



WHAT CONSPIRACY? ON THE NEFARIOUS PURPOSE, MEANS AND IDEAS OF GLOBALIST IMPERIALISM

Posted on June 1, 2023 by Wayne Cristaudo



Read [Part 2](#) and [Part 3](#).

Intelligence and the Global Imperialist Purpose of Disinformation, and Malformation

This is the first part of an essay in three parts. The second part is on the disinformation spread by the intelligence agencies and media of the US / European Alliance to destroy any nations that oppose their hegemony and the new world they are pushing for. It is also a 'review' of two books by Jacques Baud, *Governing By Fake News: International Conflict: 30 Years of Fake News Used by Western Countries* and *Operation Z*. The third part is a philosophical critique of the bad ideas that were the seeds of the modern metaphysical project that was the launching pad for the Enlightenment and the technocratic view of the world that accompanies it.

Introduction

The supporters of the world in which the Pharmaceutical Industrial Complex, the Tech Industrial Complex, the Media Industrial Complex, the Censorship Industrial Complex, the Military Industrial Complex, the Mass Killing of the Unborn Industrial Complex, The Mass Mutation of Children Industrial Complex, the Mass Brainwashing and Infantilizing of Minds through Entertainment, Media and Academic Complexes, the Mass Use of Sport for the Political Agenda Complex, and the Mass Religious Industrial Complex, and so forth believe that what they are doing is achieving human progress and emancipation, while its enemies are brainwashed, haters, bigots, and conspiracy theorists, who must be set straight, silenced, or reduced to penury, or imprisoned.

Yet they hate with little or no understanding of what the criticisms against them are (i.e., they really are bigots) and they readily denounce those who criticize them as the dupes of conspirators such as Vladimir Putin or QAnon, or white supremacists—allying a world historic figure (like him or not Putin is undeniably that) engaging in a geopolitical struggle for the fate of a people with lunatics in the basement or a bunch of retards, whose numbers are sizably swelled by FBI informants, at a bivouac playing with guns comes easily to the mental pygmies who see themselves as the great harbingers of what the social philosophers like to call 'the to come', and whose idea of thinking and building community is yelling hater, racist, homophobe or whatever two syllable word makes its way through the sludge of their brain synapses and into their vocal chords as they then proceed to vape them. Now that I have got that off my chest, let us examine what kind of criticisms of the globalist ruling class and

their paid-up enablers and dupes are being regularly dismissed as "conspiracy theories." At the same time allow me to demonstrate that the disinformation spread by our intelligence services is creating a misinformed public that is now malforming the new generation and their world.

Yes—There is a Coalition of Interests working to Create a Globalist Empire Presided over by Oligarchs and their Hired Help.

The forces that direct or enable the unipolar world view of 'progressivist' globalist corporatism and the US/ Western European hegemonic imperial axis (yes the EU is an empire) involves an overlapping set of contradictory interests and immediate objectives. The forces are constituted by oligarchs and global corporations, unions, NGOs and philanthropic foundations, elected politicians and radical political activists such as members of Antifa, the BLM, and Extinction Rebellion, government officials, military and intelligence officers, journalists, academics, entertainers and sportspeople, business professionals, school and even pre-school teachers, students and members of minority underclasses, amongst others. That sure sounds like a massive coalition—and it is.

But in many, even most, of these organizations it is not a matter of everyone in it agreeing with the values or designs—lots of corporate people, academics, teachers, journalists athletes (especially women in sports having to compete against biological men), may think what their organization is now normalizing is madness and socially destructive and that DEI and ESG are rubbish. But they know they have to keep their views to themselves, because their organization is no longer simply in the business of making money, or accumulating knowledge and instructing students in that knowledge, or informing an audience about who has done what and how that came to be: they are beholden to the values designated by and represented by their organization. They are part of the brand and hence representatives of the social legitimacy, value, and justice of the organization.

What matters is the pyramid nature of organizations and institutions, i.e. the values and 'designs', the dominant ethos—the ethos that one must comply with if one is to be appointed, retain one's job or get ahead within these organizations. What the Nazis called *Gleichschaltung*, the coordination or alignment of institutions and organizations by the party leadership and those beholden to them to achieve their political objective, is now the norm in what were previously identifiable as liberal democratic regimes, as the major parties form broader policy consensus that the electorate has no say in approving. Western political leaders who defy even some of these consensus quickly find themselves denounced by the media and other politicians as being "fascists" and "Nazis."

Employees who are openly critical of any number of the socio-political policies that leadership/management 'teams' of institutions, companies, or organizations have signed up to will lose their job, or have their career "stalled." The recent requirement in the first two divisions of the French football league to wear "pride" jerseys, or the WHO "Standards for Sexuality Education in Europe"—a "framework for policy makers, educational and health professionals and specialists"—which states that children under four should be instructed in the "enjoyment and pleasure when touching one's own body," "early childhood masturbation and discovery of own body and own genitals," and "have the right to explore gender identities"—are indicative of how policy makers, educationalists, corporations, and organizations intertwine to ensure that no part of society be free from the values, symbols and practices serving their objectives.

These objectives are anathema to billions of people on the planet. China, and Asia more generally, Russia, and much of Central Europe, Africa, and all Muslim nations are firmly united against the values of the West, and their ruling classes make no secret of how degenerate they think the West is. This does not stop the West, though, from exhibiting its moral superiority, which ostensibly includes being respectful of cultural diversity. Thus when the US Ambassador to Japan, Rahm Emmanuel, recently weighed in on a contentious bill declaring that there "should be no unfair discrimination" against the gay and transgender community,"he marshalled 'a group of 15 foreign ambassadors in Tokyo to record a four-minute video nudging Japan to embrace LGBTQ rights and, by implication, same-sex marriage. The response from a Liberal Democratic member of the upper house of the Diet, [retorted by tweet](#): "If Ambassador Emanuel wants to use his position as U.S. ambassador to Japan in any way to influence Japan, we will take immediate action to make him go back to his country."

Of course, there would have been no opportunity for Emmanuel to make such a tweet with another US ally, Saudi Arabia. But the fact that ambassadors from the West use their position to publicly comment on legislation is one further symptom of the West's division of the world into allies, and suzerainties, and enemies. There is no room for international dialogue, just as there is no room for domestic dialogue. There are those who are on the right side of history and those of the wrong side, and the West is the right side.

Thus, as it is with Western ambassadors, it also the assumption of our political, corporate, pedagogical leaders that their job is to articulate and enforce values which have little or no connection to our historical and civilizational experience. The state and church have become one. The political class is also the priest class. It has a monopoly on the truth and its task is to instruct us in that truth, to lead us,

and punish us if we refuse to accept it. The reach and power of the political class far exceeds that of the Church in the Middle Ages. For those who might object—but what about the Inquisition (and leaving aside all the historical ignorance and nonsense about the Inquisition)—I can only respond—Iraq? Or Afghanistan?

Within a generation we have abandoned a political and social consensus in which governments of free people existed to facilitate, not dictate, the choices of its citizens—there was disputation between parties over what governments should be doing to facilitate that—how much education, how much healthcare, how much welfare etc. But the political consensus was that the diverse range of social interests would be represented by political parties, that those interests had to be able to express themselves (that was why in the US, McCarthyism was viewed, even by many anti-communists, as a threat to the American way of life), and that the electorate would elect a government, which when in power, acted in conjunction with a public service generally providing advice on policy options that reflected the prevailing realities that a governing party needed to consider, realities that preserved the integrity of the nation.

Thus the government was not simply trusted to pander to the interests of the party's constituents, but to represent the people as a whole. People complained, and were not persecuted because they did so. Number crunchers advised and parties wheeled and dealt—and compromised. Politicians knew that if they wanted to attain and retain power they had to have broad appeal. It was far from perfect. State and society were corrupt—very corrupt, and the secret deals between organized crime and the state infiltrated many areas of public policy (see especially Whitney Webb's meticulously researched, *One Nation Under Blackmail*); but it was not a world in which we must comply with decisions made by leaders in almost every aspect of our lives. It managed to hold serious class differences and antagonisms together—in large part that was because identity politics had not become so widely circulated and influential, and having professional training did not then mean being ideologically inducted in every area of study and professional development into a world view where one's best way to advance was to prove one's victimhood. Even when governments were extremely polarizing, and protests were widespread, as say in the Thatcher government, none seriously thought the nation was on the brink of civil war—okay, the academic Marxists and some students banged on about revolution, but none listened to them, and they said the same thing no matter who was in government.

Western societies are completely polarized and that is reflected by that fact that some half of the Western population do not trust our institutions, nor the policies that come from the ruling class

consensus. But the fact that the ruling class and those who work on its behalf only press down further on the most polarizing of issues, issues which are becoming exponentially crazier by the second—"women" with penises winning women's beauty competitions, and sweeping up the trophies in women's sports.

Crazy as that is, how crazy was the logic that not only demanded that people take a vaccine if they wanted to keep their jobs (even though, if the vaccine worked, why would the vaccinated care whether other people did not take a vaccine)? But even crazier was the fact that it was part of a general undertaking to "give" (of course at a price) 'this vaccine to the entire world"—and if that meant disrupting the entire global economy to get everyone vaccinated then that was fair enough for Gates, [the logic being](#), until we get almost everybody vaccinated globally, we still won't be fully back to normal.

As the craziness also keeps mounting up so does the frustration and anger, and political decisions to crack down against that hostility. Defiance of the vaccine mandate by truckers in Canada quickly segued into the state demanding asset confiscation. Who would have foreseen that in 2019? But that's the thing. Increasingly we are presented with a present that was not only unforeseeable, and the unthinkable—at least to anyone who was not considered a lunatic. Likewise, if anyone had said to gay rights activists twenty years ago, that one of the major issues of the 2020s would be the demand for the right for drag queens and skimpily clad transsexuals to perform or read to children under the age of 7, they would have been castigated for thinking that gay people would be so perverse as to dream up such a thing.

But this issue is pushed by the media, by legislators, academics and corporate and organizational leaders—and it is issues like this that make people who just want to go to work, put bread on the table, and have their kids well educated and well-adjusted to deal with the trials that adulthood will bring boil over with rage. And the media paints them as extremists, and the parent who wants its non-binary or trans child to be immersed in his world is presented as a fearful and persecuted victim of bigotry and cruelty.

That the American ruling class deemed a riot, far less destructive in terms of lives and property than riots which had been all but justified and sanctioned by the main stream media, to be an insurrection only illustrates the fragility and the extent of hatred of the ruling class and organizations in the United States—no wonder "hate speech," and "misinformation" (which is synonymous with non-approved

information, and opinions) are now part of the conceptual acid-baths to dissolve the first amendment of the constitution of the US.

In countries with no first amendment rights, hate speech legislation is well entrenched. And the same larger agenda and the values that hold it together accelerate as the social antagonisms mount. And as they mount the media and the ruling class and the amalgam of groups serving that class deal with the problem by further denunciations and laws and penalties.

The sheer scale and range of those involved in dismantling the nation and the various practices and values that held it together and replacing it with a globalist political order, as well as the vast inequality of opportunities and resources of those working for the triumph of a global order, based upon "progressive" (Western) rights-based and anti-traditional values defy the logic of a centralized command system, even if we can locate all manner of overlapping centralized command systems (leadership/management "teams") within the various organizations and institutions.

This lack of any obvious overarching centralized command system is one reason why any criticism of the alliance of interests is so readily dismissed as a conspiracy theory. The parties doing the dismantling all have a stake in the globalist, liberal, totalitarian world we in the West now live within—i.e., they are, in the parlance of the globalists, "stakeholders" in this new world order. It is true that in spite of whatever conspiracies may take place when powerful people make decisions that affect entire nations, most of those involved in doing their bidding are not party to any conspiracy. They are just complying with what their rulers, their leaders, and managers have decided is for the good of the nation or institution, or organization.

Anyone who bothers to look more closely at the various agendas coming out of such forums and organizations, or foundations such as the Trilateral Commission, the Club of Rome, the Bilderberg group, UN and World Economic Forum, the WTO, G20, G7, WHO, the Gates Foundation, to name just a few, or the financial donors partners and behind them—names like, or professionally linked to, Rothschild, Rockefeller, Gates, Soros, Warburg, Warren Buffet, Larry Page, Jeff Bezos, Ford, Kellogg, Mark Carney, Michael Bloomberg, JP Morgan Chase, Google, Volkswagon, Coca Cola, Blackrock, Shell, Goldman Sachs.

These are just some of the names that everybody recognizes which provide financial backing for the kinds of priorities, policies and narratives which have been adopted by Western nation states,

organizations and corporations.

One way that one can recognize whether a particular policy is globalist is to take cognizance of the oligarchical interest funding a cause, or rights-claim. Thus, for example, [consider the following answer](#) by Jennifer Bilek to the question, "Who is funding the Transgender Movement?"

These include but are not limited to Jennifer Pritzker (a male who identifies as transgender); George Soros; Martine Rothblatt (a male who identifies as transgender and transhumanist); Tim Gill (a gay man); Drummond Pike; Warren and Peter Bubett; Jon Stryker (a gay man); Mark Bonham (a gay man); and Ric Weiland (a deceased gay man whose philanthropy is still LGBT-oriented). Most of these billionaires fund the transgender lobby and organizations through their own organizations, including corporations.

Separating transgender issues from LGBT infrastructure is not an easy task. All the wealthiest donors have been funding LGB institutions before they became LGBT-oriented, and only in some instances are monies earmarked specifically for transgender issues. Some of these billionaires fund the LGBT through their myriad companies, multiplying their contributions many times over in ways that are also diGcult to track.

These funders often go through anonymous funding organizations such as Tides Foundation, founded and operated by Pike. Large corporations, philanthropists, and organizations can send enormous sums of money to the Tides Foundation, specify the direction the funds are to go, and have the funds get to their destination anonymously. Tides Foundation creates a legal firewall and tax shelter for foundations and funds political campaigns, often using legally dubious tactics.

These men and others, including pharmaceutical companies and the U.S. government, are sending millions of dollars to LGBT causes. Overall reported global spending on LGBT is now estimated at \$424 million. From 2003-2013, reported funding for transgender issues increased more than eightfold, growing at threefold the increase of LGBTQ funding overall, which quadrupled from 2003 to 2012. This huge spike in funding happened at the same time transgenderism began gaining traction in American culture. \$424 million is a lot of money. Is it enough to change laws, uproot language and force new speech on the public, to censor, to create an atmosphere of threat for those who do not comply with [gender identity](#)

ideology?

The globalist agenda is not a spontaneous uprising of the “masses,” it is a paid for operation by the richest people of the planet. And although the PR machines and mainstream media work incessantly to create the image of being geniuses intent on saving the planet, the fact is that they are money people—frequently they belong to, or have been adopted into a dynasty, and their philanthropic work is invariably a way to make massive money. Bill Gates on one occasion talks of making twenty times the return on the work undertaken by his and his former wife's Foundation.

These unelected people are the true global leaders, lifting up others who serve their interests along the way. They consider themselves wise enough to identify the most important problems facing the species as well as how to solve them, and they have the resources to buy people who do their will. The fact that their 'employees' may not think they are pursuing their agenda, or be critical of a system which is so inequitable is irrelevant—which is also why the alliance mentioned in the opening of this essay is so contradictory. But contradictions are as intrinsic to a person's life as they are to that of any group or alliance. Thus it is, for example, that academic Marxists and progressivists generally think they are tearing down capitalism and contributing to a utopia, even though they are enabling greater corporatist control over the world's people's and resources. The narrative of emancipation has contributed to a reality of totalizing enslavement; the critics of capitalist society have been the builders of a world of total calculability—and it is simply a matter of time before no natural part of our world be accessible without someone owning it and renting it to us.

People rarely know what they are doing because they have not the patience to consider all the possible implications of their action, to see whose interests they may also be serving when insisting upon getting their way. Transgender activists insisting upon the legalization and normalization of hormone blockers or surgical amputations and constructions of children don't particularly see themselves as being but the means for massively enriching and empowering Jenifer Pritzker, Pfizer, Janssen Therapeutics, Abbot Laboratories. ViiV, Bristol-Myers Squibb Company and Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, not to mention Google and Microsoft who are also investing heavily in the trans project. Nor do they generally have a clue that they are the means for creating a world not only in which natural child birth may only be granted to those deemed by the state to be worthwhile parents, but in which human beings may be a completely synthetic fabrication.

Likewise, those who support NATO supplying the weapons, training, and tactical information for the

Zelensky government and its supporters in Ukraine's war against Russia, are largely ignorant of the fact that they are supporters of ethnic nationalists intent on ethnic cleansing, though that is exactly what the post-Maidan Ukrainian governments in cooperation with various battalions, para-military groups etc. have been. They might also be the kind of people who think they are anti-militaristic, or opposed to Western imperialism, yet they are fully supporting the entrenchment of a globalist military industrial complex that is ever ready to attack any socio-political order that deviates from a globalist Western led hegemonic imperial order.

Likewise, the doctors and health practitioners and bureaucrats and citizens who attacked people critical of mRNA vaccines against COVID were certain that because the stakes seemed so high—mass death—this ultimately justified ensuring people comply with whatever health policy was mandated—lockdowns, masks, vaccines within certain professions being a requirement of continued employment and pushed upon the population as the sole way of successfully protecting people against the virus, channeling hospital resources in such a way that there was an economic incentive to conflate "death by" and "death with" COVID.

These people's unwavering commitment to ensuring a better health outcome along with the support of the media, social media platforms, and the academy led them to denounce and destroy the career of anyone speaking publicly about the need for a better informed exploration of the scale of the risks involved in prioritizing these policies over alternatives, especially over the use of potential treatments, such as Hydroxychloroquine and Ivermectin which, for year had been widely available for treatment of other diseases and had been relatively free of malign side effects, were suddenly targeted as dangerous drugs. Studies which supported their value as partial treatments were discarded, while everyone had to trust a vaccine developed at "warp speed," which simply meant one in which there simply was not enough time to observe potentially dangerous side-effects. People were pressured—and in many professions forced to take drugs created out of a relatively new vaccine technology—at least that is how it seemed.

While the coalition of forces intent upon, or enabling a technocratic corporatist globalist world occurs because people think they are pursuing their advantage, those who serve that coalition are also helping build a society, in which the sole purpose of the middle class, will be to monitor and punish an enslaved class which provides the bodies and organs, and labour power to service the desires of a relatively small ruling class in pursuit of transhumanist/ eugenically engineered lives, i.e., lives without sickness or death in bodies that are part nature and increasingly large part machine. A number of people,

including myself, think that it is also becoming ever more apparent that the rest of us will also be increasingly made of machine parts that can be surveilled, programmed, controlled, and dependent upon those who design and run the machines. Just as the globalist future is transhumanist, it is, as the COVID experience demonstrated, a bio-political one—as COVID has fizzled out, WHO keep uttering dire predictions about what will be the next 'plague' requiring global compliance.

The irony, lost on most academic supporters of the new world, is that the most influential philosopher upon the project of radical emancipation, Michel Foucault, saw the great danger of bio-politics. Yet the academy is an institution that plays a decisive role in forming the professional technocrats whose livelihoods are increasingly dependent upon the administration and economization of life so that everyone becomes the clients of corporate owners, managers, and state officials who may oversee all aspects of our lives so that we may comply with the directives and dictates that will 'save the planet' and the species. The radical students, who played such a decisive role in the Russian and subsequent communist revolutions, as well as the rise of National Socialism, and the identity politics that would flow from the student revolution of the 1960s in the West, never doubted that they had the ability and right to dictate what the future should be. What they did not realize—because they did not care about it—was that their solutions were inevitably technocratic and elite driven (for they were the professionals in waiting), and as such would require the resources of others who would find some material use for them. That they thought they knew the way to improve the world, yet so easily gravitated into the service not simply of the capitalist class they taught were the cause of all social ills, but of those who had the greatest capital and social reach is indicative of just how indifferent or blind they were to their own role in world-making.

People are easily swayed, especially when they are swayed toward a position that builds upon commitments and priorities they already stand by. The mimetic effect of personal development, and social bonding is such that so many of the above issues have demonstrated that narrative conformity can emerge very swiftly amongst those of similar professions, backgrounds and social and economic stakes and interests. People do not need to bond together and say, "this is the objective and this is the plan of attack"—though as the WEF, UN etc. documents show some of that definitely goes on, and there is a class of oligarchs who openly "conspired" with intelligence agencies and vested political interests to censor information they disapprove of, whilst pouring money into elections and candidates, activist and 'philanthropist' organizations and foundations, educational institutions, etc.

It is not a conspiracy theory to point out the existence of what former Clinton administration employee,

editor Foreign Policy magazine, and columnist for the Daily Beast, and contributor to USA Today, David Rothkopf, has, in his book of 2008, called a "superclass" (*Superclass: The Global Elite and the World They Make*)—the existence of this class is simply a reality. Like Bill Clinton's one time teacher, the brilliant Carroll Quigley, who, in *Tragedy and Hope*, also wrote extensively on various groups and persons funneling resources to support government policies suiting their globalist and imperial interests, Rothkopf's work is not a critique of this class, but simply an account of its activities. Take the two following passages, one discussing how members from the same pool of people are regularly found on boards and management of the largest companies, the other noting how they often even go to the same schools.

"With regard to the concentration of power among individuals, perhaps a more telling demonstration is how boards and management of the biggest companies overlap, linking the superclass in an extended network.

For example, if you were to take just the top three corporate executives (in most cases the chairman, CEO, and executive director) of the top five biggest companies as well as the members of their boards—approximately seventy people—you would find that they have active connections fanning out to more than 145 other major companies either through board memberships, advisory positions, or former positions in senior management. Of these 145, thirty-six are among the one hundred largest in the world and fifty-two are in the top 250. Sixteen of these companies have more than one representative from the top five companies on their boards. These sixteen are Akzo Nobel, ABB, Astra-Zeneca, British Airways, Deutsche Bank, Ernst & Young, Ford, GE, Goldman Sachs, Lehman Brothers, Lloyds TSB, Pfizer, Royal Bank of Scotland, Sara Lee, Unilever, and Vodafone—all major, major players in their own right. Of these, which one has the most crossover to the top five companies? Goldman Sachs, with four links."

And

"Networking among the corporate elite can thus take a variety of forms. Working together, doing deals together, sitting on boards together, even attending gala events together—all these things help forge the networks that empower and define the superclass. And these networks begin early. For example, take the Harvard Business School class of 1979. This class alone graduated Meg Whitman, the CEO of eBay; Jeffrey Skilling, the former president

of Enron; John Thain, former president of Goldman Sachs and currently head of the New York Stock Exchange; Ron Sargent, the CEO of Staples; George McMillan, the CEO of Palladium Group; Elaine Chao, the secretary of labor (who also happens to be married to Republican Senator Mitch McConnell of Kentucky); and Dan Bricklin, who developed the first electronic spreadsheet. And because schools like Oxford, Cambridge, France's École Polytechnique, the Indian Institute of Technology, and the University of Tokyo all perform a similar function, cadres of leaders emerge into the world with important linkages even before other layers of ties begin to form."

Business and political interests are so entwined that where one ends and one begins is not that obvious, with lucrative careers open to politicians once they retire, whether through speaking engagements, or joining a board or the accrual of massive investment portfolios, and property ownerships gathered in a life of "public service." The leverage of well-funded interest groups and lobbyists working on behalf of corporate interests are just part of the flow of modern democratic politics, in no small part because of the economic opportunities they provide for employment and national wealth. Journalists and academics and left-wing parties may well speak out against the dangers of huge wealth disparities—and there are grave dangers, not the least being how the ostensible critics of corporate control can be bought under their influences without even realizing that they have been bought. That there are economic/ material interests is a fact of life. But there are in every type of society a class of people who forego material advantage in favor of the things of the spirit is also profoundly important.

Journalists are often called the fourth estate, but along with academics those at least who were driven by a desire to make the society conscious of the powers being served through their reportage were aspiring to usurp the role of the first estate, by instructing the population in the ideas of the absolute they served. Over time they have not proved themselves to be less susceptible to corruption than the worst of the members of the first estate. The source of that corruption was the same as the source that did so much damage especially to the upper clergy by the time of the French revolution—viz., the betrayal of a very elementary demand of the spirit to serve the spirit of that part of life and our soul that requires a class of persons to instruct and help bond their flock (the public) in the first place. In the case of academics and journalists that spirit is the spirit of truth, the truth to be found in their respective areas of specialization or information gathering. And what has led to that corruption is the elevation of power itself above that commitment—their own power, and the desire for the power of whatever interest they purport to represent has become viscerally equated with the truth. But it is not. Representative systems always involve a devolution and dilution transpiring between the party to be represented and the

representative. But even more importantly the representative class forms a set of interests due to it being a class of representatives. It thus becomes as natural to professional representatives as the air they breathe to assume that must first be well provided for so they can help the other members of their group. Of course, this is completely self-serving.

But material interests are by nature self-serving, and politics is a material before it is a spiritual power—something anyone can see if they but consider how political power originates in violence and protection rackets. In sum, the dangerous alliance of economic power, and political power, an alliance that is intrinsic—those with economic power need legislators to assist their enterprises, those seeking political power require economic assistance—could only be mitigated by spiritual resistance. That resistance previously took a cultural form. Its preservation required pedagogical cultivation—it required well educated teachers who understood the larger cultural and historical backdrop to the traditions of the spirit presiding over the group. The desire to completely overhaul the traditions by political means was bound to lead to corruption—and it has. What corrupt spirits with economic power have always known is that political power can be bought. The totalizing character of corporate power advanced in tandem with the totalizing character of political power.

Anyone familiar with what has happened to the university will know the story—neoliberalism merges with radical identity politics to create an economic-political alliance destroying all intellectual independence and any higher values of the spirit that do not fit into DEI or ESG or what university administrative leaders on an obscene salary dictate and bullying social justice warriors push in the classroom. The latter think they are bringing down capitalism but they are so naïve that they take no historical cognizance of how corporations have pushed for exactly the same social outcomes that they preach—destruction of the traditional family, traditional faith, gender roles, the creation of open borders, greater ideological conformity, dismantling the nation state in favour of globalism. In some ways they are immediate material beneficiaries as job opportunities for the best of them open up globally. That they all push not only for the same political agenda but the very same party is just one other indication of how the very professions that pride themselves on opposing the corporatization and commodification of the world have so readily surrendered their critical capacities (and I speak of them en masse because almost all their members have surrendered) to enable that.

The disease of politicization of the spirit has also infected other state agencies that always had to be beholden to political authority as institutions, but which, nevertheless, required that their own personal political preferences be put aside. That requirement, i.e., to put aside one's own political interests and

beliefs, in service to an elected government also involved a spiritual component that was of far greater value to the preservation of the body politic than the various political representatives who came and went. Though, the entire society worked better when even the managers of corporations and political representatives bowed their heads to a higher power of the spirit than their own material interests. DEI and ESG are no substitutes for a higher power because they are simply means for getting power, and for forming a society in which its members tear at each other to get and to have. The better Marxist and leftwing critics—people like Erich Fromm and C.B. MacPherson—knew human betterment was not just having more stuff.

What we now have then is a society in which corporate interests, and political interests have indeed conspired to get what they want at any cost, and that means extinguishing any critical response to the nightmare world they are making.

The Spooks and their Megaphones

That intelligence agencies and members of the military have demonstrated their commitment to certain political parties which in turn are served by the mainstream media is not a theory about people conspiring, it is a reality, as are the walls of censorship, shadow-bans, algorithmic concealment and preference, media silence and the like. Take the New York Post (May 5 2023) story that Michael Morrell was attempting to give Biden's 2020 presidential campaign some ammunition to "push back on Trump" during the debate as he urged John Brennan to sign on to the letter calling Hunter Biden's laptop a possible Russian disinformation operation.' That intelligence and military officers were 'conspiring' to have a party win an election is not a theory it is just what happened. As did the disinformation campaign about Trump and Russia—as I was write this even Jake Tapper from CNN momentarily thought that retrieving the credibility of the mainstream media might require some small amount of soul searching. Though *The New York Times*, having reporting the results of the John Durham Report, showed the way forward—the Russia stuff was all a big nothing burger of right-wing conspiracy theorists. There was, though, nothing new in the Durham Report—the report only makes public what people who explored the story 7 or 8 years ago, outside the mainstream media, already knew. That no prosecutions will flow from the various acts of conspiring with foreign parties to influence an election by spreading disinformation and lies, that the parties knew to be lies, is itself indicative of how successful the tactics of denouncing anyone who draws attention to the coordinated disinformation that transpired between the ruling party, the intelligence agencies, military officers, and the media as spreaders of disinformation has been.

The amount of disinformation involving the alliance of intelligence agencies and the media has been astonishing.

Allow me to cite some tweets from Mike Benz in December 2022 when he too was also noting the disinformation involving Michael Morrell and other CIA directors:

"Morrell was one of the 7 CIA directors—Michael Hayden, James Woolsey, Leon Panetta, David Petraeus, Michael Morrell, William Webster & Robert Gates—on the board of the Atlantic Council, who DHS deputized to censor the 2020 election, & who was partnered with Burisma." "The Biden Admin has given GWU (George Washington University) in government grants to censor the internet." "The Atlantic Council is the anchor of EIP, part of its 'core four.' When EIP published its 292-page report about how they censored tens of millions of conservatives with DHS in the 2020 election, they made their launch event an Atlantic Council event."

Or take these from Andrew Lowenthal—link provided by Matt Taibbi in his "Report On The Censorship-Industrial Complex." Lowenthal had spent 18 years as Executive Director of @Engage Media, an NGO formed "to protect digital rights and freedom," and what shocked him was the pervasiveness within the profession to collaborate with the very powers that they should be scrutinizing. He writes:

"The (Twitter) Files show an uncanny alliance of academics, journalists, intelligence operatives, military personnel, government bureaucrats, NGO workers and more. Some I know personally... I had always understood 'civil society' to mean 'not the military.' The former exists to check the latter. So I was shocked to see the depth of collaboration. For instance, 'civil society' groups coordinating with Pentagon officials in an 'election tabletop' exercise... Twitter emails and Slack communications suggesting heightened levels of data access for the military. Or military contractors like Mitre being part of the Aspen Institute's 'Information Disorder' report along with NGO and academic colleagues... Tech firms collaborate with each other, and the state. Companies organize 'IndustrySynch,' 'Industry comms,' 'pre-sync,' and 'Multi-Party Information Sharing,' collaborating on a 'whole range' of subjects, from election security to state-media labelling... Tech companies not only collaborate on content, they gather regularly for 'private sector engagement' with the FBI, DOD, DHS, House and Senate Intel Committees, and others, each agency getting its own meetings... Twitter staff ask for Twitter General Counsel (& former FBI Deputy General

Counsel) Jim Baker's blessing for EIP and Virality Project partner Graphika to "inform their partners in USG 3-5 days before publication' of a report detailing Pentagon disinformation operations... Graphika receives money from the Pentagon, Navy, and Air Force, while simultaneously supporting human rights organizations such as Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch... As reported by @shellenbergerMD, The Aspen Institute combined WaPo, NYT, *Rolling Stone*, NBC, CNN, Twitter, Facebook, Stanford, and "anti-disinfo" NGOs like FirstDraft to practice an oddly prescient "hack and leak" exercise on the Hunter Biden laptop BEFORE its release... Last week Secretary of State Anthony Blinken was alleged to have instigated the "Russian" "hack" letter signed by 50 former intel officials. At RightsCon, civil society's biggest digital rights event, Blinken spoke on 'disinformation' with Nobel Prize winner Maria Ressa."

These tweets report facts not theories. They are facts that once upon a time would have shocked enough journalists for them to become public scandals of such a magnitude that the ruling class would have had to respond to the public outcry. They refer to something involving infinitely greater collaboration, abuse of citizens' rights, and consequence for the destruction of the republican constitution and democratic components of the United States than Water Gate. Yet, the mainstream media has remained silent on this, preferring instead to have journalists attack the owner of Twitter Elon Musk as well as those like Matt Taibbi and Michael Schellenberger working on the Twitter files, and any other journalists reporting on what Schellenberger has called the Industrial Censorship Complex. Without free speech there can be no freedom—for freedom requires expressing oneself, however wrong (as opposed to libellous) one may be, in order to garner the information, one needs to navigate one's way through life. Without freedom of speech, freedom of assembly to express dissent is impossible, and without freedom of assembly for peaceful dissenters there can be no collective political alternatives to the prevailing political order and party, and the dictates that it lays down. No matter how it is wrapped up the attack upon freedom of speech is a means for preserving the social and political interests that 'conspire' to suppress opposition to what they do with their power.

In a world where the partisan nature of journalists is a crucial component of them having a career it is difficult to know how many even care enough to look at the information that has come out of the Twitter files and elsewhere disclosing the scale of complicity between intelligence agencies, oligarchs, and media/ tech employees. One might think that in an open democratic society, the public would be extremely well informed about the alliance between intelligence agencies and oligarchs, or extremely concerned that that alliance has dictated what information is favoured and promoted, or banned or buried in the information algorithms designed by people who have a background or are openly serving

commands from intelligence agents. That domestic intelligence agencies spy upon citizens deemed subversives —for that is what they were designed to do —may not be troubling if those people really are plotting acts of terrorism, but it is a different matter when they spy upon people who comply with the law and who are simply representing interests that have every right —deplorable as they may be —to be represented.

Yet when we see how the media and tech platforms are now operating it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the objective of intelligence agencies has long been to shape a certain kind of society, which is not simply one shaped by the wishes of the electorate. Certainly almost fifty years ago (1977) Carl Bernstein had written a widely read article on the CIA's use of the media in *Rolling Stone* (when it was a magazine whose writers did not see themselves as working for "The Man"), and that story was considered something of a revelation, and something that suggested governmental malfeasance. According to Bernstein:

The use of journalists has been among the most productive means of intelligence gathering employed by the CIA. Although the Agency has cut back sharply on the use of reporters since 1973 primarily as a result of pressure from the media, some journalist operatives are still posted abroad.

Further investigation into the matter, CIA officials say, would inevitably reveal a series of embarrassing relationships in the 1950s and 1960s with some of the most powerful organizations and individuals in American journalism.

Among the executives who lent their cooperation to the Agency were William Paley of the Columbia Broadcasting System, Henry Luce of Time Inc., Arthur Hays Sulzberger of *The New York Times*, Barry Bingham Sr. of the *Louisville Courier Journal*, and James Copley of the Copley News Service. Other organizations which cooperated with the CIA include the American Broadcasting Company, the National Broadcasting Company, the Associated Press, United Press International, Reuters, Hearst Newspapers, Scripps Howard, *Newsweek* magazine, the Mutual Broadcasting System, the *Miami Herald* and the old *Saturday Evening Post* and *New York Herald Tribune*.

By far the most valuable of these associations, according to CIA officials, have been with *The New York Times*, CBS and Time Inc.

Matt Taibbi's recent Substack essay, "A Century of Censorship" pushes the connection between an administration and media control back to Woodrow Wilson and the 1917 "Espionage Act." As he points out "Wilson's administration also decided that any publications violating the act were 'non-mailable matter,' and this rationale was used to suppress dissenting views by aggressively enforcing the postal codes so no subversive publications could reach their subscribers. At least 74 newspapers were denied mailing permits at this time."

While, then, there is a long history of media being an outlet for government misinformation, the most conspicuous new development is the brazen openness of the connection between a political party and administration and the media. Thus the career movement between (former?) intelligence agents and mainstream media outlets is simply par for the course, nicely summed up in the Corbett report (episode 432):

"I mean could you imagine, if say, the ex-director of the CIA was currently a contributor to MSNBC that would be crazy wouldn't it? Or could you imagine if a former FBI agent was now an active national security contributor to NBC News, or if a former FBI special agent was now the CNN political analyst there, a former Homeland Security official was a CNN national security analyst, or a former DEA administrator was an MSNBC legal and political analysts with his own podcast cheque it out folks, or James Baker, former FBI general counsel, if he was a CNN legal analyst, or if Frances Townsend, the former Homeland Security advisor for George W Bush, was now CBS News senior security and law enforcement analyst, or if a retired CIA chief of Russia operations with CNN national security analyst or if the retired FBI supervisory special agent James Gagliano was now the CBS News security and law enforcement analyst, or Philip Mudd, the former CIA counterterrorism official, was now the CNN counterterrorism analyst that would be crazy wouldn't it, oh yeah?"

Crazy? Well, that is the norm today—and the reason James Corbett is simply dismissed as a kook, in spite of him constantly using public source and verifiable information in such documentaries as he has done on the CIA and the funding of Al Qaeda, or questions concerning all the weird stuff surrounding 9/11—that is the kind of stuff journalists and academics simply roll their eyes over. Unlike mainstream journalists—and on 9/11 Matt Taibbi has had plenty to say without showing he has really done any journalistic probing—I confess I was until relatively recently simply unaware of the extent of the serious unanswered questions surrounding the event. By the way, I am not saying I or anyone else, not involved in the planning and execution, knows exactly what happened, but someone like Corbett has raised

important questions about 9/11 that are just not answered by repeating the name bin Laden ad nauseam. And once again it is a story covered up by the media rather than covered by it—and there are too many aspects about it to mention here, but it is just one other example where the media is simply serving as a public outlet for what intelligence agencies want the public to think.

Much less well known than the increasingly obvious fact that the mainstream media has a long history of being an intelligence outlet is the connection between the founding and funding of Google and the CIA. Alan MacLeod writes of this in his book *Propaganda in the Information Age*, (one can also hear him in discussion with Whitney Webb in *Unlimited Hangout*, and I cite [from a summary](#) of that show, where MacLeod notes that

"a prior investigation by Dr. Nafeez Ahmed found that the CIA and the National Security Agency (NSA) were 'bankrolling' research by Sergey Brin at Stanford University, which 'produced Google...' Not only that... but his supervisor there was a CIA person. So, the CIA actually directly midwived Google into existence. In fact, until 2005, the CIA actually held shares in Google and eventually sold them."

It continues:

"Ahmed explained that Brin and his Google co-founder, Larry Page, developed 'the core component of what eventually became Google's search service...' 'with funding from the Digital Library Initiative (DLI),' a program of the National Science Foundation (NSF), NASA, and DARPA. In addition, the intelligence community's Massive Digital Data Systems (MDDS) initiative, a project sponsored by the NSA, CIA, and the Director of Central Intelligence, 'essentially provided Brin seed-funding, which was supplemented by many other sources.' Brin and Page 'regularly' reported to Dr. Bhavani Thuraisingham and Dr. Rick Steinheiser, who were 'representatives of a sensitive US intelligence community research programme on information security and data-mining,' Ahmed shared. Ahmed has argued that the involvement of intelligence agencies in the birth of Google, for example, is deeply purposeful: that they have nurtur[ed] the web platforms we know today for the precise purpose of utilizing the technology... to fight [a] global 'information war' — a war to legitimize the power of the few over the rest of us."

Infowars

Anyone who is familiar with the magnitude of the audience (often outstripping the audience of *The New York Times*, CNN and the various confabulations of mainstream fabulists) reached by podcasts and podcasters who do address issues of disinformation and suppression of information—to take some at random, George Galloway's *MOATS*, Glenn Greenwald, Whitney Web and *Unlimited Hangout*, the *Last American Vagabond*, *The Free Thought Project*, *The Grayzone*, PBD podcast, *21st Century Wire*, the *Corbett Report*, Derrick Broze, *Grand Theft World*—knows that the attempt by the mainstream media to disinform them is only working on its own "stakeholders." Unfortunately those stakeholders are running the institutions and governments within the West. And whether wittingly or not, they do so on the basis of either not informing, or misinforming, or disinforming people about world making events.

While the collaboration of intelligence agencies and the media may have a long history, it is only in the last seven or eight years that the majority of journalists and academics would simply be the mouth pieces of globalist oligarchs and their political agents, at least on domestic issues—international issues are, as I will discuss in more detail below, another matter. We now live in an age which, Alex Jones, in the late 1990s succinctly and brilliantly formulated as "Info(rmation) Wars." Jones has made all sorts of wrong or exaggerated predictions, and wading into the Sandy Hook massacre, by his own admission, was an act of folly. But think what you will about his style and some, possibly even much, of his content, he is in the fight against globalist disinformation. His program has a vast audience and he was a driving force giving a voice to the huge number of anti-globalists in the United States who were responsible for Trump's 2016 victory. His book attacking the WEF's "recovery plan," *The Great Reset: And the War for the World* has sold by the truckload—there are over 3500 reviews on Amazon, almost all positive. And it has sold because it informs his audience about the details of the social and technocratic plans laid out in Klaus Schwab's book, *The Great Reset*.

While the policies and plans Schwab lays out suit those who attend Davos and believe in "sustainable development," population control, and the kind of state control that was exercised to deal with COVID, the curtailments of liberty that their execution requires (not the least being freedom to criticise the plans and their authors) are widely detested. Jones is the establishment's embodiment of "disinformation." And as such he is a litmus test of what one thinks of the right to dissent. The mainstream media have cheered every attempt to destroy him. And the attempts reveal the extent of corporate statism in the Western World—if Jones really were just a nut job, how could he possibly be such a threat to the state?

The problem with Jones is that he expresses the concerns of millions of people who hate the direction

their lives and that of their children are being dragged in—and that is why they not only listen to Jones but to his guests, some like Peter McCullough, Robert Malone, and Judy Mickowitz, were prestigious scientific researchers whose careers were destroyed by research that failed to comply with some of the scientific consensus that underpin the technocratic bureaucracy that demands complete obeisance.

In a world where inquiry into medical practices was not dominated by the outcomes required by those responsible for most of the funding exploring whether vaccines may lead to autism would be an extremely important subject. But Mickowitz's career came to an abrupt end when she produced data which suggested there was a spike in autism that could be tracked to the proliferation of vaccines. I have no idea whether her research conclusions are scientifically correct. But her story is indicative of the fact that medical research today is inexorably linked to research grants, and grants are inexorably linked to outcomes which do not contravene the enormous investments made by pharmaceutical companies. How distant we are now from Karl Popper's falsification principle being an essential criterion for any scientific endeavour can be seen in the imbecilic formulation that became a mandatory phrase during the pandemic, "I trust the science."

Jones was the first to be censored by YouTube and other social media platforms, Mickowitz was not that long in following, and shortly thereafter so was the elected President of the United States. The media and the academy saw this as a victory. And for them it was, because they no longer cared what people thought—so long as they would shut up and do what they were told. Those of us who believe in the importance of freedom of speech know that the issue is not whether you like what someone says, or whether you think it based upon being well informed or being a complete dope.

Certainly, the people who impose censorship always think they are virtuous as well as wise. Of course, none who is not a journalist or academic, and has not been brainwashed by them, and has ever spent any-time with them suffers under such a delusion. I know the logic is circular, but not less circular than you should trust our opinions because we are journalists and academics and we trust each other's opinions. When Alex Jones was banned from the various social media sites, people with a college education in the main thought it was a good thing because they had been informed that he publicised an outrageously hurtful and misinformed opinion on the massacre at Sandy Hook: he thought and said aloud that the massacre did not take place, and the photos and new items about it were staged. Jones was not the original source of this "theory" which he was airing on his program—and which had never played a particularly important role in the more general arguments he was making about

disinformation and how it is used by globalists and how the USA was losing the qualities that made it a free and prosperous country. It had been [expounded previously](#) by the philosopher James Fetzer (whose [book on Carl Hempel](#) is probably the definitive book on the fairly well-known philosopher of science) and Mike Paleck, [*Nobody Died at Sandy Hook: It was a FEMA Drill to Promote Gun Control*](#). The title encapsulates the argument, and it included essays by other academics. The various contributors to the book supplied what they believed was compelling evidence against there being a massacre. The “evidence” had to do with the school buildings, various photos such as those of the car park and the students filing out of the school, and the school itself being closed. The argument combined with the photos do give the impression of Fetzer, Paleck and the other authors having a case. But strange as the circumstantial evidence may have appeared, that “evidence” would evaporate in the face of the testimony of anyone who was a first-hand witness of the event, or knew any of the survivors, and victims of the massacre. To publicly claim that their testimony should be discounted because they are actors or liars does seem to the lay person to be a strong case of defamation. Although facts are inevitably only notable in so far as they are meaningful, facts remain facts. And the case about Sandy Hook was a matter in which one's opinions count for nothing when compared to the facts. So it is not surprising that Fetzer and Paleck and their publishers were sued for defamation, and that the publisher apologized to Lenny Pozner, whose six year old son was killed in the shooting. The settlement in that case was \$450,000.

The lawsuits against Jones for defamation which commenced in 2018 culminated in the \$1 billion verdict against him—it was the largest defamation award in US history. By that stage Jones himself had admitted he had been wrong, on numerous occasions. He was embarrassed by it, and he conceded that he had become over medicated and paranoid. He had, then, by his own admission, aired an opinion that was misinformed—and although he was repeating misinformation, he never claimed as far as I know to be the source of the idea that the Sandy Hook shooting was a hoax. And there is nothing to indicate he believed he was lying at the time he expressed his opinion.

But what is most striking about the verdict is that there seems to be no sense of proportionality between crime and punishment. Jones did not murder the children—and there are no instances of civil cases against murders in which the plaintiffs receive anything even close to that amount. Moreover, there is nothing to indicate that Jones' fortune was primarily due to his opinion about Sandy Hook. In various interviews I have seen e.g., with Joe Rogan, Michael Malice, Tim Pool, and Steven Crowder he consistently makes the point that Sandy Hook is but a very small portion of his work—he compares the “amount” of time devoted to talking about Sandy Hook as akin to a sentence in a large book. It is difficult to see how the amount awarded to the plaintiffs could be considered anything other than an

attempt to destroy the potential for Alex Jones to have a livelihood, and that this decision was based upon his political influence, and he was being used as an example not of what might happen to people who expressed false or defamatory opinions—for the thing about this case, and the thing which makes it stick out as such a politicized judgment is that its severity has no parallel. When major media companies are sued, they are not targeted in such a way that they can never operate again. And even if Jones had underrepresented, had lied, about his worth, the idea that it is remotely close to a billion dollars is absurd.

For his part, Jones made the salient point that those responsible for using the false claim that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction and sending hundreds of thousands of people in the US led invasion of Iraq to their death have not paid any financial penalty. Like him or hate him, there is no denying the truth of that particular quip. He also riposted with another salutary and brilliant quip consisting of two words—“Jeffrey Epstein?”—when journalists, going for the kill, cornered him for claiming there were paedophile networks that operated at the highest political levels.

The case of Alex Jones should concern everyone who understands that if we cannot express our scepticism and our criticism, even if we are mistaken, we can never have a society in which not only independent thinking is valued, but our own personhood is taken seriously. For no person can avoid mistakes, and the idea that there are a group of people who we should always agree with because they are our 'leaders' or truth czars or brilliant political pundits on television (forgive my oxymoron), or celebrities (forgive me citing just morons), or scientists, or professors—the latter of whom, on extra-ideological issues, at least rarely agree on anything—is simply childish. But that is what the progressivist globalist project requires—getting us all to think like children—imbecilic children (see my [“Dialectics of Imbecility”](#)). Moreover, their hold upon the world along with the world itself is so fragile that they cannot tolerate the cracks in the edifice that some crackpot might open up lest the whole world collapses. The problem they faced, though, was not that their schemes and objectives and policies were facing resistance from about as many people who were paid-up people making careers out of the narratives supporting globalisation were opposing it. Some of the opposition embraced social media, others expressed their dissent by voting for outsider candidates. Opposition voices with a large audience like Jones had to be either censored, outright, for good, or for enough time for them to change the error of their ways and get back in the flow of the main stream, or demonetized, or algorithmically buried. As for more mass opposition the media had to go on full attack deploying labels to highlight the disinformation they were using to denounce, break down, or when nothing else worked imprison dissenters.

Thus, critics of the COVID vaccines are anti-vaxxers. Parents who object to schools and librarians having their kids be 'entertained', danced to, read to etc. by drag queens or trans people are 'anti-drag queen' or transphobes, or parents who do not want school libraries carrying sexualized material are homophobes. People who are not of the opinion that the world will end by 2030 unless oil and coal are eliminated are "climate deniers." People who express the desire to have border controls so that national sovereignty and citizenship are preserved are racists—those who illegally enter into the US are designated with the same terms as those who legally enter as migrants. Whites are all racists, and hence in need of training by others (often whites) who can get them to not offend or harm with their whiteness. Everybody is a white supremacist, or if black or Asian or something else, a lackey thereof, if they do not accept that the pockets of black poverty suffice to discount not only white poverty (which is larger in absolute numbers, though not proportionally), but the substantial black middle class, and hence who do not accept that racism is the cause of black poverty in the US, or that the cure for black poverty lies in employing critical race theorists to train the entire society. A white supremacist is also anyone who does not go along with BLM and has the temerity to point out that black on black crime, as well as black on white crime, is proportionally far higher than white on black crime. Being labelled a white supremacist also is equivalent to being a "domestic terrorist"—and the President of the USA has himself declared that white supremacists are the greatest source of domestic terrorism within the USA today. People who are critical of the fact that entire suburbs in Western Europe have become enclaves of Muslims who do not want to make cultural compromises with the host country are Islamophobes, as is anyone else who brings up the issue of the prevalence of honour killings in Muslim communities, and the problem of women being forced to wear the veil. Anyone opposed to supporting the Zelensky government in the war against Russia is a "Putin stooge." A protest gone awry, in no small part due to government and Antifa plants is an insurrection.

On that front, *Gateway Pundit*, always dismissed as a source of mis- and disinformation by the media that wants to monopolize mis- and disinformation, noted that the [FBI admitted](#) having 8 informants inside the Proud Boys organization on January 6, whilst court documents put the number at 40 undercover agents, and the DC Metro Police had 13 undercover operatives —this is straight out of Chesterton's *The Man Who Was Thursday*—and if this was not enough to make anyone with a modicum of information or good sense realize that the word "insurrection" should be synonymous with a government intelligence operation designed to terrify anyone thinking of participating in a demonstration against whatever the government, and the media and the corporate decide is truth, it was left to one solitary main stream tv journalist, now sacked, to show the footage of police politely ushering in protestors at the back of the capitol building. Any elected governments or presidents whose policies halt the progress of what Klaus Schwab and the Davos crowd and Justin Trudeau herald

as the “Fourth Industrial Revolution” are equated with Nazis. Every oppositionist position to what, in the once relatively free world, was a matter of potential policy for public discussion is now cause for some new denunciative label—even if one sided with the mainstream, one might think there might be some old school defenders of the English language somewhere who still believe words and names should be used correctly.

But as we can see each label is itself an example of disinformation—whether in the form of an outright lie, or in ensuring that anyone who wants public policy and debate to be better honed and pitched be presented as a bigot, or a monster. But it seems for the moment the worst kind of monster is the bigot who does not believe a woman can have a penis, or that someone born without one is really a man.

Pride: Dragging and Transitioning the Population into the New World Order

It has become very obvious in the last few years—and amongst those who also note this is Jacob Dreizen in his important (albeit belligerent and sarcastic) *DreizenReport*—that the LGBTQ pride flag is the symbol of Western led globalist freedom. Thus very early in the Biden administration US embassies were authorized to fly pride flags—in 2016 on his becoming Foreign Minister of the Conservative Party Boris Johnson had also overturned the decision not to allow pride flags to be flown from embassies. Pride flags have also been flown at the UK and US embassies in some Islamic countries such as the UAE which has incurred a backlash from locals. China has just recently demanded that pride flags, along with the Ukraine flag be taken down from visiting embassies, because they are simply Western propaganda.

The pride flag had also been flown in US embassies in Russia in 2020 and 2021, until Russia introduced laws in December of 2022 banning LGBTQ propaganda. The political significance of the LGBTQ movement as a cipher for Western progressive values was also driven home early in the Russia-Ukraine war by MI6 chief Richard Moore who tweeted, “With the tragedy and destruction unfolding so distressingly in Ukraine, we should remember the values and hard won freedoms that distinguish us from Putin, none more than LGBT+ rights.”

The Western media has also been awash with stories about LGBTQ and the war in the Ukraine, whilst refusing to mention that Ukraine has never been a haven of LGBTQ freedom, and that when Western powers have tried to push Zelensky to legislate for same sex marriage—gay adoption is also prohibited there, he has refused to do so. He knows that it simply could not fly there, and he already has enough

popularity problems on his hands (also unreported by Western journalists).

While, as the above examples illustrate, the West has used such symbols as pride month, and the pride flag as a means of its core value and virtue—not just the acceptance of sexual diversity, but its celebration—the move from personal acceptance of private same sex acts to institutionally valorising it commenced with same sex unions. The first country to legally recognize same sex marriages was the Netherlands, which was also the first to legalize euthanasia—both occurred in 2001. Same sex marriage followed by Belgium, two years later, and the provinces of Ontario and British Columbia. It was only, though, within the last ten years that same sex marriage became increasingly common place in Western Europe and Latin America. In Asia and Africa, it is only permitted in Taiwan and South Africa. Hilary Clinton eventually came to support same sex marriage in 2013, Obama had come out for it the previous year.

It was not just, though, that political parties in the West started flip-flopping on the issue, the push for same sex marriage was a symptom of a major transformation in the gay movement itself. In the 1960s and 1970s the gay movement was generally part of a wider sexual revolution— “free love” —and attack upon the family and the Christian religion (the Sisters of Perpetual Indulgence began in 1979). It was only as politicized gay people started aging and dying that they had to come to grips with the legal issues surrounding wills and inheritance. They had, in other words, been dragged into a world where sex mattered less than legal bonds. Gradually the issue of gay parenting was also taking on importance, not the least reason with the increase in divorce, more people came to identify as gay in the aftermath, and the matter of child rearing became important. That would morph into increasing number of gay people wanting to adopt—in countries such as Australia and Great Britain the acceptance of a gay couple raising children morphed into gay adoption, and along with single parents, gay people were legally entitled to adopt before they could marry. It is also noteworthy that around the same time there were an increasing number of stories coming out of Great Britain that religious couples were finding it increasingly difficult to adopt. There were very understandable reasons why gay people wanted to participate in the institutions that they, if not individually at least as a movement, had generally rejected—that included the Christian Church as well.

Even before newly elected Biden authorized embassies to fly the pride flag, he had overturned President Trump's ban on transgender people joining the military. Trump had always been 'liberal' of sexual issues, even supporting same sex marriage, but he objected to gender reassignment being on the military dime, and was also aware that the army needed people who can kill people and follow

orders, rather than express their identity. But inclusivity and diversity has now been restored as a central value of the US military, and US leadership, with the US Navy having a drag queen as its "Digital Ambassador." They were a little behind the CIA and FBI who had also used pride in diverse sexual orientation as a recruitment strategy. Likewise the administration more generally ensured that it employs people (like Rachel Levine, and Sam Brinton, at least before the source of his fetching wardrobe became widely publicized) whose sexual identity is not only part of their cv but on public display.

What is happening in the public sector has also become part of the public presentation of corporations. Although none in their life has ever seen a woman act like Dylan Mulvaney Bud Light decided to promote it as the face of beer. The strategy of using a fake woman to promote a fake beer backfired, but it has not stopped other corporations—the most visible of the recent ones has been the Target draping its store with pride flags and parading mannequins in LGBTQ attire, which has also lost a lot of money. The backlash is interpreted by the progressive liberals as a sign of how far society has to go before there is full acceptance of sexual diversity, when, in fact, it is led by people who object to a lifestyle based upon sexual identity being constantly publicly promoted and pushed upon them and their children. The riposte by liberals is that this is what the LGBTQ have to face every-day of their lives. And to a large extent this is correct.

Though, what is the real issue is not that, it is that the politicization and promotion of the LGBTQ lifestyle is but one further step in a society which has made sexual exhibitionism part of its daily culture. For the real drive—from the point of view of the diverse—or perverse (depending where you come from) people engaging in it—the constant exhibition of sexuality is the drive to push ever further into the sexual possibilities available to the species. That in turn is a drive not only for increasing sterile acts of sexual expression, but a drive for the destruction of life. The society that celebrates and routinizes sexuality is one which not only widely requires sterility through birth control, but freely available abortion. How one reacts to this fact morally is irrelevant to the point I am making—for the point of raising it is to get people to see what kind of world they are making and to at least have some sense of how far from traditional it is, and hence too why people from more traditional societies are so hostile to this. For my interest in all this is primarily social and political—to be cognisant of what happens with the political and social choices we are making.

And what has happened with the choices that have become prioritized in the West is that we have the world we have: it is a riven world—domestically it is one verged on civil war, internationally it is one at

war. The riven-ness is veiled by the media and the universities and schools which see their task as educating people to accept that this riven world is one which is more just and more free than the old one, and that the only obstacle to its realization, domestically, is some demon like a Donald Trump, or, internationally, Vladimir Putin. The complete destruction of institutions required to instantiate this justice and freedom is not even noticed, nor is the reality of the freedom it achieves. Again the misery of what the new justice is is exhibited by the extent of identity conflict, particularly racial and ethnic conflict. Though this too is veiled by blaming the conflict on white supremacy. The problem with having a class of people whose job it is to educate, but who themselves are simply rote learners and appliers of ideas, at best (e.g., Marx, Foucault, the Frankfurt School) not sufficiently well thought through, and at worst (choose any of the thousands upon thousands of academic scribblers pointing out how racist, homophobic, transphobic etc. the West is, whilst having or aspiring to have tenured academic jobs to write their 'critiques') imbecilic ideas, is that they cannot see what they are doing in any other terms than those which valorise themselves and their ideas, as well as their policies and institutional and social changes. More jobs in schools, universities and corporations for people to give more classes to the bored or too stupid to understand the stupidity of what they are doing scribbling about how racist they are or the society around them is—that is now what justice is.

As for freedom—it is even more pathetic than what passes for social justice. It is the freedom to have blue hair, to have tantrums and call out everybody who does not accept the real you as a genocidal transphobe, to have one's body amputated and rebuilt with the help of drugs. It is the freedom to have one's very own pronoun. Though, to be fair, for men with autogynephilia, it is the freedom to be almost permanently aroused as one has open access into women's spaces that were once private and cordoned off from the male gaze—their dormitories, toilets, and prisons and expose themselves with the protection of the law. For men who want to be applauded and acclaimed for their achievements, but who are not competitive against their own biological kind, it is the freedom to compete against biologically weaker competitors. It is the freedom to humiliate and devalue women who want to excel in some activity to compete with their biological kind so they can explore the transcendence involved in combining discipline and service in striving to reach beyond limits. It is the freedom to be morally superior and to have economic advantage and enhanced social status in a competitive world. It is the freedom to be special and to receive special attention. In a culture in which being a white heterosexual male youth is to be derided by teachers, becoming trans is increasingly a way out, a way of having attention, love even—and that extra attention and "love" will be appealing not just to white heterosexual boys being bullied by their teachers. The huge spike in girls wanting to be boys is also their way of escaping the burdens that are part of being a woman. Being a grown up is to take on a new burden in another phase of life. Being trans today appears a new life option, an easy option, encouraged at every

step by professionals who tell them constantly how brave they are and that they are doing the right thing, for to say otherwise is now a way to lose one's profession. They really are much braver than they realize because they think they will find their true selves, when they are simply the unwitting cannon fodder in a vast war of social experiment and anti-traditionalism in the globalist alliance of oligarchs and their sterile complexes of compliant identities.

Thus it is that having realized one has made a gigantic mistake, and wanting to retrieve whatever biological vestiges (sadly by adopting further surgery) of their presurgical nature they become hated. Transphobia has nothing on the hatred that Western trans people have for apostates. Irrespective of fact checkers telling us that it is only a teeny weeny number of people who re/ or de-transition, twenty years from now, as a large number of transitioned children on reaching adulthood discover that their biology does not "recognize" the equipment that was reassigned to them, we will be witnessing one hell of a social backlash. What they considered to be discomfort or even intense dislike of their gender will end up far, far more debilitating than the discomfort they feel now—this story of the deep regret involved in deciding too young or too swiftly to surgically change one's sexual parts is being told time and time again, but not by the mainstream media. The freedom exercised by Big Pharma and the medical professions and the various other unions and boards that have enabled this, along with the parents who have brainwashed their children into being "free," will be legally protected from any liability.

The real reason that the overwhelming majority of people recoil against the new freedom in general, and the trans contagion, especially among youth, and middle aged men, is not because they fear trans people. Where there is any fear it is the fear to speak their mind about what they don't like, it is the fear of being bullied or losing a job from defending the rights of biological women to have private spaces. What they often fear is what the West has become. But it is not a phobia of trans people per se that drives people to speak out against the trans contagion and corporate push to celebrate trans-ness—people might think a bearded bloke dressed up as a deranged girl looks stupid, but that does not make them scared. And yes when it comes to teachers and doctors and deranged parents banging on about the right of the child to determine what sex they are (as if in the long run that might not do more damage than allowing children the right to drive and drink beer) they might get really angry.

Recently Chris Hayes at MSNBC exclaimed, like some giant moral version of a puffer fish, that it was "None of your Goddamned business" if you do "not like" "gender affirming care." The new civil war plays it out as much by the deliberately misleading choice of words (though I get the fact that Hayes is too

stupid to have the faculty of deliberation, lacking that faculty is now a requirement for getting a network job) as by the infantilization of the population and the sexualization of infants. For some reason that can only be grasped by an undeveloped brain it is 'right wing' to think that children who are instructed to read sexualized material and to choose a sexual identity are being "groomed."

But, apart from the fact that brainwashing children about their sexuality, and playing havoc with their hormones and preparing them for surgery is grooming, and indeed that it is one that uses children for sexual gratification of adult voyeurs, is hateful, the most common response to the trans contagion is pity. It is a pity to see a young adult who identifies as the opposite sex think that all their problems come down to other people not accepting that their sexual identity is contrary to their biological nature. It is a pity that someone is so vulnerable that they think that if they do not have a new pronoun they will consider suicide. It is a pity that someone thinks that this issue, which might in very rare cases be a real one, a tragedy not simply a life style choice, has become not only so central to what the West stands for, but a source of derision and contempt for people who see this as but the final gasp of a civilization in its death throes. It is a pity that someone can think that not seeing the trans identity issue the same way as someone who embraces it as a way out or into a much better life is portrayed as an extremist and accomplice to genocide. It is a pity if someone thinks that by taking drugs, putting on women's clothes and makeup that they pass for a woman, even when they look and act nothing like a woman. It is pitiable to see a glum looking bearded young trans male who thinks that the reason they have suicidal tendencies is because nature gave them the wrong body, and that when they have the new body and identity, and everyone congratulates them on their bravery and emancipation they will be happy.

The trans issue is one of the most pitiable examples of the cultural descent of the West—the parents of the child, who goes to school as a little girl in the morning and returns in the evening saying she is now he, are also to be pitied, as are the children who along with all the other craziness, all the fear about the environment and the hatred (for the identity people it's anyone they deem to be their persecutor, and for the mainstream it's the Russians and next the Chinese), and now the burden of having to decide before knowing anything important about life of whether their sexual parts have been a massive error of nature are to be pitied because the world they are growing up in will have no safe spaces. (And the very designation of such spaces in universities today is yet another sign of the Orwellian reality in which slavery is salvation.)

The trans issue and the pronoun issue are symptoms of a society in which all real priorities have been

abandoned because the culture has completely lost any bearing toward the future. It is a culture in which freedom has been extinguished—for freedom is useless, indeed meaningless in a life, if not undergirded by the virtues, by discipline and by knowledge. Further, discipline is one of the most fundamental mechanisms of social survival. Discipline is a cultural and social necessity. It is even more primordial than freedom, which is a far later and rarer cultural plant.

Culturally discipline begins with the designation of the name that distinguishes the life-path that awaits one—and the first name one receives equips one for the role that one must play socially. Some eighty years ago the brilliant Rosenstock-Huessy pointed out that the devaluation of names, which he saw in the widespread dropping of Christian names, was a serious symptom of a culture in decline. How right he was. It was a sign that the culture had been plagued by social amnesia. That it had no idea of its debt to its Christian heritage. Those who despise that heritage can now exult in the neo-pagan revival which has taken hold in the West. Had they learnt anything from the two most anti-Christian regimes to have emerged to drive out their Christian heritage, the Nazis and the Bolsheviks, they might have realized that people will always find some god to follow and sacrifice themselves and others to. And that a God who sacrifices Himself is far more benign than a God or Idea (a God by another name, albeit a loveless God in its most insubstantial form) that can only live off human sacrifices.

The story of what Christianity contributed to the West and to the world has been told best, in my opinion, by Christopher Dawson and Rosenstock-Huessy, and even, more briefly, by Chesterton. It would take me too far afield to discuss the Christian contribution to the classical virtues and how an orientation to reality which accepts that we are born in sin, and that we will continue to sin, and that we must make our world through being open to redemption and grace, which requires cultivating a culture of forgiveness and awareness of our frailty and lack, our weaknesses, and the insurmountable permanence of our ignorance equips us for a far better way of dealing with life than the technocratic fake world and fake love that we are hurtling toward in the name of emancipation, and progress. But the Christian way of life is one which drew upon, fused and reinvigorated traditions, and in so doing offered a culture in which freedom began to flourish. It was not the freedom of simply following a law we gave ourselves (the philosophical freedom of Rousseau and Kant), nor the freedom of unleashing the appetites and doing one's will (the diabolical freedom of Alastair Crowley and the Marquis de Sade), nor the freedom of surrendering to the determinations of the universe (Spinoza and the Stoics) it was the freedom to act under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, to enter into a new path of life by following where the Spirit takes us, and to be open to life being breathed into the broken and damaged parts of what we are. It could work with classical virtues, but it was not limited by those virtues.

Some twentieth century philosophers seeking a radically emancipated future had sought to interpret love, hope and faith in purely political and material terms. But the freedom that had been such a creative power in every aspect of the life of the West, from its art to its enterprises to its spirit of inquiry, and the bonds of solidarity it established (to be sure ever precarious, ever compromised by powerful people and powerful appetites uncurbed by the higher laws of the spirit) was only ever of nourishment and durability where it was not disassociated from the spiritual service which enables being open to its source. Freedom as a thing in-itself is a path to nothingness. And combining it with other wisps such as equity does not make it more substantial.

But the story of the growth of freedom in the West is one which is also a falling away from the spirit, a falling into anomie and alienation (the ailments that almost all-important sociologist of the late 19th and early 20th century explored). The 20th century and what had been made out of the industrial revolution of the previous century in the West was one of unprecedented plenty, unprecedented possibility—and the unimaginable horrors of the gulags and gas chambers, of wars of anticolonialism. Freedom without the Holy Spirit (which is also to say, freedom in service to the spirits of Imperialism, Nazism, and Communism) was a contradiction of material abundance, spiritual impoverishment and mass death. The world wars—the mass death—also opened up new possibilities of material advancement and freedom—the economic freedom of women and the transformation of social roles and the family. As with every gift, blessing, or new potential, it is what one makes of them that mattered. We are witnesses today of how that has played out, for better and worse.

For all that the freedom opened up by the explosions and inventiveness that have preceded us have been an experiment, an unprecedented cultural experiment, and the current trans contagion is one more contribution to the dark side of the experiment. The darkness comes not from the fact that some people genuinely have gender dysphoria, but that their suffering is an occasion for profiteering, economically and politically, and that profiteering must be protected from being criticized.

Sexual politics is not really about sex *per se*—it is about rearranging institutions around one variable of human experience—in the case of LGBTQ sexuality, the focus is upon a variable that is not capable in and of itself of giving natural birth. To be sure all love is fecund, and involves a creative even 'supranatural' birth. But the sexual act is an act of desire, and while desire may activate who we wish to be with, the act is completely irrelevant to love. It is only in the deluded sentimental culture in which the dizzying enticements of romantic love are essentialised as love itself that the foundation of the perpetuity of the species is passed onto such a fleeting and ephemeral quality. The culture that makes

the sentiment of romantic love the bedrock of marriage and child rearing was always bound to end as it has, in a society of fractured relationships, presided over by divorced parents and children becoming moved from one "family" to another. Of course quite a few make a fist of it, but the more the society licenses desire the more the search for the One becomes a kind of farce. Again LGBTQ are not responsible for this—like everyone else they are thrown into their world and much of that world has already been devouring itself through excess and indulgence. And my point (now made in a number of essays in this magazine) is not about any wish to persecute people for their sexual preference. Liberality is a virtue when it does not drive out our understanding of the complexity of consequences and the importance of thinking through institutional arrangements. That takes far more than sentiment—it takes learning from generations of experience, and that is precisely what the liberal progressive mind set refuses to do because it simply focusses upon thwarted desire and the delusion that men—or white men—or white wealthy men—or white wealthy men without a disability (the logic is farcical) have had it all. The only person that has it all—in terms of having every desire satiated—is, as Plato astutely observed a tyrant, but the 'all' of a tyrant is a gaping maw of appetite that devours everything.

Plato knew of the Greek tyrants, and he wrote centuries before Roman emperors would forever be immortalized as beasts by Roman historians who despised the imperial debauchery. Our "progressive" historians generally don't trust Tacitus or Suetonius. But that is because they have little appreciation of how the Republic, for all its flaws, relied for its existence upon the classical virtues. And the historians who saw the fish was rotting from the head down were making the case that Rome could not survive if it was ruled by men drowning in their own appetites.

Love is essentially self-sacrificing. A society which flourishes, which is also a society in which love is genuinely a driving power enabling social and personal flourishing necessarily imposes a limit upon pleasure and consideration of where it fits—with sacrifice—in the scheme of a society and in an individual life. To be sure there can be a strong case that the suffocation of desire is replete with dire social consequences, and to an important extent what happened in the West in the nineteenth and first half of the twentieth century was an attempt to release bonds that were hard felt. More the generation that spearheaded the sexual revolution had been raised in a culture shrouded by their parents experiencing two sequential catastrophes. No wonder they wanted to dance and sing—and have lots of sex. But the pushing of it into institutions has not led to more dancing and joy, but to ever greater fracture and a society that now holds itself together by waging war—for only the completely deluded fail to grasp that a proxy war is a real war—even if it is a particularly cowardly war, a war without self-sacrifice by those instigating it, with warriors supplied by the people who cannot escape the consequences of a corrupt government pushed by foreign powers and oligarchical money who have

used Ukrainian (very white) supremacists thugs to ensure the inevitability of a war. It is also a war of the completely morally bankrupt who think they are moral because they fly flags of a country which they know nothing about, nor care anything about except that it is at war against their greatest fear. This is the context of the trans contagion, of adults sacrificing children to their own deluded sterile death-wish fantasies by pretending the child knows its will. If the parents, doctors, teachers etc. pushing this agenda saw themselves, or could even see how monstrous they appear to others they could not stand it. Hence too they must protect themselves from themselves by pushing ever further for more censorship and sounding ever more removed from reality as the reality they are defending is a completely absurd technological fabrication that is profit driven, and pharmaceutically and surgically induced.

And to repeat, the trans contagion in the Western world is ultimately not about transexuality or trans identity per se. Anyone who has spent time in Thailand knows that "ladyboys" are almost a feature of the country—one might be greeted at a tourist destination with the words "Ladies, gentlemen and ladyboys." In Thailand, though, the existence of ladyboys has a completely different cultural significance—transsexuality is not a weapon against the family, it is not the symbol of solidarity and freedom, it is not an excuse to change the language to ensure total conformity of thought in the name of "emancipation." It needs no flag. It just is what it is.

Unlike in Thailand, transsexuality in the West is primarily about politicizing people who are the damaged product of a deeply damaged culture, a culture which has become putrefied through its own indulgence, through its excess, through its over medicalisation, through its hyper-sexualization, through its expansion of the state into the very capillaries of the smallest social unit, the family. The liberal totalising reach of the state was preceded by the Nazis and communists. But the scale and scope of the liberal state may well be heading toward the excesses of the worst regimes. This was recently noticed by a refugee from North Korea, Yeonmi Park, who has attained some kind of celebrity by talking and writing about the similarities of what is happening in the West with North Korea. Naturally, she is mocked, and derided by liberal youth who are completely brainwashed into thinking that she is a threat to their emancipation.

College kids doing Humanities in the last thirty or forty years have been thrilled by the paens to excess (mere joy and play - jouissance) to be found in French authors such as Bataille, Jacques Derrida, Jacques Lacan, not realizing that there have been very sound reasons why cultures generally suppress excess. 'Nothing in excess' was one of the Delphic utterances. The West's hegemony over the globalist

project is nothing if not excess. But the greatest excess is what I have hinted at already—an excessive love of death.

Depopulation and Eugenics

The turn that the sexualization of the culture, which was precipitated earlier but broke out completely in the 1960s in the West, is one that ties in with another key plank of the globalist agenda, viz., population /depopulation and eugenics, and the technocracy and bioweaponry that enables that agenda.

In spite of the mistake to lump in all political elites throughout history in the one basket, a mistake that has no bearing on the 'thesis' and evidence supplied in the book, Gavin Nascimento's [*A History of Elitism, World Government and Population Control*](#) is an invaluable resource for those wanting to track the Malthusian rationale of the globalist project, involving governmental agencies engaging in brainwashing their populations, and using them as the material for bio-experimentations.

His book commences with the claim that "some of the most trusted medical authorities—and indeed pioneers in medical history—secretly worked for different government agencies, most prominently the CIA."

Using the example of MKULTRA (Nascimento uses MKULTRA as an umbrella term to include a variety of clandestine projects of behavioural/ bio modifications), which the Church Committee Report, of the US Senate, in 1975, listed as involving "radiation, electroshock, various fields of psychology, psychiatry, sociology, and anthropology, graphology, harassment substances, and paramilitary devices and materials." Nascimento points out:

This clandestine agenda was skillfully carried out through dozens of well-respected Hospitals, Universities, Prisons and Government Agencies, amongst other select locations. This included a large number of North America's most elite universities, such as Stanford, Princeton, Columbia, Cornell, McGill, Harvard, Johns Hopkins, and many others. Trusted health authorities like the Addiction Research Center in Lexington Kentucky, the FDA (Federal Drug Agency) and NIH (National Institute of Health) were all involved in MKULTRA. Chemicals, drugs, poisons and different hallucinogens were supplied by leading pharmaceutical-vaccine companies, like Eli Lilly & Company and Sandoz (Today Novartis)

and Parke Davis (Today a subsidiary of Pfizer). Funding for MKULTRA research was inconspicuously made through "Nonprofit Foundations" like the Society for the Investigation of Human Ecology and the Geschickter Foundation. Although scarcely known, at least two major Foundations — the Josiah Macy Foundation (See [HERE](#) and [HERE](#)) and the pioneering Rockefeller Foundation— were also sources of MKULTRA funding. According to Historian Alfred W McCoy, the Ford Foundation was also used as a front for CIA "mind-control" research.

Nascimento then presents a lengthy list of experiments and operations which have been discovered thanks to declassified documents, reports and research articles which illustrate the shocking scale and scope of the projects. They include: Operation Sea-Spray, finally exposed in 1976, though first undertaken in 1950, which involved the Navy spraying "the entire San Francisco Area" with the bacteria *Serratia marcescens* (SM), in the following year the same experiment along with another bacteria was sprayed in Fort McClellan Alabama Florida leading to a huge spike (240%) in reported cases of pneumonia—SM was also sprayed in Key West, which also suffered a spike in pneumonia cases. In Virginia and Pennsylvania, in 1951 experimenting on unwitting Black people to test the racial biological response to exposure to *Aspergillus fumigatus*; an experiment in 1951 involving hypnotizing young girls to unconsciously carry out hypothetical bombings. In 1953 children at Clinton Elementary School in Minneapolis were repeatedly sprayed with zinc cadmium sulfide, a toxic chemical. That same chemical was "being secretly sprayed" in the poor neighbourhood of Pruitt-Igoe in St. Louis. In none of these experiments was there any attempt to monitor the health outcomes. Another experiment—this time in the mid 1960s was conducted to test the bacteria *Bacillus globigii* (BG). It was released in Washington's National Airport and Greyhound Bus station—again without any knowledge of the commuters "who, in turn, reportedly spread the bacteria to more than 200 cities."

A year later the CIA would release the same bacteria in New York's subway system. It was not only in the USA where such experiments were being conducted by intelligence services. In 2002 (April 21) the *Guardian* (when it was it was not easily dismissed as being another medium of disinformation) reported that millions of unsuspecting UK citizens had been subjected to clandestine biological weapons trials.

Given the above one should hardly be surprised that many people who knew about such operations as those mentioned above—which seem to the mere tip of a large iceberg—began to question not only the mandates of health officials, but the source of the virus. Was it really a super-deadly virus that originated with bats? Or was it a plan-demic (Mikki Willis)? Or a scam-demic (Corbett)? Or a pseudo

pandemic (Iain Davis)? All sorts of information pertinent to the origin of the disease concerning the Wuhan laboratory smelled funny. Take this from Newsweek magazine April 2020, (Mikki Willis in his *Plandemic: Fear is the Virus, Truth is the Cure*, alerted me to it):

"The NIH (with NIAID Director Dr. Anthony Fauci's backing) promised \$7.4 million to the EcoHealth Alliance to study bat coronaviruses from 2014 to 2019— and in doing so, to conduct gain-of-function research. A large portion of that went to the Wuhan Institute of Virology. The lab also received millions from a program called PREDICT, funded by the United States Agency for International Development, which works closely with the NIH."

Or, what about Event 201 exercise conducted by the Gates Foundation with the World Economic Forum "hosted to illustrate the potential consequences of a pandemic and the kinds of societal and economic challenges it would pose." As Willis comments:

"The Event 201 scenario is fictional, but it's based on public health principles, epidemiological modeling, and assessment of past outbreaks," the speaker explained. "In other words, we've created a pandemic that could realistically occur." The simulation kicked off with a well-produced—but fake—news video. "It began in healthy-looking pigs," a polished female newscaster announced solemnly, over B-roll of a writhing herd. "Months, perhaps years ago. A new coronavirus spread silently. Infected people got a respiratory illness with symptoms ranging from mild, flu-like symptoms to severe pneumonia," the voiceover continued, as chilling images were projected on the screen at the front of the room. "The sickest required intensive care. Many died. At first, the spread was limited to those with close contacts . . . but now it's spreading rapidly throughout local communities." International travel helped the illness hop borders, the news reel explained, until it was a full-scale global pandemic. The simulation predicted the spread of conspiracy theories, as the elite panel discussed the most effective ways to prevent the flow of public disinformation.

Censorship was rampant as millions clamored for a vaccine—even one that would be experimental and not fully tested. Hospitals were overflowing, and masks and gloves were scarce. Event 201 took place in October 2019—five months before COVID-19 was declared a pandemic. An event of this complexity and magnitude would take months to write, prep, and produce, placing its date of conceptualization at least one year prior to the actual pandemic. The question that arises for anyone paying close enough attention is—if this collection of

wealthy and powerful knew that far in advance exactly what would be needed and in short supply, why did they wait till the actual pandemic to begin addressing those critical details?

Mysteriously, while Event 201 was "hosted" by Johns Hopkins University, the World Economic Forum, and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, it was paid for by Open Philanthropy, an opaque charity run by Facebook cofounder Dustin Moskovitz. An investor in Chinese CRISPR technology company Sherlock Biosciences, Dustin had considerable gain from an "epidemic" that would get his technology authorized under an Emergency Use Authorization (EUA). (In fact, that's what wound up happening.)'

In a speech given by David Martin at the EU COVID Summit this year, he raised a number of point that I think are completely unknown to most people. I quote at some length from the highlights of his talk because I doubt if many people are familiar with it, though they should be:

The common cold was turned into a chimaera in the 1970s and in 1975, 1976 and 1977 we started figuring out how to modify coronavirus by putting it into different animals pigs and dogs, and not surprisingly by the time we got to 1990 we found out that coronavirus as an infectious agent was an industrial problem for two primary industries: the industries of dogs and pigs dog breeders in pigs found that coronavirus created gastrointestinal problems and that became the basis for Pfizer's first spike protein vaccine patent filed.

In 1990 they found out that there was a problem with vaccines they didn't work do you know why they didn't work it turns out that corona virus is a very malleable model that transforms, changes - it mutates overtime... every publication on vaccines for Coronavirus from 1990 until 2018 - every single publication - concluded that Coronavirus escapes the vaccine impulse because it modifies and mutates too quickly for vaccines to be effective and since 1990 to 2018 that is the published science... There are thousands of publications to that fact, not a few hundred, and not paid for by pharmaceutical companies. These are publications that are independent scientific research that shows unequivocally including efforts of the chimaera modifications made by Ralph Baer in the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill all of them show vaccines do not work on coronavirus.

In 2002 the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill patented, and I quote an infectious replication defective clone of Coronavirus.. for those of you not familiar with the language let

me unpack it for you: infectious replication defective means a weapon. It means something meant to target an individual but not have collateral damage to other individuals... That patent was filed in 2002 on work funded by... Anthony Fauci from 1999 to 2002. And that work patented at the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill mysteriously preceded SARS 1.0.

SARS is not a naturally occurring phenomenon - the naturally occurring phenomenon is called the common cold, it's called influenza-like illness, it's called gastroenteritis: that's the naturally occurring coronavirus. SARS is the research developed by humans weaponizing a life system model to actually attack human beings and they patented it.

When the CDC (enters for Disease Control and Prevention) in April of 2003 filed the patent on SARS coronavirus isolated from humans ... they downloaded a sequence from China and filed a patent on it in the United States. Any of you familiar with biological and chemical weapons treaties knows ... that's a crime a crime in the United States. The Patent Office went as far as to reject that patent application on two occasions until the CDC decided to bribe the Patent Office to override the patent examiner to ultimately issue the patent in 2007 on SARS Coronavirus... The RTPCR, which was the test that we allegedly were going to use to identify the risks associated with Coronavirus, was actually identified as a bioterrorism threat by me in the European Union sponsored events in 2002 and 2003... In 2005 this particular pathogen was specifically labelled as a bioterrorism and bio weapon platform technology described as such—that's not my terminology that I'm applying.

We have been lured into believing that Ecohealth alliance and DARPA and all of these organisations are what we should be pointing to, but we've been specifically requested to ignore the facts that over \$10 billion have been funnelled through black operations, through the cheque of Anthony Fauci and a side-by-side ledger where NIAID has a balance sheet, and next to it is a biodefense balance sheet equivalent dollar for dollar matching, that no one in the media talks about. And it's been going on since 2005. A gain of function moratorium, the moratorium that was supposed to freeze any efforts to do gain of function research, conveniently in the fall of 2014. The University of North Carolina Chapel Hill received a letter from NIAID saying that while the gain of function moratorium on corona virus in vivo should be suspended because their grants had already been funded, they received an exemption...- a biological weapons lab facility at the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill received an

exemption from the gain of function moratorium so that by 2016 we could publish the journal article that said SARS Coronavirus is poised for human emergence in 2016.

By the time we get to 2017 and 2018 the following phrase entered into common parlance among the community there is going to be an accidental or intentional release of a respiratory pathogen.

Four times in April of 2019 seven months before the allegation of patient number 14 patent applications of Moderna were modified to include the term accidental or intentional release upper respiratory pathogen as the justification for making a vaccine for a thing that did not exist... By September 2020 there would be a worldwide acceptance of a universal vaccine template.

One might have thought that the facts mentioned in this speech just might have been reported or discovered by journalists when the pandemic was announced. He is no dummy—he is the founder and CEO of M-CAM that has developed a widely used and valuable public equity index. Before the pandemic David Martin was interviewed regularly enough on Bloomberg, CNBC and the like. Now he has joined the ranks of the disappeared and, if cited, condemned. But no achievement can be so great for journalists that if they provide serious facts that go against "the narrative" they won't be ghosted or denounced as conspiracy theorists. Even having served as Pfizer's former chief scientist and vice-president of the allergy and respiratory research division of the drug company, and forty years' experience in the pharmaceutical industry does not count for anything if, like Michael Yeardon, one has the temerity to think the virus was designed, the pandemic planned, the dangers no more than a flu, the medical cartel's response created far more dangers than the disease, and that the pandemic just happened to create an unprecedented opportunity for those who openly publicize the need to redesign the world and reset it according to their intelligence, and compassion, and financial backing. That is why there is nothing unreasonable in the claim by Iain Davis that "The COVID 19 pseudopandemic was the first concerted attempt to establish a single, centralised form of global governance which had any realistic prospect of success. For the first time in human history, advances in technology made total global control entirely feasible."

The only difference between Davis and what Klaus Schwab and his mates are claiming is that COVID was not something that came from bats, but has all the hallmarks of something being planned. But even if the journalists are right—"nothing strange here—stop believing in conspiracies, just trust the

science, as embodied by Anthony Fauci, and take the vaccine so that we will all be safe," there is no ignoring the fact of the fusion of the global push for vaccines, the huge investments in biometrics, the development of centralized digital currencies—in Australia we now have many venues where paper money is simply not accepted. The step from computer viruses to natural viruses is so facile, so obvious that even if the project involves a vast number of participants working to a common goal, some with more, some with less information and a role to play (most being clueless about the endgame and hence their real role in it), it can be symbolically boiled down to one name—Bill Gates.

In James' Corbett's documentary *Who is Bill Gates?*, Corbett explores the extent to which vaccines and biometrics were so easily fused "for the task of creating an identification system tied to a digital payments infrastructure that will be used to track, catalogue and control every movement, every transaction and every interaction of every citizen." A friend and business partner of Bill Gates, Nandan Nilekani, also a co-founder of Indian multi-national Infosys India had launched the massive biometric id system which would be a kind of prototype for what Gates and his various capital partners in biometric systems and vaccine development was doing. While the most repeated argument about the necessity of the COVID vaccine was the success of the polio vaccine, in India the oral polio vaccine supported by the Gates foundation had proven to be a disaster with (according to a paper in International Journal of Environmental Research) over 490,000 developing paralysis from it—Corbett also refers to studies showing "that 80% of polio cases are now vaccine-derived."

The fact that someone has made such vast sums of money from computer software, and r & d against computer viruses then moves into a field involving the patenting and development of vaccines against real viruses, and finds the solution to a global pandemic of just the sort he had been talking about and preparing for years in the development of a technology which is essentially turning every one into a digital data/information complex which could be accessed by anyone with access to the data base, and then to also be part of a larger plan to ensure that their property would also be centrally digitalized and hence all freedom of movement and decision could be controlled is beyond being made up. Conspiracy theory? No fact.

COVID was the biggest blessing that Gates and all those investing in a transhumanist digitalized control world could have received.

If you wished to travel, or you have a certain profession such as a teacher or nurse, or wanted to go to certain concerts, you had to be vaccinated . But if you wanted to riot and burn down buildings to protest against an accidental death by a policeman or to express your hatred of Donald Trump that was

not necessary. The widespread acceptance (indeed for many enthusiasm for the) vaccine was already to draw the population into an acceptance of it being the government's 'duty' to genetically modify our bodies if that would keep us alive longer. To say that was a gigantic step is a very big understatement. The COVID vaccine now fully completed the journey of eugenics and population control kicked off by Thomas Malthus, and continued further by Darwin and his cousin, the pioneer of modern eugenics and founder of Social Darwinism, Francis Galton. While the Nazis pursued a eugenics program in conjunction with a genocidal one against those they deemed living viruses, in the United States eugenics and enforced sterilization of the poor and mentally unfit developed without needing to resort to concentration camps. Iain Davis has a chapter on the development in his book. And he cites a judgment from one of the United States' most prestigious and influential jurists, Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr., Holmes ruled in the *Buck vs Bell* case of 1927, a case and decision that Davis rightly notes was helping consolidate the eugenics program being pushed by the Rockefeller and Carnegie Foundations: 'It is better for all the world if, instead of waiting to execute degenerate offspring for crime or to let them starve for their imbecility, society can prevent those who are manifestly unfit from continuing their kind. The principle that sustains compulsory vaccination is broad enough to cover cutting the Fallopian tubes.'

The eugenics movement had its most important 'success' in the creation of the development of what would become Planned Parenthood, an organization at one time headed by William Gates Snr., and founded by Margaret Sanger. Her rationale for birth control was grounded in her eugenicist faith that everything should be done to prevent mentally or physical sick children, as well as those who were genetically determined to become delinquents and prisoners, and the overbreeding of the 'working class'. It was also a means to extirpate "defective stocks"—i.e., poor whites and blacks—"those human weeds which threaten the blooming of the finest flowers of American civilization." Had the US not gone to war with the Nazis, and had the Nazis not displayed how savage eugenics, which, in its inception, was presented as a most humane way of achieving human betterment, and breeding, who knows exactly what trajectory the eugenics movement may have taken in the United States. But the direction it did take, as Nascimento points out, in the aftermath of the Second World War, was a crypto-form, concealing itself under the "sheepskins" of genetics, population control, and Family Planning. Nevertheless, population control and eugenics were ever paired in the minds of the Malthusians and Social Darwinians. The following passage by Nascimento is salient on the interplay of the triad of crypto-eugenics:

The Rockefeller Establishment was once again intimately involved here. The prestigious Institute for Human Genetics in Copenhagen, for example, was founded with Rockefeller

money under the Directorship of Dr. Tage Kemp, a prominent Rockefeller scientist and Eugenist from Denmark. The Institute went on to become a leader in the field of "Genetics" whilst continuing its research into Eugenics. Correspondingly, the influential Population Council was founded by CFR veteran and Rockefeller Foundation Chairman John D. Rockefeller III in 1952, where he chose the former President of the American Eugenics Society (AES) Major General Frederick H. Osborn — the nephew of AES co-founder (alongside Madison Grant) Henry Fairfield Osborn Sr. — to be his first Director and succeeding President. According to the Wall Street Journal, six of the Council's ten founding members were intimately involved with the Eugenics Establishment. Frederick, who was also a CFR veteran, openly praised the Nazi Eugenics program in 1937 and even distributed Nazi propaganda to different institutions including High Schools. More significantly, he was a key figure in the perceptual transmutation of Eugenics to the more amenable terminology of Genetics and Population Control. The new strategy proved highly effective, and by 1968 the Population Council methodically recruited thirty Governments worldwide to adopt Population Control programs. This culminated in an infamous partnership between the U.S. and Indian Governments in which millions of Indian civilians were sterilized—many of them forced and virtually all of them coerced... Another useful vehicle that was hijacked and weaponized by the Eugenics Establishment in the wake of World War II, was Environmentalism. Just three years after the War ended in 1948, Henry Fairfield Osborn Jr—cousin of Frederick Osborn and son of Henry Fairfield Sr—published *Our Plundered Planet*, proclaiming the world to be severely overpopulated ("more than two billion human beings") and in urgent need of having its numbers reduced through Population Control. Failure to do so, he suggested, would result in famine, starvation, or war. In fact, Osborn went so far as to claim the recent World War—and even the First World War before it — were both the "spawn" of overpopulation. Unsurprisingly, the book was well received, widely propagated, and quickly became a Best Seller. That same year, a friend of Osborn Jr that worked as an Associate Director under Nelson Rockefeller during the War, William Vogt, published *Road to Survival*, which likewise alleged the greatest threat to the Planet, and thus Humanity, was the evil of overpopulation which would result in recurring cycles of famine and war if left unchecked, thereby threatening the security and well being of the United States.

Nascimento continues by elaborating on the financial role played by the Rockefeller and Ford foundations and others in fostering the fear of the impending doom that overpopulation would cause, including the impending doom to the environment. It is one of the many ironies—which only goes to

show how self-serving material interest is—that the social scientists who were so devoted to pushing a radical transformation of society to liberate it from the perniciousness of capitalism so readily swallowed and marched in step with 'studies' that were built from the financial backing of the biggest capitalists on the planet. For it was precisely the richest people of the planet who were pouring money into schools and universities and research institutions, the media, the entertainment business, and the political parties to push the agenda of the impending horrors of overpopulation.

It was—and remains the case—that it was a very rare and very brave researcher who dared to question the consensus that were formed in a matrix of interests and economic incentives, where livelihoods had become completely dependent upon the ability to come up, not just with research projects, but research conclusions. The science had been bought and paid for and it was all to uphold the objective of decreasing the population. Thus too it was devoted to ensuring that the very things that helped human beings better survive and live better lives—specifically the energy systems that contributed to higher economic growth, and the creation of technologies that helped overcome famine, and the raising of life-expectancy—were to be seen as forces of destruction imperilling the entire planet. To be sure, it took time to edge out of the schools, universities and research institutions those who argued that the consensus were often bogus. That the dissenters included noble prize winners, or scientists from prestigious universities, who had published in the best scientific journals did not matter. For at the same time as the funding for scientists coming up with the right answers was increasing, the reliability of scientific articles in journals was plummeting—a piece in *The Economist* (10/25/13), "Problems with scientific research: How science goes wrong":

"Modern scientists are doing too much trusting and not enough verifying—to the detriment of the whole of science, and of humanity. Too many of the findings that fill the academic ether are the result of shoddy experiments or poor analysis. A rule of thumb among biotechnology venture-capitalists is that half of published research cannot be replicated. Even that may be optimistic. Last year researchers at one biotech firm, Amgen, found they could reproduce just six of 53 "landmark" studies in cancer research. Earlier, a group at Bayer, a drug company, managed to repeat just a quarter of 67 similarly important papers. A leading computer scientist frets that three-quarters of papers in his subfield are bunk. In 2000... roughly 80,000 patients took part in clinical trials based on research that was later retracted because of mistakes or improprieties."

Eight years earlier [another paper](#) by John Ioannidis in *PLoS Med.* 2005 Aug; 2(8): e124 bore the

disturbing title, "Why most published research findings are false."

The other thing that was happening was academic independence had been vanquished, as control over the what could and could not be done in the university was passed from the academic 'community' to the administrators of the university. Management and administration dictated the values and policies of the university, and the kind of research that was not only desirable, but permissible. The administrators of the universities, in spite of the inflation of student fees, also required ever more dependence upon the largess of donors, and foundations who pay the research bill. The university has long since become a corporation, and the trade-off was that the corporations adopted values that fitted what the university had come to teach. In the Humanities that was the plethora of 'social justice' narratives that just happened to neatly fit the values that the richest people on the planet were also supporting. As Victor Davis Hanson [notes in](#) "Silicon Valley's Moral Bankruptcy":

of those seventeen U.S. tech companies claiming a value of \$100 billion, 98 percent of their aggregate donations are directed to Democrats. Dustin Moskovitz, a cofounder of Facebook and worth a reported \$11 billion, gave Hillary Clinton \$20 million in 2016 and Joe Biden \$24 million in 2020. Karla Jurvetson, the former spouse of the tech mogul Steve Jurvetson (SpaceX, Tesla), sent some \$27 million to Elizabeth Warren, Barack Obama, Hillary Clinton, and Joe Biden. Reid Hoffman (LinkedIn) pledged nearly \$5 million to stop Donald Trump in 2020. Some fifteen Silicon Valley rich people sent more than \$120 million to left-wing candidates between 2018 and 2020 alone.

The adage you get what you pay for is very fitting for the nexus between research grants and money poured into universities, the corporate character of research and teaching today, and the ideological employees and components that run through them. Sexual diversity as we indicated above is not simply a private matter it is a publicly and corporately funded requirement as is racially profiled hiring and student selection. So what do they want for their money? To that Nascimento answers—that one thing many of them want is control of the population as well as diminishing its size. He also suggests that the surge in gender dysphoria may be a consequence of a deliberate tactic in the war for depopulation. That war has drug companies involved in the alpha and omega—first creating the drugs that create the dysphoria, then providing the drugs, and the various instruments and technologies used by the surgeons, to satisfy the need for "gender reassignment."

That might sound crazy—but surely if the massive spike in trans drugs and surgery is due to people

identifying with the other sex, then it is reasonable to suppose that there has been a chemical change taking place in the population. Of course, the political argument—you know the one that takes up an entire undergraduate education today so it can be deployed for any and every occasion - is that in the past trans people were oppressed so they kept it to themselves—there have, so the nonsense goes, always been a fairly large minority wanting to cut off and stitch on new parts. The evidence for this is that professors say it is so. It may well be, though, that the spike is due to chemical affects. The question, then, is, were these affects intended or are they simply side-effects of drugs? If the latter was the case, though, then why is there not greater attention to the problem in tracking which drugs are causing this dysphoria, and how that side-effect can be eliminated. But now that being trans must not ever be seen as a medical problem, but as a perfectly normal condition like having blond hair, even though extra-normal drugs and surgery are essential for completing the transition there can be no justification for seeking for the side-effect, let alone curing it. The logic is straight out of Lewis Carroll but it certainly leaves pharmaceutical companies and surgeons in a win-win situation.

And before this is simply dismissed as a ridiculous conspiracy, consider the ethical dilemma and the logic of really believing that unless there is depopulation there will be mass starvation. In other words, if people really believed what they were writing about the population bomb or climate change back in the 1960s—Exhibit A: Paul Ehrlich who was immensely popular back in the day foretold the “extinction of “all important animal life in the sea” by 1979, and that England would not exist by 2000—surely it would be crazy not to do all one could to stop the population increasing—and if that meant giving people drugs to make them sterile, or engage in sterile sexual practices, how could that be wrong? One reason I generally find moral argument to be useless is that people can reason themselves into believing anything—far better to look at what happens when people do a, b, c etc. and then talk about the consequences of actions, and not intentions—intentions are overrated, as very little in life turns out as intended.

In any case, here is a fact. In 1969, the former Director of the Behavioural Science Division at the Ford Foundation, Bernard Berelson published a paper in the journal *Science*, where he surveyed “the most promising Population Control ideas in circulation at the time.” Amongst the works he cited most worthy of consideration, included the clandestine sterilization proposals of Dr. Melvin M. Ketchel and Professor Paul R. Ehrlich. Unsurprisingly, Berelson concluded that the “Establishment of involuntary fertility control methods were likely the most effective means of population control.” The month after that paper appeared, Frederick Jaffe, the Vice President of Planned Parenthood under Alan F. Guttmacher, sent a memo to him outlining dozens of population control proposals including “Encourage increased homosexuality.” “Require women to work,” and use “Fertility control agents in water supply.” *Family*

Planning Perspectives, Vol. 2, No. 4 (Oct 1970), pp. i-xvi (16 pages).

The following year in 1970, "the Father of the [contraceptive] pill" Carl Djerassi, published a paper entitled, 'Birth Control After 1984,' where he deliberated on both Bereleson and Ketchel's proposals and then expanded on their practical application. For example, Djerassi notes that a sterilant "added to food or water would (need to) be a general environmental pollutant. It would have to be considered a pesticide, albeit one that is directed primarily at humans." He then proceeds to emphasize that 'since initial biological screening for such an agent would be carried out not in man but in animals, an agent truly specific for man would completely escape detection.' In other words, a weaponized pesticide could serve as the perfect disguise for a Population Control program.

Nascimento then goes on to argue that this weaponization of a pesticide in the 'war' against overpopulation might well have been carried out with the application of the herbicide Atrazine.

As exposed by Professor Tyrone Hayes, [Atrazine](#) has contaminated the water supply throughout the world, which includes the drinking supply and the water we use to grow crops. Professor Hayes originally studied the herbicides effects on frogs and found it was causing chemical castration and "males didn't breed properly," some demonstrated unnatural "homosexual behavior," and others even "completely turned into females."

What makes Hayes' findings especially concerning, is that frogs have biological responses similar to humans. In fact, a 2003 study found that men exposed to Atrazine had significantly lower sperm counts compared to those who had not been and a 2013 study found that babies exposed to Atrazine in their mother's womb developed abnormal genitals.

Unfortunately, Atrazine is far from the only problem. In 2017, a major study examining 185 smaller studies conducted in multiple countries throughout the world showed a 59% decline in healthy male sperm counts from 1973 to 2011. In 2021, one of the authors of that study, renowned Epidemiologist Shanna Swan, warned that sperm counts are on track to reach zero by 2045, meaning humanity may no longer be able to reproduce naturally. Despite this, there are still an alarming number of people worldwide that have been misled to believe "overpopulation" is the greatest threat to society.

Swan claims different manmade chemicals, including Atrazine, are overwhelmingly to blame and may even be partly behind the rising trend in “gender dysphoria” and “gender fluidity.” When [asked in a recent interview](#) if the U.S. government was protecting its people from these harmful chemicals through regulations, she replied (18:03) “It doesn’t protect us and it could. It could do better.” She also points out (18:07) that the chemical manufacturers “often remove the chemical that we’ve identified as harmful and replace it with another one with a slightly different name, which causes the same harm.” For those who are not hopelessly naïve, this certainly reflects the “crypto-eugenics” policies that Carlos Patton Blacker unambiguously wrote about to Dorothy Brush 60 years ago.”

Now let us be clear here, knowing this does not mean that we can know for sure that Atrazine has caused the sperm decline or increase in homosexuality or massive increase in gender dysphoria. But the rise in infertility, of people identifying as homosexuals, and ‘trans-ness’ is a fact not a conspiracy theory. Likewise the intentions expressed by the authors mentioned above are not the product of a theory—they too are facts. Likewise the role played by the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations in supporting research that requires investigating tactics of depopulation. Whether or not the specific tactic of using pesticide to do it is a theory. The thing about theories is that they are not facts, but they are means for exploring further facts, which in turn may help us see the meaning of certain facts more clearly, or, as in this case, who or what is responsible for them. When theories are constructed to explain the meaning of actions of people with economic, political and social power it is perfectly understandable why those same powerful persons do not want the meaning or even the facts themselves to be widely known.

We know that all sorts of experiments were conducted on unwitting subjects in the West—and I can think of several other examples that Nascimento does not mention involving atomic tests in Australia and Pacific islands. There was also the claim almost ten years ago that the WHO tetanus vaccine was spiked with an infertility chemical, and that when the Kenyan Catholic doctors found evidence to support this claim, WHO subsequently engaged in an elaborate coverup—see the documentary by Andy Wakefield and Robert Kennedy Jnr., [*Infertility: A Diabolical Agenda*](#).

Conclusion

It is not a theory that there are numerous examples of liberal democratic governments complying with research institutions and scientists who are not only paid for by tax payers but private ‘philanthropists’

and their various foundations. One does not need to invoke masons, or the Illuminati to know this (I will briefly discuss these groups in the third part of this essay). And the only reason anyone would not know this is because of a lack of knowledge, in part because there is such a bombardment of information, including disinformation, in today's white noise media, or because they have forgotten it – for much has been reported over time in the mainstream media - or because they are too lazy to go and follow up if the facts are raised.

The term conspiracy theory today had largely become a synonym today for the excuse 'I don't want to explore this matter further because I am too lazy, and or/so gullible I trust sources that have been proven multiple times to be sources of disinformation and vehicles for the same groups of people and organizations that have conducted unconscionable experiments on at least three generations.' Our news today is bound up with routines and laziness, the laziness of someone who slumps in the chair at the end of the day and wants to have their thoughts and information packaged and presented by a network, or broadcaster, or print source they have incorporated into their routine. To a large extent this combination of routine and laziness is a symptom of the low level anomie and mild depression that is not uncommon in people today due to the nature of their work, diet, mental habits etc. One of the most common responses I receive from friends in my circle when I raise facts they are not aware of is that they dismiss what is being said because they have never heard of these facts, and instead of thinking they will check them out, they simply return to the induced slumber and comfort that comes from talking about what they know, which is what the networks, etc. served up, as part of their deficient mental diet.

So, the fact that there are facts which people either have never heard of or refuse to see alone does not make a theory about who is doing what and why it is true, nor is it an excuse for making up facts, but it certainly should make us wary of simply accepting that the ruling class and its enablers should be trusted. That was previously the one thing that Marxists could often be relied on—before most of them disappeared into more progressive causes which just happen to serve the interests and tactics of a class which pays their wages, and funds the organizations, and institutions which form their thoughts. They can't and because they can't we now find ourselves in a world war – a war in which the disinformation campaign is so great and so successful that most people in the West don't even think that is the case.

In the next part of this essay, I want to focus upon another author, an author who I suspect may not want anything to do with the likes of Alex Jones, or Gavin Nascimento, or even my good self, but I am

only assuming that because he is a very cautious writer and nothing in the four books by him that I have read or the articles he has published veers into the territory of population control or the objective of progressive globalism being a neo-feudal transhumanist world consisting of three major classes. The author I am talking about is Jacques Baud, and the two books I will discuss in the next part of this essay are *Governing By Fake News: International Conflict: 30 Years of Fake News Used by Western Countries* and [*Operation Z*](#)

Read [Part 2](#) and [Part 3](#).

Wayne Cristaudo is a philosopher, author, and educator, who has published over a [dozen books](#). He also doubles up as a singer songwriter. His latest album can be [found here](#).

[**Featured:**](#) *Bordando el manto terrestre (Embroidering the Mantle of the Earth)*, by Remedios Varo; painted in 1961.

