mentioned. Sometimes when I see a news article and you'll see this spoken on the crash course series, once you have a number of sources that you trust look for that story in all of them. Because if one has filed a fact check it's unlikely that they've all made the same mistake to the same degree, and it'll start to show.

1. Model of agriculture
2. Revolutions
3. Omega ancient Israel
4. Alpha modern Israel
5. † as Priest




MSNBC (tv) ≠ OAN

With this chart it's good to one degree, but I don't believe it's 100% accurate which is a common problem with charts and graphs. I gave two reasons for that. It's going to place MSNBC TV on a similar fact level to One America Network. I don't believe that's a reasonable comparison. If you haven't heard about one American Network, they are not the safe source. It's conspiracy theories and propaganda.




1. Model of agriculture
2. Revolutions
3. Omega ancient Israel
4. Alpha modern Israel
5. ☩ as Priest




So like any chart it needs a careful analysis, understand why MSNBC TV was failing, OAN is deliberate propaganda. MSNBC TV can make lazy mistakes and call experts in to give opinions that we may not agree with, and MSNBC TV may not even agree with. So the chart would make them just about the same and they are not.

MSNBC (tv) \neq OAN




1. Model of agriculture
2. Revolutions
3. Omega ancient Israel
4. Alpha modern Israel
5. † as Priest




MSNBC (tv) ≠ OAN


Someone asked about Voice of America. They have a good history recently; I'm not going back to the Cold War. But following the news, what Trump has recently done to this news source it is struggling.



1. Model of agriculture
2. Revolutions
3. Omega ancient Israel
4. Alpha modern Israel
5. ☩ as Priest




MSNBC (tv) ≠ OAN



A couple of thoughts, each have to check what is in their own country in their own language. I would suggest you need to do a similar investigative process. Look for what they say about an issue that you are sure about. For example, if they start to say there were never ever any Russian troops in Ukraine you know it's immediately failed a fact check. Look for motive language and where they stand on certain issues.


1. Model of agriculture
2. Revolutions
3. Omega ancient Israel
4. Alpha modern Israel
5. † as Priest




At the moment it's easy because you can just start to see what they say about the pandemic and about Donald Trump. Issues where facts are not hard to find. Pay attention to what country that news comes from. Sky News Australia is far right propaganda. Sky News UK is actually probably in that reliable box that we saw on the media bias chart. You only know by either the UK or AU.

MSNBC (tv) ≠ OAN

uk / au
 ✓ ✗




1. Model of agriculture
2. Revolutions
3. Omega ancient Israel
4. Alpha modern Israel
5. † as Priest




Yahoo news: just my own observation in Australia they're more like tabloids, it's all about celebrities. So I don't use Yahoo news Australia. I deliberately put in a US if I want their position because I believe their reporting is more reliable.

MSNBC (tv) ≠ OAN

uk / au
 ✓ ☒




1. Model of agriculture
2. Revolutions
3. Omega ancient Israel
4. Alpha modern Israel
5. ☩ as Priest




Don't be afraid to look for news outside of your country, we are not nationalistic so we shouldn't be with our news sources. Even if you're in a country like Australia or Britain that speaks the English language you still need to double check the news sources coming from your own country and compare and contrast them with other countries. Obviously if you don't speak English that becomes more challenging and more important.

MSNBC (tv) ≠ OAN

uk / au
 ✓ ☒




1. Model of agriculture
2. Revolutions
3. Omega ancient Israel
4. Alpha modern Israel
5. ☩ as Priest




Try and use the most reliable sources but I gave an example with Common Dreams, why I don't find them unreliable, they've never failed a fact check but they have a political perspective that in today's world becomes unavoidable. That said I first heard of them yesterday, there's enough in that box to keep with what is described as the most reliable.

MSNBC (tv) ≠ OAN

uk / au
 ✓ ☒




1. Model of agriculture
2. Revolutions
3. Omega ancient Israel
4. Alpha modern Israel
5. † as Priest




I'll give another example: I was searching for information on a particular subject, it related to Islam. In Google search I came across an article from this news organization TRT World. The perspective of the article was what I wanted to hear, it read really well, it seemed to share the perspective I was developing; there's nothing in the name to indicate where it comes from but I wasn't familiar with the source. So I researched the source. This news source is owned by Turkish Radio and Television Corporation, a news source owned by the corporation which is owned by the Turkish government.

MSNBC (tv) ≠ OAN

uk / au
 ✓ ☒




1. Model of agriculture
2. Revolutions
3. Omega ancient Israel
4. Alpha modern Israel
5. ☩ as Priest




In 2018 Reporters Without Borders ranked Turkey 157th in the world for press freedom from among 180 countries. Media bias fact check describe this as a pro-government propaganda source. And because Turkey has a right-leaning government the news organizations that the government directly controls are right-leaning. Even though what I read in the article sounded good to me I discarded it, we have to know the sources of our news.

MSNBC (tv) ≠ OAN

uk / au
 ✓ ☒




1. Model of agriculture
2. Revolutions
3. Omega ancient Israel
4. Alpha modern Israel
5. ☩ as Priest




If you can't identify a source, there's hundreds of these little videos being shared on that, of some man panting into a camera Jacinda Ardern is about to declare martial law. Those sources are just straight conspiracy theories and I'm horrified when I see them shared and believed inside the movement, they'd be at the bottom of that chart with Infowars. If it's happening Oceania, then it's happening in other places too.

MSNBC (tv) ≠ OAN

uk / au
 ✓ ☒




1. Model of agriculture
2. Revolutions
3. Omega ancient Israel
4. Alpha modern Israel
5. † as Priest




MSNBC (tv) ≠ OAN

Avoid opinion pieces; if you are unsure of the source, somewhat unsure of the writer and they use extremely emotionally manipulative language.

uk / au
 ✓ ☒




1. Model of agriculture
2. Revolutions
3. Omega ancient Israel
4. Alpha modern Israel
5. ☩ as Priest




I hope this has helped someone, it's a fascinating subject to look into information in this information age. Not everyone wants to pay for subscriptions, that's one reason behind having a media broadcast. But there are good sources that are not subscription, it's not completely necessary. We just need to have some tools in our kit of how to access that. One thought about what we're doing when it comes to information, the purpose of the media broadcast is not just to share with you current events, there's a greater purpose than keeping up with current events.

MSNBC (tv) ≠ OAN

uk / au
 ✓ ☒



1. Model of agriculture
2. Revolutions
3. Omega ancient Israel
4. Alpha modern Israel
5. ☩ as Priest





If this is that chart, many of us have grown up around this type of news source; bad on facts and far right leaning. There is a real danger that in just saying from now on I'm going to follow current events from here, that's not where I want you to follow current events -- opposite side is correct. It may help you understand one current event correctly, but we are hardwired. Like a computer even if we start taking in the good information, our worldview, our perspectives, our very character is programmed for the wrong information source.


MSNBC (tv) ≠ OAN

uk / au

✓ ☒





1. Model of agriculture
2. Revolutions
3. Omega ancient Israel
4. Alpha modern Israel
5. ☩ as Priest





So the main reason is not to follow current events, we need breaking and remolding outside of Evangelical nationalistic worldviews. The way they manipulate history and sometimes subtly devalue certain groups of people. So we're not just looking at information on current events, we want to see information correctly as far back as we can go. Looking into what were the vandals like, what's our perspective of the crusades, because even that can all be influenced by right leaning Christian nationalism.

MSNBC (tv) ≠ OAN

uk / au
 ✓ ☒



1. Model of agriculture
2. Revolutions
3. Omega ancient Israel
4. Alpha modern Israel
5. † as Priest





I'm returning again to the subject of the Apis Bull, just following current events from a good source is not enough, it will create the form but not the character, not the spirit. So then this comes down to personal education and this is a purpose also behind the media broadcast. This is where documentaries particularly Frontline documentaries are very good. They can go back into past history and help re-educate us.


MSNBC (tv) ≠ OAN

uk / au

✓ ☒



1. Model of agriculture
2. Revolutions
3. Omega ancient Israel
4. Alpha modern Israel
5. † as Priest





We won't have the right perspective of Black Lives Matter from just following current events from this source if we've been in the bottom right corner. We need to remake our thinking going back 400 years of history and much of that becomes a personal work. But the failure to do that is one of the reasons we developed the form and not the spirit of equality. I want to repeat that because it's the point of my study, **to not remake our worldview by appropriate education develops in us the form and not the spirit.**


MSNBC (tv) ≠ OAN

uk / au

✓ ☒





1. Model of agriculture
2. Revolutions
3. Omega ancient Israel
4. Alpha modern Israel
5. ☩ as Priest




An example, what I have heard over and over and over again in this movement is men suddenly or openly accusing us of the following: there's a board just for an example. On this board (we've remade it, or someone has) and there are seven women and six men. So now men are coming up saying you don't practice equality. **What is the underlying deep-set fear behind white nationalism?**

Women 7
Men 6





- 1. Model of agriculture
- 2. Revolutions
- 3. Omega ancient Israel
- 4. Alpha modern Israel
- 5. ☩ as Priest




Women 7
Men 6

This is proud boys, this is all of them, what is the foundation of white supremacy?





1. Model of agriculture
2. Revolutions
3. Omega ancient Israel
4. Alpha modern Israel
5. ☩ as Priest




You can have your culture, you can do what you like, be who you want, but don't replace us. To go extinct, it's known as the great replacement, fear mobilizes people. It's that powerful emotion that under sets white supremacy, it underlied slavery. If you free black people and they have a lot of children that they'll start replacing the white population in America. At one point there was many Irish Catholic immigrants, so they are afraid of replacement by Irish Catholics, so they'll persecute them.

Women 7
Men 6





1. Model of agriculture
2. Revolutions
3. Omega ancient Israel
4. Alpha modern Israel
5. ☩ as Priest




People from Muslim countries, they can tend to have a lot of children, immigrants from some backgrounds can have a lot of children. Even particularly Vladimir Putin speaks about the great replacement in Europe, destroying what he describes as their white Christian identity and culture. So what they fear is replacement, it underlines white supremacy and I wish I could show you how clearly it's demonstrated, the way in this movement it underlines sexism as men in this movement are afraid of being replaced in power structures by women.

Women 7
Men 6





1. Model of agriculture
2. Revolutions
3. Omega ancient Israel
4. Alpha modern Israel
5. ☩ as Priest




Many men in the movement thought equality looks like this: I am a man; I'll move over a little and make room for a woman in teaching and leadership that I still expect to criticize and control. And then when you start saying that's not equality, this fear rises up and it demonstrates itself in these comments.


Women 7
Men 6




1. Model of agriculture
2. Revolutions
3. Omega ancient Israel
4. Alpha modern Israel
5. ☩ as Priest




If you have a predominantly black neighborhood in the United States with a predominantly black school, you'll find it like this, this is the black school, and this a predominantly white school because segregation still exists.





Now if you had \$50,000 to give to these schools at the moment what could happen is they'll give \$40,000 to the white school \$10,000 to the black school. I'm using this as a parable. Now we have \$50,000, how would you divide it?




1. Model of agriculture
2. Revolutions
3. Omega ancient Israel
4. Alpha modern Israel
5. ☩ as Priest






What these men would say, staunch equality: you need to give the white school \$25,000 and the black school \$25,000, this is still built on the same fear of replacement. The only way to make sure that someone doesn't become over you is try to keep your foot on their neck. So the complaints we get in this movement is that we do not do that, we do not practice that. Using this as a parable I would suggest we give 10 to the white and 40 to the black till we get to equity, to equality.



1. Model of agriculture
2. Revolutions
3. Omega ancient Israel
4. Alpha modern Israel
5. ☩ as Priest




Equity until you get to equality, this is affirmative action, it's the only way to bring equality when you have 6,000 years of suppression. The failure to recognize this we see it through sexism throughout the world and this also comes down to education. They say they are in the correct source; their worldview is in the incorrect source. It's the form and not the spirit because even though the imbalance is so obvious, they have not educated themselves to see it and empathize with it.




1. Model of agriculture
2. Revolutions
3. Omega ancient Israel
4. Alpha modern Israel
5. ☩ as Priest




So when we're in Uganda and say there's 50 men and 10 women, and we say the front row is women only and not everyone gets to speak in class, we're asking the questions directly to them and if you're a man don't raise your hand. A few individuals would say that's not equality and our response is, "we know, we're not trying to practice equality." The inequality and suppression has been so bad for so long, not that long ago you had almost entirely male schools, in some places you had a hundred men in the movement and four women, those four women are not going to get an equal amount of attention to four men, we will practice affirmative action until that situation reaches equality.




1. Model of agriculture
2. Revolutions
3. Omega ancient Israel
4. Alpha modern Israel
5. ☩ as Priest






This is not an African problem, this is not a problem restricted to one part of the world, this is a European problem. You can see if Europe has a problem with nationalism and racism, and it severely does, the two issues are inseparable. There's a reason that the racist group proud boys are men only; because you cannot separate sexism and racism, nationalism. This is a European problem, it's a French World problem too. Tamina said Europe is heading into a bad place at high speed.





1. Model of agriculture
2. Revolutions
3. Omega ancient Israel
4. Alpha modern Israel
5. ☩ as Priest



We need to not just follow current events; we need to educate. It runs deeper than many of us are willing to see in our own spheres of influence and these comments demonstrate why we have the form and not the spirit. Women can do it to other women: when you see a couple divorce the woman says you don't understand, she's really bad with money so the fault is equal. What should the response be? First of all, there is no excuse for abuse. And second, why are some married women in this movement not understanding how to open a bank account and budget correctly?






1. Model of agriculture
2. Revolutions
3. Omega ancient Israel
4. Alpha modern Israel
5. ☩ as Priest




It's because of a lifetime of sexism and suppression. So when the thoughts are shared, she isn't good with money therefore she carries fault for that, women can do this to other women, it's a demonstration of the form and not the spirit, **it's a lack of vaccinating ourselves, educating ourselves.** Because the entire purpose of education is to develop empathy and you won't just say she's just bad with money, you'll look at who was her father, who was her husband, what was her society and you'll start to see why she's bad with money and you'll recognize at who's door the fault lies, what failed her.




6/21/2022



- 1. Model of agriculture
- 2. Revolutions
- 3. Omega ancient Israel
- 4. Alpha modern Israel
- 5. ☩ as Priest



These subtle perspectives that exist in Europe as much as everywhere else are demonstrations of how many of us have the form and not the spirit and I'm not discounting prophecy and inspiration. Prophecy and inspiration are not going to tell you how to respond to the Romani people, but they will tell you what you need to do about your perspectives. And prophecy is saying we need to re-educate not by just reading recent news but especially to go back and re-educate ourselves away from the wrong source to develop empathy.



Dear Lord in Heaven,

Thank you for our blessings. We see the heavy work we have ahead, so many of us have been set in a wrong mold for so long it's taking you 31 years now to try and get a people out of it, and you've given us a deadline. I pray that you will help us, remove us from apathy, may we make the effort required so we are fit for purpose, fit to represent you. I pray this in Jesus' name, Amen