



JUNE 20 AT 6:05 PM

Angry Mob Activism

Please subscribe to this page if you can

Recently, I happened across a bizarre tweet posted by a nonprofit working to abolish nuclear weapons. In the statement, the organization declared their mission to be an intersectional issue of grave importance to racial justice. The confusing tweet posted a link to a much lengthier statement that failed to make a convincing correlation, but contained much of the standard rhetoric of the social justice script used by corporations to offer empty assurances that they are the proper side of the issues, whether they are doing anything about those issues, or just demanding irrational leaps of the reader's imagination to create the impression that their work has always been vital to each and every social justice issue that anybody might justifiably be concerned about. Comments following the tweet almost universally mocked and ridiculed the organization for "going woke," a criticism that itself holds as little meaning as the empty rhetoric it attacked, as "woke" seems to defy any clear definition from those who most often employ the word.

When I see catch-phrase laden statements for social justice, posted by corporations and organizations, I am not disturbed that those entities have "gone woke" or that they are attempting to build a world that challenges my place in my own. To the contrary, it disturbs me to think that anybody is placated by social media posts and grandstanding statements coming from such unlikely sources, even as those statements almost always completely fail to outline any theory of action whatsoever.

While the theocratic right unifies to lobby for legislative efforts to overthrow our constitutional republic, their would-be opposition seems content to accept banal, anodyne statements of solidarity. This is not new. In fact, this has been going on for so long now that such statements seem to be



Lucien Greaves
creating Satanic Psalms

Become a patron

Tiers

Patron

\$1 per month



Show more tiers

Recent Posts



Movie Night After Hours

June 27 at
11:50 AM



**State
Capitols
have been
hosting
Sean
Feucht's
performances.
Now they
can host
Satanic
Planet.**

June 13 at
9:06 PM

held in higher regard than actual campaigns to achieve clearly defined social justice goals. "Statements," made on behalf of organizations, to my mind, have a certain responsibility to clearly state a goal and a plan of action for achieving it. All else is grandstanding and – as such grandstanding seems to have a placating effect while changing nothing – it is counter-productive.

The response from those who decry "woke" messaging is typically that the organization has been "hijacked" by a sinister "agenda." Lending to this appearance of "hijacking" is the growing list of organizations that have [ruptured from within](#) due to the prevalent "activist" approach of seeking out the enemy within while making little to no effort to confront the external issues clearly stated in the mission statements of those organizations.

Progressive organizations' leadership has long felt that they are walking on a razor's edge, the primary targets of their own membership. Last year, *The Intercept* reported:

In the long term, the organizations may become better versions of themselves while finally living the values they've long fought for. In the short term, the battles between staff and organizational leadership have effectively sidelined major progressive institutions at a critical moment in U.S. and world history. "We used to want to make the world a better place," said one leader of a progressive organization. "Now we just make our organizations more miserable to work at."

It is not that organizations are "more miserable to work at" because their management objects to an expansion in social justice, but because:

The environment has pushed expectations far beyond what workplaces previously offered to employees. "A lot of staff that work for me, they expect the organization to be all the things: a movement, OK, get out the vote, OK, healing, OK, take care of you when you're sick, OK. It's all the things," said one executive director.

And there too, the objection is not necessarily that any of the demands are for unjust causes, but that the demands seem to follow a pattern of spiraling into directions well outside the scope and capabilities of the organization. Organizations that attempt to do everything at once soon fall into a confused and dysfunctional state, achieving nothing at all.

The Satanic Temple has tried to mitigate this culture of internal dissent by restricting statements to tangible calls to action and making room for individual internal coalitions and committees to devise action plans for approaching the issues they are most passionate about. Nonetheless, I still find myself



Inside SatanCon with Dex Desjardins

June 5 at 10:49 AM








SatanCon: pointless protests & incoherent uproar

May 28 at 2:30 PM



What is Hypnosis? A Chat with Author, Journalist & Hypnotist Lenny Flatley

May 13 at 1:11 PM




in a lose-lose situation in which it is often demanded that I make placating statements that not only violate my own standards for clear, meaningful communication, but that also run a high risk of eliciting responses of “stay in your lane” from the very people such statements are meant to appeal to.

During the protests of 2020, following the murder of George Floyd, many within TST were demanding to take to the street in our name, waving the Satanic banner. This is a common lose-lose scenario for us: a demand that we allow ourselves to be publicly represented at protests, or risk being seen as in opposition to the cause being championed. On the other hand, allowing that type of self-serving representation would also likely lead to outrage from at least some of those to whom it is meant to appeal. Met with censure from Black Lives Matter organizers, who may well have objected to Satanists opportunistically advertising themselves at their protests, I am not at all convinced that the very people who were insisting that they wave our banner wouldn't have turned around and blamed TST itself for exhibiting bad judgment. In any case, we asked TST members participating in the protests to do so in their personal capacity, opting to weather the storm of their outrage and accusations in preference to instigating a potential negative response from Black Lives Matter, which would find us weathering both their outrage and the slightly-delayed outrage of a part of our membership.

The inevitable need to make unwinnable decisions like these always builds an air of suspicion among those who believe they would have made the opposite decision, and that the results would have been perfectly ideal. An abundance of certainty in the virtue of grandstanding tactics, by those who most resort to them, seems to have led to an inability to even consider the likelihood of counter-productive outcomes. To far too many, it seems that there is a perception that their moral position is inextricably tied to their tactics, and to even investigate those tactics for their efficiency in reaching a prescribed goal is tantamount to repudiating the moral position itself. And so, despite the work I have been doing for social justice for 10 years now, paranoid vultures circle my every social media post nonstop, looking for any opportunity to construe anything in a negative light. Anything to prove that I too am an enemy within.

A few weeks ago, they rejoiced to find such an opportunity in a picture posted by one David Silverman, former head of American Atheists, who had recently stopped into The Satanic Temple headquarters. He asked to take a picture with me in front of our famed Baphomet monument – a request I had never turned down for anybody before (our headquarters is open to the public) and did not think to deny him. I thought



nothing of the interaction.






Days later, people were melting down around me. David Silverman, they told me, is a raving transphobe. There were immediate calls for my resignation, demands for a "statement," and of course accusations of all manner. *Was this man a friend of mine? How dare I?* Some of the inquiries struck me as bizarre. *Did I not have people on staff to vet such appointments for me?* Of course not. I do not have anybody, much less a staff, to manage my daily affairs. I don't have that kind of money. TST doesn't have that kind of money. It's all we can do to keep up with the invoices related to our campaigns and legal efforts.

At first, I merely explained to a few people that nearly everybody who comes into our HQ and catches me there ends up getting a picture with me and that I was not aware of any views held by Silverman regarding trans rights. The outrage persisted by parties uninterested in explanations. Ultimately, I nonetheless posted the following explanation for all to see, as internal outrage insisted it be made a public issue:

*There are numerous photos of me with visitors at HQ. A photo, circulating around recently, is no more significant than any of the others. I refuse to let this contrived non-story divert our attention from the crucial work TST is undertaking to support our LGBTQ community members. I have no desire to dignify assumptions that claim I agree with individuals simply because I have interacted with them. It is highly likely that I may interact with someone who doesn't reflect my personal views or TST's platforms again in the future. *I thought this went without saying, but I disagree with Tucker Carlson's worldview, for the record* The most vital element of our work at TST is ensuring the religious rights of our members, which includes enforcing the bodily autonomy of our LGBTQ members. Many of our transgender members are confronting restrictive legislation specifically targeting them. The focus must be on the work we are doing within TST to support our members, not a photo with someone whose opinions I did not vet prior to agreeing to take it. The focus must always be on the work needed to support our LGBTQ members, not just this month but always.*

I will not address this matter further because we all have more important work to do in opposing the very real tyrannical threats. Follow TST to hear more about our plans to support our LGBTQ members throughout the next few weeks.

This, of course, was insufficient. Soon enough, it was proclaimed that the "issue" wasn't actually that I had ended up in this picture unaware of the controversy, it was that I failed to apologize for it. It was that I failed to denounce




Silverman, and this all falls into a disturbing pattern of behavior that I display by not posting “statements” in support of trans rights. Soon, this occasion was used to validate any number of complaints. *Why, I was being asked, have we consistently refused offers to start a trans rights campaign, even as the idea has been suggested again and again?*






The last question struck me as disingenuous or completely uninformed. Yes, people have asked for a trans rights campaign, but to this day, nobody has proposed what such a campaign might look like. A campaign is more than a logo, social media page, and teleconferencing meetings. A campaign comes with a plan of action – a legal approach, specific goals. TST has an enormous number of trans membership within its ranks. Not being trans myself, and not being an expert on trans issues, I prefer their guidance regarding their needs and how we may assist them.

Incidentally, at the time of the Silverman post, we were days away from releasing instructions to our ministry for acting as potential expert witnesses in trans rights suits where trans Satanists might utilize the protection of Religious Freedom invoking our bodily autonomy tenet. The expert witness coaching was my own idea. It may not seem like much, but it was the best thing I could think of within our capabilities, and it currently stands as the one tangible idea to be proposed.

But the demand that I “denounce” Silverman struck me as particularly cruel and unnecessary. While it may matter little to anybody that it is cruel to Silverman, I think that the demands that I be forced into denouncing anybody is cruel to me. It’s cruel to demand that anybody “reform” themselves of a non-transgression by denouncing another. It is bizarre to assert that because I had been made aware that Silverman’s views on trans rights are controversial, and that I was caught in a picture with him, that I should then be obligated to scour his social media looking for those views and debating them publicly. If my pictured proximity to Silverman necessitates that I investigate the man with the predetermined understanding that I will denounce him, then I need to be honest about the entirety of interactions with him and why I thought nothing of being in a picture with him.

I met David Silverman when he was still head of American Atheists. He invited TST to speak at an American Atheists conference – one of the first people to break the ice for us, resisting opposition within his own organization that felt we had no place there. At the conference, he greeted us warmly and was unfailingly accommodating. Some time later, I heard that Silverman had been booted from American Atheists for, as I understood it, elevating a sexual partner to a board level position, as well as other accusations of misconduct. The





story did not interest me. I did not understand myself as having any continuing relationship to the man, and it all looked like a messy split that anybody would do well to avoid. By the time he came to our HQ I assumed him long retired from public exposure: independent and uninfluential.


Why is any of this relevant? It's still my entire relationship to the man, and if that's not relevant, then neither is my particular judgment upon anything he may say. If people have made up their minds about him, my personal insights are of little value, and I have no interest in re-litigating the transgressions of somebody I now understand to be entirely and effectively canceled.


One does not look upon the barbarity of medieval torture devices and ask, *but were those who were subjected to this guilty?* It does not matter if they were. The torture devices are still barbaric, and we can not help but be wary of those who would use them. *What kind of people were they? What kind of culture allows for such practices to be carried out?* Similarly, whether David Silverman is worthy of the highest levels of contempt, even if he were a serial murderer, what kind of person am I if I begin yielding to calls from angry mobs to denounce people publicly? What kind of people are we if we insist that such actions are the only remedial course? Who do we become if this is what we demand of people?

Of course I talk shit to people online – people attacking me, or people with real influence, fighting for real changes that have a real chance of impacting our lives for the worst. I do not go around looking to start social media wars with any and all people who post offensive content, especially in cases like Silverman's where it now seems that the majority of people following him on social media do so because they hate him.

But then the objection is raised that in failing to denounce him, I somehow signal to everybody else that I do not care about trans rights. Nothing could be further from the truth. It is in hopes of preserving the dignity of our community that I suggest we question angry mob tactics of activism that bring us no closer to reaching our common goals. I suggest that we take the higher, productive ground, and that we reason our solutions together before immediately taking to social media to express outrage first. I suggest that we not take the bait for pointless controversy, but try to argue our case articulately and tactically, when it stands a chance of being persuasive.

Some people might read this and think that it is "brave" of me to speak out. It is not. This is designed to be a lose-lose situation, and people will be dissatisfied either way. And, truth be told, despite the fact that the public social media posts about this were mostly disparaging of me, the lion's share





(more than double) the reactions I received were emails and background messages of support from people who grow weary of the torch-and-pitchfork knee-jerk reactions of their peers. We received more messages from people that were resigning from TST because of the way members of TST were reacting to the photo than we received resignations from people who were outraged at the picture itself. (Yes, I received a not-insignificant amount of supportive messages from people who identified themselves as trans as well.) A lot of the people who messaged me are fed up by what they see as raw malice. But there too, I beg to differ. We live in highly polarized times, and there is much at stake. I think that many of the people who were demanding that I denounce Silverman never thought to question whether such a demand was appropriate or not. It is my hope that some of them will read this and come to think about the situation differently. I also know that some will read this and find it to be a fresh outrage.

That's fine too.

Activism Essay Opinion



44 Likes

[Load more comments](#)

17 of 27



Bert Nielson

1w

Lucien, I appreciate your reasoned approach and comments on the matter. Several weeks back I was enjoying The Friendly Atheist podcast and Hemant mentioned that Eric Hovind had reached out about being in the Chicago area. He has asked if they could meet for lunch again. Hemant explained that although they have vehement disagreements on religion, they would avoid those topics on which they would not agree. It certainly helped in preparing to place the events in context.

I'm saddened that people felt it necessary to engage in a game of guilt by association. If we retreat ever into echo chambers and cease to engage with differing views, we'll only become polarized in our othering of those with whom we disagree.

The hardship of having to cut toxic people out of ones life should be based in the first tenet, care of oneself. By engaging, I can argue, convince, or at least make known in the hope of consideration. I would rather people choose to part ways with me over my views

than take the role of cutting them off. It is in part why despite having a Satanym, most people know me by my given name.

It does come from a place of privilege. I acknowledge that. It means I can also take active risks with fewer fears of repercussions. I can and should be a shield to the victim.

Fame and recognition make a lonely existence.

I remember you saying that you are unable to have friends in your home to ensure your own safety. Few humans are prepared for that level of social isolation. Having a familiar face show up at work, ask for a photo, and some level of positive interaction would be completely reasonable. Having your friends and colleagues then lambast you as a transphobe or disingenuously accuse you of condoning such ideals would feel like a complete betrayal.

I was hurt by Mormonism and will actively speak out against that sect, but I'd find it hilarious to have a photo of you and and of the leadership. I certainly wouldn't jump to the conclusion that you'd converted or were even sympathetic.

All this said, people are going to follow their feelings, whether it's rational or not. It's tragic to have them distance themselves from the community. Here's to hoping they'll remain allies in the causes TST supports.

Best,
Hellequin - the affable satanist

♡ 10



Social Venom

1w

Social media generally is more toxic and useless compared to irl grass roots, boots on the ground activism. It's easy for brands to tweet #pride and call it a day. "Rainbow capitalism" lasts as long as there is no backlash or loss of revenue. Also, the self cannibalism doesn't help. I've been in some communities where nothing actually gets done and felt like internal politics has everyone walking on eggshells. This tendency for people to get caught up in a hive mindset makes me nervous, evoking memories of the implosion of Atheist+ a few years ago. Seeing groups dox their own members for failing "purity tests" and fear of "bad optics" until the entire community disintegrates into a

cesspool. That fear is what gave me pause to jump headfirst into TST last year. Generally can't fully trust social media based activism/activists, too easy for anyone with varying agendas to do. Not sure what the solution is. Personally I'll keep supporting human and animal rights, by actually trying to help real life causes in my area. Hope more folx in general do that as well, instead of attacking our own endlessly while human rights are actively being stripped away.

♡ 3



Lucien Greaves

1w

The obsession with "optics" always seems to assume that the best optics are compliance in posting the standard empty scripts. That might be what some people want to see now, but I think that ultimately the best optics come from being honest and confronting issues in a reasonable manner. In the longterm, I think (I hope) that people will come to recognize this destructive behavior for what it is, and we'll look a whole lot better for being among those who hadn't resorted to their baser instincts in this troubled time. And we'll certainly be better off if we foster an internal culture that strives to make affirmative changes, instead of destructive purges.

♡ 7



[Load reply](#)



Beyond Binary Thinking Podcast

1w

A bold stance, and a shame it came to this. I recently shut down my charity dungeons and dragons game for disabled kids, because there was forever an outraged mob, angry in hindsight about revelations that came out about one or another of the players at our table. It's natural for groups to splinter, there's an optimal size, and you can't be all thing to all people. You will now attract some more weird free speech absolutists, I hope your don't become The Satanic Terfs, but it's a balancing act that's worth getting right.

♡ 1



Cheyenne

1w

People need to be held accountable. Especially cis white men that continue to advocate for their actions. As time goes on, there is back peddling and gaslighting continuing to happen. It's not hard to take a look inside and realize the wrongdoing. Doubling down and excuses are a huge privilege of cis white men

behavior and should be checked and called in at best. Sometimes being called in isn't enough and being called out is the next step. Say you fucked up, and you are sorry for the mistake. Say you will do better next time and sorry for hurting so many people that your actions affected. You sound like a fucking politician that we all claim to fight against which leave me personally feeling like you are a tyrant we are all fighting against. It's white supremacy, it's patriarchal privilege and over all words of a coward.

♡ 3 💬



Lucien Greaves

1w

What fuck up are you demanding that I apologize for here?

♡ 8 💬

[Load reply](#)



Magdalena

1w

I'd like to think that since I've been here long enough it gives me a right to have a valid opinion on the matter (or at least valid-ish).

As a nonbinary person myself, I didn't find any fault in your actions, especially at that time.

When asked in comments you stated: 'fuck transphobes.' and when asked 'Lucien, do you personally, support trans rights?' answered 'Always fucking have 100%!'

I might present myself as a die hard fan or whatever (which is not false) but I'm also capable of independent thinking and forming my own opinion.

Do you always do things that I like or agree with? No, of course not.

But this one? This one is just stupid. And / or wilfully ignorant.

What are the things I don't like? If, and only if, I find it beneficial to share with the group, I will.

(I had to edit some typos, I was using outdated and bugged version of the app! The only thing added is this note!)

♡ 4 💬



Erica Stumpf

6d

I'm glad you wrote this. It's exhausting, just as a general human, to constantly be walking on eggshells. And before anyone comes at me, I am a queer woman of color. People forget the right to offend. And people are fallible. I have plenty of friends that I fundamentally disagree with. We are all human. I hate the all or nothing mentality drilled into peoples brains.



Lucien Gr  es

6d

I feel as though most of the letters of support I've gotten behind the scenes have been from people who identify themselves within LGBTQIA+. That's partially probably because our demographics skew heavily in that direction, but I also think that some of the issue is that people who aren't part of that community are unfortunately convinced that they are being good allies when they take the approach that we witnessed here. What grows tedious is that they are most often the ones to suggest that none of the background I explored here matters in the least, all that matters is that the community was harmed, and the assumption is that the only way in which to rectify that is to balance it with my (metaphorical) blood. They speak about "the community that I've harmed" as though it's this collective infant that is only capable of emotional reaction, unable to engage in rational discussion or to consider the fact that the picture wasn't an endorsement of a viewpoint. There certainly are people within the LGBTQIA+ community that endorse Angry Mob Activism as well, but I think the larger problem is that so many people outside of marginalized communities have come to believe that Angry Mob Activism within those communities is the only true expression of those communities' wills. In some cases, it seems we have people who feel qualified to speak for all marginalized communities based on nothing more than the strength of their willingness to try to destroy anybody around them in those communities names.

 6








[Load reply](#)



Eugene Butler

6d

I can't speak for every single person who may have




contacted you about this issue, but it seems like some pertinent information may have been lost in the shuffle. Assumptions that you were familiar with David Silverman were not (AFAIK) made solely because of the photo. I believe a key ingredient to the assumptions **was Silverman publicly claiming you were friends in the post in question**!

You, apparently innocently and unintentionally, provided Silverman with a prop he immediately misused to publicly assert a familiarity and affiliation with you that does not exist. His public, false claim of an ongoing relationship (totally contradicted by your post here) resulted in substantial confusion: About the nature of his presence at the gallery, the nature of the photo, and even the nature of your and TST's beliefs. After all, familiarity with him on an ongoing basis (as Silverman falsely alleged) implies commensurate familiarity, and therefore toleration, of his ongoing beliefs and actions.

Correcting the mistruth at issue is neither cruel nor unnecessary, but a proportional and prudent response to a public, misleading statement about you, your deeply held beliefs, and the beliefs of the religion you continue to represent.

I appreciate that it may feel interpersonally uncharitable to explicitly and directly state "Nah, we're not friends. That guy bought a ticket and I take pictures with whoever wants them. I didn't know about and don't fuck with the odious trans-panic shit he's up to now." about someone who was friendly and hospitable to you in the past, but dragging you into his current nonsense, willfully creating a distraction from TST's pre-planned, important work on real issues, is not a friendly act and is, IMO, entirely worthy of the mild embarrassment that may result from public correction/clarification.

Lastly, and more generally, I think the "devoting all organizational resources to 'Vampire Castle'-style denouncements" vs "taking no steps to prevent people from willfully misrepresenting you" dichotomy elides some potentially fruitful middle-ground. You've been consistently and remarkably charitable with your time when publicly engaging with randos (such as myself), but interaction with public figures does come with the danger of creating an appearance of endorsement (especially if the figure subsequently misleads about



the nature of the interaction in order to create that appearance). It's, IMO, worth taking some steps to reduce the rate at which similar distractions might be produced. If being individually choosy feels too arbitrary or seems like it involves too much of a time commitment sifting through distasteful drama, maybe a blanket "No free clout if your name is blue on Wikipedia" photo policy could be the start of a short list of simple, defensive, prophylactic measures to decrease the frequency of unwelcome surprises like this in the future.



 **Lucien Greaves**

6d

I understand that, and I had no reservations against describing the entirety of my background with the man, as I did here. Calls for his denouncement went beyond that, however, as my explanations concerning the photo and my general unawareness of his controversial views served the work of disowning, but I was immediately under fire for still not denouncing. I know that not everybody could have seen the full scope of reactions that I saw, but from my perspective, I first heard that the picture was controversial almost simultaneous to my being sent screen shots of people denouncing me or making more vague statements clearly suggesting a high level of guilt on my part, I started hearing of and seeing demands for my resignations, people started telling me about emergency meetings where people were hysterical and calling for my head. People who I really thought wouldn't have done such things. To my mind, I simply thought that the appropriate thing to do would be to explain what the picture was and what it wasn't, which I tried to do. But then it doesn't stop. Then, suddenly, the scandal isn't about the picture, but that I replied "defensively," when what I should have done, I am told, is admit guilt anyways and stand trial. At least, that's what it seems to translate into to — though I know that the extreme reactions aren't shared by all my colleagues, nor are you necessarily aware of how bad it's been. I take a lot of abuse doing this job, and I expect it, and I weather it as well as I think anybody can. But when people were demanding that I resign, I realized that standing up for myself wasn't just about me — I could



never even feel comfortable passing my duties off to anybody else in an environment where people feel entitled to treat them in that way, an environment where something as circumstantial as the Silverman photo could not only find them immediately without a job, but with the unexpected assaults upon their character by friends, and a destroyed reputation. An organization isn't going to survive if people within it can do easily and immediately be destroyed over occasions like this. Days later, I received a letter from congregations, and that is where the story of this dialogue seems to begin for some who now wonder why I seem defensive, though that does still feel a bit disingenuous on my end. It is one thing to see the outrage from the public, it is another to see it initiated from sources internally who should have known better than to assume I'd suddenly become a transphobe. It was unbelievable to me to consider the time I had spent trying to think of what religious approach could best protect our trans membership, having come up with the expert witnessing approach, and then finding myself admonished by congregations that there is a pattern of my not having done enough, even as I've never received a proposal for a tangible approach to the issue from any of them. I just don't know how to talk to people, or if I should talk to people, when they say that my explanations of events don't matter, my thoughts don't even matter, and that all that matters, apparently, is that I vow to adopt these same brutal tactics in confronting perceived transgressions.



  6
Nickie Millington

6d

My friend, you state clear communication is one of your priorities. Yet, you have not replied to the NUMEROUS congregations and ministers that contacted you with a heart felt explanation of the situation.



Lucien Greaves

6d

I really have to push back against this bullshit revisionist history in which the first response of the congregations was to ask for a dialogue. First were the social media posts, the melt downs in meetings, the calls for my resignation.



Then, a request for "dialogue" from some of the same people who seem to insist that my opinion on these events don't matter in the first place.

♡ 4 💬



Nickie Millington

6d

I am not trying to revise history. That timeline may be true of some of the people who signed the letter, I had no way of knowing that. However, I know many of the people on the letter did NOT participate in the aforementioned actions. Our congregation leadership/ministers specifically took time to process the situation, as to not react inappropriately.

♡ 💬



Lucien Greaves

6d

I appreciate the effort to process and to react appropriately. It must be recognized, however, that I was treated the way in which I was treated, and the meeting is still requested for me to engage with people who responded the way they did. But even if that were not the case, I can't help but feel that the demand for a meeting shows a bit of a misunderstanding of TST structure to begin with. I have not managed and overseen congregations by design. We have tried to build separate pillars of the organization so as to decentralize power and provide multiple avenues for peoples' interests. In the heat of the accusations I more than once saw the bizarre claim that what the congregations do somehow makes money for me. The congregations pay nothing. Ordination comes with a cost, but that cost is charged to offset the expense of maintaining a ministry with online coursework. I do not work for the ministry. I was unaware that ministry felt I work for them. I have never asked anything of the congregations, but congregations should be well aware that they can submit proposals for campaigns and projects, and they should be well aware of how to do that. How can I not resent the fact that I've seen nothing in the way of any such proposals for trans rights, I myself proposed, and we rolled out, the one tangible approach we have, and yet I'm called upon to discuss the concerns of congregations that perhaps I've not done enough? We have made no demands of congregations in the way of



mandatory goals, progress reports, fundraising, quarterly or annual events, or local participation. We have given congregations our name, for which we get phenomenal work from some, but from others we get absolutely nothing at all until they decide they're angry about something, whereupon they scream their grievances to the world while seeking social media fame as a whistleblowing former insider. Such screaming always comes with accusations against me, despite my usually never having had any type of contact with these people whatsoever. The attacks come seeming to suggest that the social justice work we do happens despite who I am, when in reality it's the very work I'm doing, and it's the work the righteous whistleblower never participated in at all. I have given my life over to trying to build this organisation. I make barely enough money for my day-to-day as a result. Now I am being told that I "owe" an open heart-to-heart discussion with ministry, even as I do not trust some of them to treat it as an Inquisition. I am just in no mind to suffer that currently, and I feel justified in saying so.

♡ 8 💬



Ptah Paradoxia

6d

As a Minister of Satan via TST Ministry, and a member of the TST-IL congregation -- I will die on this hill, if I must, to continually voice my reasoned dissent for what I regard is an emotions-run-amok over-reaction by some -- not all. I do NOT agree with the congregation's statement issued to EM on the matter, for instance. ... To those who demand for denuncements, apology, and/or express bitter betrayal, etc, I assert: compassion must go ~both ways~ lest dysfunction ensues. If you ask me, those who demand for gestures of "compassion", as such, ironically demonstrate its lack or opposite in themselves. To capitulate to such demands is to surrender your moral character and standing to whatever whims of all-comers, damned be the truth or the reality in favor of the optics. Come what may from my repeatedly commenting as such, I care not. Insofar as others are free to call it like they see it, so am I.

♡ 7 💬





Lucien Greaves

5d

Thank you

♡ 2 💬



Join the conversation...

By becoming a patron, you'll instantly unlock access to 163
exclusive posts

40

Audio releases

61

Images

1

Link

52

Writings

12

Videos