Brain Massage[®]: Show No. 702 Vacation Special: Acosta The Accoster / Who Killed Khashoggi?/ The Anglican Church Neuters GOD! But Female Deities Are No Problem.

Original Air Date: 11.24.18

Jerry Scheidbach



Segment.01 Hello. I'm Dr. Jerry Scheidbach, pastor of the Lighthouse Baptist Church in Santa Maria, CA—and your brain masseur—get ready for your brain massage.

I'm wrapping up our vacation — we've had a wonderful time together! Looking forward to getting back into the saddle — we plan to return Wednesday — I'll be back in my pulpit at the Lighthouse Wednesday night. These things called vacations — the word comes from the French word *vacare*, which means to be unoccupied — have some merit — I am already feeling recharged and ready for a return to full service. I trust you have enjoyed your Thanksgiving Holiday — and you are looking forward to Christmas.

- $\begin{array}{ll} 9 & \text{What I'm going to do is throw down some commentary on some recent issues} -- \text{ and} \\ 10 & \text{intersperse that with some Christmas music and maybe I'll thrown in a Psalm or two} -- \\ 11 & \text{let's get started.} \end{array}$
- 12 It's time for your Brain Massage.
- 13 [TRUTH]

1

2

- 14 What is the Brain Masseur's take on Acosta accosting the President and the Court's ruling
- regarding his WH Press Pass creds? What about Trump's decision on the Crown Prince
- 16 Saud of Saudi *Mohamed bin Salman* did the prince order the killing of Jamal
- 17 Khashoggi?
- 18 (Sounds like a Japanese name anyway)
- Okay, let's start here. I can't say I trust the CIA's assessment it's ambiguous. It is not a definitive report and the MSM are disingenuous in the way they are reporting on this what a surprise. And you surely get why Trump and his cabinet would be suspicious and careful about moving aggressively on intelligence that is not 100% actionable on a matter of such importance.
- The CIA I repeat, the CIA has NOT definitively determined the culpability of the Crown Prince in the murder of the erstwhile journalist. There does seem to be some evidence he was supportive of the riddance of Khashoggi who was increasingly annoying the family of Saud, but whether he ordered the killing of Khashoggi (sound Japanese) continues to be denied by the Saudis and emphatically by the Crown Prince himself, and the king and the rest of the family is standing by his denials.
- Personally, it's not the sort of thing that would surprise me coming from this family, why
 America continues to entangle herself with this crowd puzzles me and probably has a lot
 to do with things I am not privy to —I hope it is not simply about oil and arms deals and
 economics. In fact, I'm certain it has more to do with national security concerns that are
 tied to Middle East stability, an need to protect the interests of our Israeli friends while

keeping our Iranian enemies at bay, and an interest in avoiding driving the Sauds into Russian or Chinese hands — you know, a lot of secret squirrel stuff like that.

I certainly hope Trump's simplistic answer — that he did not want to upset American and world economic and oil interests — was not all there is to it. I agree that it would be inappropriate to dissolve all ties with Saudi Arabia over this alleged human rights abuse when neither Obama, nor Clinton, nor any President would dissolve ties with China over, say, Tiannamen Square — something that happened right in front of our eyes, or when Iran cracked down on a move for freedom back in the day — and Obama ignored their plea for help — the hypocrisy of the left is appalling — but more on that later — so, I get it! It would not be appropriate to cut off ties to Saudi Arabia unless we are willing to cut off ties with Russia, China, and Turkey too, by the way, with Pakistan, and, well, you name it — these countries routinely abuse the human rights of Christians, and other dissidents — they kill, torture, imprison, journalists, refuse to allow free speech, and all the things that American journalists cherish, except when it comes to Kim Jung Ill or — you know what I mean? The swamp sludge is thick with Hypocrisy and almost impossible to wade through —

But for my part, I want nothing to do with countries that refuse to recognize the inalienable rights of all men. These rights are GOD given and they are the birth right of mankind.

While Trump sounded like he was subordinating human rights to our economic plight — I think I've learned how to read this President — it's really simple — he refuses to allow the left to manipulate him into doing something for purely political purposes.

So, the stakes are way to high for President Trump to allow himself to be manipulated by the hate-Trump media into taking action based on allegations that are not 100% proved. The more serious the allegation, the more serious the consequences of action, the more necessary it is that the evidence be compelling. If there is any room for, ready for this? "reasonable doubt" (remember that old yarn?) — he would be foolish to act on it when the consequences of action are in this case so very, very serious. But, again, the Left is taking the sledge hammer to yet another valuable, cherished, American ideal — the bar has always been set at "beyond reasonable doubt" — now they want to lower it to a believable allegation — if it's believable, that's enough for the Left. A believable allegation warrants investigation but does not warrant judgment.

I think Trump is on the right track in the Khashoggi matter. As for his former connections with Bin Laden — well, after some investigation into that matter, there is reasonable doubt that he was ever actually allied with Bin Laden and there is plausibility to the argument that in fact he had a falling out with Osama Bin Lying — after the conflict with Russia in Afghanistan, and that the issue was concern that Osama continued the war beyond the conflict with Russia and was beginning to set his sites on targets beyond the Russian occupation of Afghanistan. On the other hand, there is this picture of Khashoggi holding an RPG in the company of Bin Laden — so!

I'll be right back!

- 76 [Break etc.]
- 77 Segment.02 Hello. Welcome back! I'm Dr. Jerry Scheidbach, pastor at the Lighthouse,
- your brain masseur, and Paul Revere's lantern lighter, lighting the lamps in the church
- belfry arch, signaling the enemy is on the march, an enemy that would steal from us our liberty.
- What is the Brain Masseur's take on Acosta accosting the President and the Court's ruling regarding his WH Press Pass creds?
- 83 And what's Roberts flapping about there are no Obama judges, and Clinton judges, and 84 Reagan judges, and Trump judges? Of course there are — all we are saying is there are 85 judges nominated by Reagan, judges nominated by Clinton, Bush, Obama — no body is 86 suggesting these Presidents own these judges in any way. Obviously, when a President 87 nominates a judge, he does so because he believes that Jurist shares some particular values 88 in common with the President — that has certainly become the issue, and increasingly so 89 since Roe — since the Court became a legislating branch of government, since the Court 90 politicized itself by weighing in on social conscience issues and making rulings that 91 amount to legislation.
- Acosta is well named he is an accosting sort of fellow to *accost* is to address boldly or aggressively Acosta accosted the President during the fateful press conference you've all seen the video, you've heard about this ad nausea the guy is just rude. The Left has become a Party of rude, mean-spirited, bullies. It's sad!
- But that is what Socialism does to people it makes them mean! Millions have been murdered and had their rights abused in the name of Socialism Socialism is anti-social, and it's anti-human rights. The cruelest people of history have been socialists Lenin, Hitler, Pol Pot and that only gets us started. Have you ever heard of the China Democratic Socialist Party? Is that what you want for America? And they all get their power over the people the same way promising them free cheese.
- You know that mice die in mousetraps because they do not understand why the cheese is free. Think about it!
- Anyway, Acosta the accoster had his WH press pass revoked and he sued with CNN's backing and a court ordered the White House to return the press credentials to Acosta and the media make it sound like Trump suffered this great loss and Acosta won and they make it out like it's about free speech and it's all nonsense.
- Essentially, the court said the White House (that is, Trump) needs to establish rules that apply equally to everyone; it's a matter of due process and not first amendment rights, since no one was denied their first amendment rights of free speech or a free press. The fact is, the President is not obliged to hold press conferences and there is no free speech infringement involved in denying someone access to the President.
- Everyone forgets Obama's use of the Espionage Act to harass reporters Times Reporter Ali Watkins, Fox News reporters James Risen, and Rosen. Risen wrote, shortly after
- 115 Trump's election: "If Donald J. Trump decides as president to throw a whistle-blower in

- jail for trying to talk to a reporter, or gets the F.B.I. to spy on a journalist, he will have one man to thank for bequeathing him such expansive power: Barack Obama."
- But, of course, today's anti-Trump press corps for a corpse it is a pack of Zombies with only one thing on their small minds "eat Trump's brain," brings none of this out.
- 120 Anyway, I agree with the court's ruling. Not real sure I get the connection of this case to 121 the fifth amendment, and its extension in the 14th amendment — that is, I'm not clear on 122 how telling a reporter he is not welcome to a press conference actually deprives a right — 123 I mean, the due process right is connected to, well, rights, right? — a right to life, or a 124 right to liberty, or a right to property. Does anyone have a right to life claim connected 125 with being invited to a press conference with the President? Does anyone have a *right of* 126 property associated with an invitation to a press conference with the President, or a right 127 of liberty — does everyone, or anyone, have a right of liberty guaranteeing an invitation to
- participate in a press conference provided by the President? See what I mean?
- These press conferences are not a right of the people they are a service provided at the pleasure of the President, and an invitation to attend is a courtesy extended to the press
- who are invited at his pleasure and they have no obligation to attend if the President
- withdraws an invitation to an unruly guest to his press conference, isn't that his business
- 133 to do so?
- 134 I suppose one could argue a sort of "right of way" has been established by long use is
- there a sort of adverse possession of a right to attend the press conferences established by
- the fact that for years this is something President's have done? Is there a claim of
- 137 "property right" on the part of the media whose "property in trade" is news, to have access
- to these press conferences if any other competitor does? You see how convoluted this is?
- Where is this judge coming from on this?
- I'll have to examine it longer I'm on vacation at present, so! haha.
- Anyway, let's grant for the moment that there is a sort of "right" in the area of liberty? No!
- That is a stretch too far. But maybe in the area of "property" maybe, and I think it's a
- stretch, but maybe one could argue that if the President grants access to any media he has
- an obligation to grant access to all media but surely you can see how this could become
- problematic and so, if we accept this notion, it might be reasonable to argue in order to
- withdraw that right, there must be previously established rules of decorum to which all
- invitees are equally subscribed and there must be some formal procedure established
- whereby this presumed "right" of access is denied or curtailed, blah, blah I think you see what I mean.
- 150 I don't see any "rights" being denied here for which there would be any required due
- process. Acosta can print whatever he chooses and say what he chooses, but there is no right to take over a press conference and dominate it rudely. And what about his denial of

 $^{^1} https://www.washingtonpost.com/lifestyle/shocked-by-the-trump-aggression-against-reporters-and-sources-the-blueprint-was-made-by-obama/2018/06/08/c0b84d88-6b06-11e8-9e38-24e693b38637_story.html?utm_term=.ac0b76bdc5be$

- the access of others to the President by his rude behavior this is the most NON-story
- on which I have ever had the displeasure to offer commentary it's a sideshow.
- Acosta accosted the President and was rightly rebuffed for doing so. End of story!
- Here, enjoy!
- Segment.03 Hello. Welcome back! I'm Dr. Jerry Scheidbach, pastor at the Lighthouse, and
- your resting brain masseur.
- 159 I understand the Anglican Church has decided God is too masculine. They want to
- neutralize the gender of Deity at least the Christian Diety not Aphrodites, or Venus,
- or Amaterasu, or Hina, or Ireland's Morrigan all female deities no gender problems
- with these female deities so only the male deities need to be well, de-gendered, or
- neutered, shall we say. Although, I must say, I've heard no complaint about Zeus, no need
- 164 to neuter Zeus! Only the Christian GOD must be neutered. Is that tacit admission He is,
- after all, the only true GOD?
- Odd. It's like this back and forth I watched between Tucker and some Liberal Lady on the
- issue of toxic masculinity. He kept saying there was no definition of toxic masculinity,
- and she kept insisting there was and on that issue, Tucker made the mistake of going
- to a Dictionary of the English language where no such term exists, and forgot that the
- Liberal Lady was talking about some book a liberal wrote where this term was used to
- describe men that abuse women so in her mind it's a settled term in the nomenclature
- of American parlance, it's a, well, it's a politically correct term but Tucker hit it on the
- head when he asked for the meaning of toxic femininity why is it always something
- that bashes men, and especially white men? What is this all about?
- 175 It's about destroying the foundations of our society the bedrock upon which this
- country was founded the beliefs and values of white European men who back in the
- early 18th century hit upon the idea of the American Republic who happened to be
- 178 Christian in their values and perspective and worldview which perspective and worldview
- was informed by the Bible. It's about casting off Christian heritage it's about the raging
- of the heathen, saying, "we will not have that man (JESUS) to reign over us" just as
- 181 Jesus predicted and screaming, "let us break their bands asunder and cast away their
- 182 cords from us," as prophesied over 3,000 years ago in Psalm 2.
- But here is the thing for, well how long has it been when I was in Bible College
- doing my undergraduate work back in the 70s and taking courses in Contemporary
- Theology we were tracking theological trends, which included this idea that God is
- neither He nor She actually, what they wanted then was to make out that God was a
- 187 SHE, and then later it went to that God was neutered neither male nor female —
- gender neutral, and that was all back in the 70s and we, the hated "fundamentalists," were
- speaking out against this way back then and the Protestant churches, most of them,
- refused to listen, and their members continued supporting the corrupted denominations
- and even now, when these things come out, many complain about it and speak against
- it but continue to support those dead and putrifying denominations I'll tell you why we

193 194	can't get justice in the land — it is because we can't get it in the HOUSE of GOD — the Churches need to repent of having turned their backs on the GOD of the BIBLE.
195 196 197 198	Judgment will come — and many will be surprised because they are looking for it to fall on all the really bad people out there in the world — but my friend, it begins with the HOUSE OF GOD. The Church will be purged first. So I call on you, dear remnant, repent toward GOD and get ready — Ezekiel 9.
199	Okay, gotta go. See you in church.