

Is COVID-19 a Bioweapon? – New Book Could Shatter the Narrative

Dr. Fleming's answer is an unequivocal Yes, we are looking at a dual bioweapon, because that's where all the documentable evidence points. There is the coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) which was man made; then there are the experimental mRNA injections being foisted on populations, sometimes against their will.

A Letter From the Bowels of the D.C./Bidenista Jan-6er Gulag

While corporate media would have you believe “justice” is being served to those who breached the Capitol on January 6, horror stories have been leaking out – like this one. More proof that the rule of law is dead, if this does not prompt a Congressional investigation.

We Are in a World War. It Is

a Fifth Generation War

With draconian policies going well beyond sensible public health measures having been imposed all over the world, no thinking person can believe the responses to COVID-19 are about public health, any more than any thinking person still believes the virus came from a bat.

“Piercing the Veils”: Revisited

These folks discover the foundations of Constitutionalism and perhaps political philosophy generally. They reach into our Western heritage and learn the significance of, e.g., the Magna Carta and the English Bill of Rights. They may read John Locke and Edmund Burke as well as Washington and Madison and Jefferson.

The Memory Hole Is As Deep As the Swamp Is Wide

He would have had to go outside the Asylum, of course, bringing in more outsiders— probably peasants the Asylum’s movers and shakers had never heard of before. They wouldn’t be in the Big Club with Harvard or Yale law degrees. Trump’s efforts would then have been fought even harder.

The Evidence Is In! COVID-19(84) Jabs Really Are Very Dangerous!

The vaccine isn't supposed to work, it's supposed to make things worse. And it has! It's increased the susceptibility of millions of people to severe illness and death. That's what it's done. It's a stealth weapon in an entirely new kind of war; a war aimed at restructuring the global order and establishing absolute social control.

More Thoughts on the Impending Break-Up of the U.S.

Last week (as I write this morning), "Joe Biden" *pulled a trigger likely to aggravate divisions over the experimental mRNA vaccines. He blatantly violated the U.S. Constitution – as if that matters these days! – by signing an executive order commanding employers with 100 or more workers to get them jabbed, or tested every week with a test known to be invalid and scheduled to be discontinued at the end of the year.

The Break-Up of the U.S. Is Inevitable. Here Is What You Can Do

The U.S. is going to break up in the near future, possibly within our lifetimes. I don't think it's stoppable at this point. The only issue is: will you prepare, or leave things to chance? You cannot save what is no longer "your" country. But you might be able to save yourself and your loved ones working with small and autonomous communities of like-minded others.

A Few Words for the Hyper-Conspiratorial and Devotees of The Science

What we must do is encourage critical thinking skills—outside schools and an academia that dropped this ball decades ago. Dominant – well-moneyed! – institutions have become barriers to knowledge, rational thought, and communication, instead of conduits of truthful information, learning, and understanding. This may be the real crisis of these Twilight Zone times we've entered.

Did GloboCorp Assassinate 3 National Presidents to Further the COVID Narrative & Import Vaccines?

What I fear is that once full FDA approval comes (and it will come), we'll see an onslaught of vaccine passports, mandates, and restrictions: whatever it takes, until those who refuse are unable to leave their homes. Or are even rounded up and put in camps, because come to think of it, in the present environment of combined corporate and governmental encirclement everywhere you turn, there is nothing sacrosanct about your home!

Is This Year One? Part 2

GloboCorp might have preferred us peasants to believe we are "free" because we can vote and consume, that we live in "democracies," that the "rule of law" is in effect, etc., etc., all while its corporate-backed trade dealers spent the past three decades destroying the U.S. manufacturing base to raise corporate profit margins, Big Food and Big Pharma pumped us full of...

Is This Year One? Part 1

The cause of the plandemic appears to have been released in Wuhan right around the time of Event 201, held October 18, 2019 at Johns Hopkins University sponsored by GloboCorp's Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and the World Economic Forum. It appears designed to infect humans and spread rapidly, but is lethal mainly to certain populations of useless eaters – the elderly...

Critical Race Theory: A Divisive, Destructive Weapon of Mass Distraction

Critical race theory (CRT) has the nation divided – to the point where angry parents disrupting school board meetings and people leaving stable employment in protest have become yesterday's news. What's it all about?

Collapsing Narratives, Converging Catastrophes

Mike Lindell, the MyPillow guy, has been quoted several times as saying he believes Trump will be reinstated as president later this year (he mentioned August). I'm very doubtful of

this, if for no other reason that, realistically, at this point it would take military action, and I don't think our "woke" military would do it.

The Worsening War Against White People

Let's just say it. White people (especially conservatives and Christians) are at war with the cult of Woke. They did not start this war. Most seem unaware of it. But they'd better wake up and realize they are in a war that has already killed dozens of white men and women whose fates will not make headlines in a controlled corporate media very much on the Woke cult's side.

Does Former Officer Derek Chauvin Have a Chance at a Fair Trial in "Woke" America?

Many of us, wherever we are. followed the first four days of the trial of former Minneapolis police officer Derek Chauvin, 45, charged with second and third degree murder and second degree manslaughter in the death of George Floyd on May 25, 2020. Chauvin has plead not guilty to all charges.

Where Do We Go From Here? GloboCorp and Collapse, Part 6

As with the Second Coming of Christ, we have no timetable for GloboCorp's collapse. And we can be sure, GloboCorp has learned from past errors. It will shore itself up for as long as it can. Moreover, never before will there have been a Leviathan the size of GloboCorp. Its tentacles are everywhere...

Where Do We Go From Here? From Tyranny to Collapse, Part 5

What does GloboCorp want? Control, through fear and technocracy. If we've learned anything over the past year, it's how easily those with the know-how can create and use fear. One of the best means of inducing fear is mass media repeating ghastly images or sequences over and over incessantly.

Where Do We Go From Here?

Part 4: Prepping For Tyranny

Increasingly, we live in a world where those fascinated with power and an urge to remake the world in their image of Utopia feel free to do as they please. They don't bother to hide it. Those who seek liberty must learn to do the same thing, when and where they can. But they would do well to separate as quietly as possible, at least for now.

Where Do We Go From Here?

Part 3

Accepting what we cannot change and acting accordingly is the only rational strategy. I am not introducing it as a permanent condition, and it does not mean doing nothing. It is not "giving up." It is going back to basics – of thought and planning, building skills and resilience for a future with no guarantees except failure and freedom's possible extinction if we continue playing the games we've played up till now.

Where Do We Go From Here?

Part 2

Herbert Marcuse, the most influential Frankfurt School

philosopher, invoked race in place of class. Feminists followed with gender-bending. They retained Marxian group-derived consciousness, and identity politics was born. This explains the cultural left's complete indifference to America's working class – too white, too male, and too heterosexual.

Where Do We Go From Here? Part 1

Prepare yourself to get into the right mindset. What I mean cannot be explained except in a full article, but you have to prepare to separate yourself psychologically, politically-economically, and spiritually, from the larger society as it lurches leftward. Get right with God. Abandon secularism, which did much to get us into this mess. You're part of the way to where you need to be already if you've read this far.

Can an Entire Society Be Gaslighted?

In a nutshell, it is the process of manipulating a person through mind games of various sorts to gain power over them by making their question their perception of reality and eventually their sanity. Gaslighting can be used by bullies, abusers, and cult leaders. The term originated with the 1944 film *Gaslight*, in which a man does this to his wife.

Truth Has Been Canceled – It Will Take Freedom With It

Today fear is the prevalent control factor. Fear of getting sick. Fear of unemployment and being financially devastated. Fear of being shamed on social media. Fear of being called a racist (if you are white). Fear is effective. It results in paralysis and looking to the authorities for rescue. Sometimes, of course, fear is justified. Other times, not. The point is, fomenting it has proven to be a very efficient control mechanism.

If the Cultural Leftists and Their Media Think they Won, Then Why are They So Concerned and Uneasy?

Facts no longer matter if they interfere with official narratives and agendas. Thus the largest narrative war I think I've ever seen has unfolded, between those using the above demon words and phrases, and those who insist that documentation of how voting-machine technology was used to commit fraud is clear and factual, and backed with evidence that corporate media and Big Tech are censoring just as fast as they can

Even If This Election Has Been Stolen, This Is What Donald Trump Should Do Next

Trump Media could report on the number of times President Biden lost his way back to the Oval Office from the nearest bathroom, for example. Both his and Kamala Harris's efforts to further the anti white racism, antimale sexism, and gender-fluidities of the Cult of Woke would be answered with real, credible exposure and competition.

The Cult of Woke: 30 Years of Inaction (Indifference?) by "Establishment Conservatives"

It is common knowledge that the Cult of Woke has conquered academia except for STEM subjects. Its minions are hard at work finding "evidence" of "systemic racism" in those. The Cult of Woke has also conquered mainstream media, Big Tech, and large portions of the business world generally.

The Storms That Are Coming

Gun sales in the U.S. are at all-time highs. There are people who will not give up their firearms without a fight. Some are Veterans with experience equal to and even surpassing that of anyone the federal government can send after them. (How do I know this? Personal correspondence.)

Conversation With a Foreign Cabbie

We'd come to another stoplight, and he looked over me as if to ask, Are you that much of a dolt? "Of course it was made," he said. "If not there, then in your country and brought to China and released in Wuhan. I don't know that, but COVID provides a cover for everything they're doing. The disease isn't that big of a deal. A bad flu.

The "Virus" of Revolutionism

Historically, what results from revolutions is always tyranny, since the old "irrational" order must be purged. Everything that would threaten the new order must be gotten rid of. This means all independent thought and writing must be crushed. Those unwilling to get with the program may be guillotined as in France

In America 2020, Truth is Being “Canceled”

A resistance of private sheepdogs is necessary because federal, state, and local governments have effectively dropped the ball, out of fear of being called racists, or white supremacists (most of those in elected office are, of course, sheep).

12 Unpleasant Truths, Part 2

Third: the U.S. Treasury Dept. / Federal Reserve axis is addicted to printing money. The level of money printing we are seeing now is utterly unprecedented, and will eventually cause a dollar collapse. This will enable the globalists to transition to a global digital currency and eliminate cash transactions.

12 Unpleasant Truths, Part 1

Regarding health care, the matter is really quite simple. People—corporate elites as well as masses—respond to incentives. In a materialist society and for moneyed interests, profit is the strongest incentive. Consumer

spending generates profits. Saving does not. Hence the manufacture of incentives to spend (and the means), and penalties visited upon savers: inflation, low interest rates, etc., destroying the value of savings.

Lockdown Lamentations

You can protect yourself from any virus including this one through commonsense cleanliness (e.g., frequent handwashing), not touching objects in public that have been touched by others (e.g., handrails), and building up your immune system with sound nutrition, exercise, at least some sunlight, and sufficient sleep.

What We Ought to Learn From the Coronavirus

Today, America has millions of people whose service sector jobs fail to pay living wages, and whose standard of living has dropped. They are up to their eyeballs in debt. Most could not come up with \$500 in an emergency situation without borrowing. Those working cannot afford decent health care because their wages have stagnated relative to a rising cost of living

Deceased German Journalist Shows How Mainstream Journalism Really Works

In 2014, Ulfkotte published *Gekaufte Journalisten* (Bought Journalists). The book became a bestseller in Germany despite a media blackout. The author, excommunicated from German mass media and unofficially blacklisted, faced lawsuits and endured police raids on his house. He told family members he feared for his life.

End of a Decade: What's Happened? What Have We Learned? What's Next?

Then let's fight to end the foreign wars that destroy peoples' homelands and send them fleeing, while lining corporate-state pockets! Let's also end the economic domination that also destroys what gives people's lives meaning, impoverishes them until strip mining their resources and removing the profits from their countries breeds revolt.

Congressional Republicans Should Think Twice Before Turning On Donald Trump

Democrats and minions of the Deep Establishment have been colluding since November of 2016 trying to reverse the outcome of that election. For a long while, it was Russia-gate. That failed miserably, at a cost of billions of taxpayer dollars. Now it's Ukraine-gate. House Democrats and their corporate media prostitutes are in overdrive. Their favorite polls have responded.

The Real Confrontation

Daily demonstrations continue, some involving over a million people. There continue to be disruptions. Fires continue to be started and acts of vandalism continue to be aimed at corporate-owned markets and public facilities. These have done millions of dollars worth of damage. A Metro station had to be closed again a couple of days ago.

Protests in Chile – October 2019: End of the Neoliberal

“Experiment”?

I do believe we can outline where the most basic fault line is. It is not between “left” and “right,” as I’ve noted previously. Those in the upper echelons of wealth and power do not care about “left” and “right” except as tools they can use to keep us all divided and fighting one another. So we won’t look at them.

How Far We’ve Fallen....

The other day I found myself perusing Federalist Papers 51 and 10. James Madison penned both. An entire course in political philosophy could be built around the core passage in Federalist 51. The problem: something every civilization where freedom is valued must face: how do its people, or their leaders, or both, design and maintain institutions limiting those in their midst who are drawn to power.

The Greatest Enemy of Freedom in America Is Big Tech

Our civilization has now reached the point technologically where a public-private distinction is increasingly meaningless. We are moving towards a Big Tech driven economic culture in which everyone will be expected, as a condition of running a business or just living a normal life, to be

connected to online platforms all the time.

“Conspiracy Theory” – The Third Most Weaponized Phrase in Corporate Media

Epstein, whose status as a known pedophile had been known for over 10 years, is arrested (July 6) and, denied bail, ends up in Metropolitan Correctional Center. Many folks predicted that he'd be “suicided” because he'd become a threat to wealthy and powerful elites, some of whom are pedophiles. He could therefore not allowed to be brought to trial.

Of Moon Landings, Rabbit Trails And Approaching Epistemic Oblivion

The above person told me about a YouTube video where the late Stanley Kubrick supposedly admits to having filmed the moon landings. If it was still there. The video was supposedly of an interview conducted three days before Kubrick died in his sleep of a heart attack, just after the end of filming his disturbing Eyes Wide Shut.

Cycles And Stages Of Civilization

In the articles linked to above, I took note of Sir John Bagot Glubb's theory of the lifecycles of civilizations. Glubb's ideas, as a few readers pointed out, are not perfect. In retrospect, he plays fast and loose with the lifespans of empires, some of which lasted much longer than the 200-plus years he allows.

The Takedown Of Julian Assange: An Existential Threat To Independent Media

It should be emphasized that WikiLeaks released material received from then-Bradley (now Chelsea*) Manning implicating U.S. troops in Iraq in what might have been judged to be war crimes if they'd been committed by anyone other than the U.S. or Israel (good WikiLeaks timeline and details here).

Truth-Tellers' Dilemma, Part 1

I have tried to tell the truth – on this site, on others where I post or have written articles (e.g., [here](#) and [here](#)), and long ago at places where I am no longer welcome ([here](#); archive butchered into unrecognizability). I've not done this for myself. My gains have been negligible. I've done it for you – readers – out of a sense, often distressing, that *truth should be told* and *writers have an obligation to tell it*. I don't always get everything right, or cover every topic out there. No one does. But given my limitations – no staff, no income from this worth speaking of (needing outside work, therefore), and being outside the U.S. – I don't think I do badly. I've had occasional help from boots-on-the-ground sources, to whom I am profoundly grateful.

It was clear before the end of the 1990s: before we fully realized that [a free press in the U.S. was a myth and had been for some time](#), the uncensored Internet had the potential to be a repository of truth: a boon to truth-seekers and truth-tellers the likes of which we had not seen before.

Turning points: Matt Drudge breaking the Clinton-Lewinsky story when mainstream outlets were burying it. New alternative media sources emphasizing later that Bill Clinton was not impeached for having sex with an intern in the Oval Office but lying under oath to a grand jury. Pivotal articles on an assortment of topics: [this](#) (orig. 1997), [this](#), [this](#) which used to be available for free but the original is long gone, [this](#), and [this](#). And the posting of older, crucial documents like [this](#), [this](#), and especially [this](#), among others.

Then came the film that capped off that decade: *The Matrix* (1999), which inspired my [debut series](#) here. What makes this film one of the half-dozen or so most important of the past

century is its planting firmly in popular culture the suggestion that much of what we are told – by media and other corporations, government, academia, even many churches – is designed to create an *appearance* of republican democracy, personal freedoms, and general political-economic well-being, in which, whatever seems wrong, the “experts” have things in hand!

The truth: much of our education and many crucial activities – work, play, taxes – all further, in one way or another, while hiding them behind smokescreens of various sorts, the goals of the oligarchy of kleptocrats in central banks and other global corporations, secondarily their bought political and administrative classes, and the power systems emanating from what is now called the Deep State: the military-intelligence-security-information complex. The main smokescreen is mainstream (corporate) media, owned by a handful of megaconglomerates and elite billionaires. What is a *kleptocrat*? We mean someone who may once have earned money with a genuinely useful product people wanted, but who discovered that in a financialized system based on fractional banking and fiat money he can get much richer through investment (going public, taking stock buybacks, etc.). And has joined the 300 or so extended families who for well over a century have seen themselves as most fit to rule over the unwashed masses, their rulership being all but invisible unless you know just where to look.

The Matrix of the film was “a neural-active simulation ... a computer-generated dream world built to keep us under control in order to change a human being into *this*,” says the central character Morpheus as he holds up a common flashlight battery, implying the machines’ parasitic use of our life energies while lay there, plugged in, oblivious. The Real Matrix is the fantasy world generated by major media, government, and public education with assistance from other dominant institutions, its purpose being to keep us peons under control, ignorant of

our parasite masters but properly servile within the system that empowers and enriches them.

Many folks, as *The Matrix's* central character Morpheus observes, are at least modestly *satisfied* in their ignorance, as the Real Matrix supplies paychecks, creature comforts, and sometimes advancement for the especially cooperative, along with abundant entertainment on the side (professional sports, *American Idol*, the Kardashians, other public spectacles of all kinds). They are entirely dependent on the system – not just economically but *psychologically*. They will fight to protect the fantasy world.

Aldous Huxley wrote back in 1955:

“A really efficient totalitarian state would be one in which the all-powerful executive of political bosses and their army of managers control a population of slaves who do not have to be coerced, because *they love their servitude*. To make them love it is the task assigned, in present-day totalitarian states, to ministries of propaganda, newspaper editors and schoolteachers.”

And CNN talking heads and many “economists” paid to cite statistics allegedly telling us that all is well in the ship of state – claims that often conflict with viewers’ personal experiences, causing cognitive dissonance. The restless can look to professional agitators across the political spectrum. The point is to keep those involved in “causes” believing they have options they realistically do not have, and to direct their attention and activities down dead ends. As long as violent baby-leftists (e.g., Antifa) and naïve alt-rightists are screaming obscenities at one another, sometimes exchanging blows, neither sees what is happening at the top.

Today, we are losing the Internet, little by little. I am not referring to “net neutrality,” another distraction. The kleptocrats allowed the Internet to get away from them well

before that as we saw. It was bound to dawn on some of them that this was a mistake. Since late 2016 they have been taking action to rectify that mistake. It hasn't been that difficult.

For starters, the Internet is now dominated by a handful of corporate goliaths: Google, Microsoft, Facebook, Twitter, Amazon, a few others. All are in bed with the Deep State. Google's is the dominant search engine, which now owns YouTube, the largest online repository of videos, and WhatsApp, the most popular messaging system. Facebook and Twitter are the most visible social media platforms. Their reputations for censorship, and the former for carelessness (on the most charitable interpretation!) with user data, grow almost daily. Amazon is the largest online retailer – and a major contractor with the CIA. Windows has been the dominant operating system for PCs at least since 1995, with which Linux cannot truly compete even when you can download it for free, because of arrangements made long ago between Microsoft and manufacturers to pre-install Windows and accompanying software on their devices.

Convenient? Of course! No one wanted to buy a computer and have to install the operating system himself. The masses' desire for convenience is a tool that can be used, however. If you believe "free market competition" exists in this environment, the Real Matrix still has you.

The Real Matrix still has you, moreover, if you believe the brand of capitalist that dominates this industry has any interest in freedom of speech or thought. The career trajectory of [James Damore](#), fired from Google following his frank but reasonable explanation why the corporation could not recruit more women engineers, ought to dispel that notion at once. Damore's claim was the obvious one: because of our natural, biological "hardwiring" there are things men tend to be better at than women, such as engineering, just as there are things women are better at than men, such as nursing and other kinds of caregiving. For this Damore was dismissed from

his job at Google. He sued; his suit was dismissed, unsurprising given both the power imbalance and the legal system's commitment to gender preferences (in the Orwellian tongue: *equal opportunity*). Some of the [ensuing discussion](#) indicated how *science itself* has been corrupted by identity politics, as well as the lengths to which some will go to discredit dissidents like Damore. The relevant questions thus cannot be asked. Dissenting lines of inquiry cannot be pursued. Doing so is career suicide.

Visceral threats to job, income, career, are how *de facto* coercion is exercised in present-day digital capitalism – a brand of dictatorship without a visible dictator because the coercion is systemic, a manifestation of what the late political philosopher Sheldon Wolin (1922 – 2015) called [inverted totalitarianism](#) in which economics trumps politics, everything and everyone is commodified, our lives are encircled by consumerism and theater, and elections become farces because so-called liberal democracy has become a façade.

Behind the façade, moneyed interests and their lobbyists matter; voters do not. The latter's focus, moreover, is more on their own often precarious situations than electoral politics, situations that are also systemic. Wolin emphasized that classic totalitarians (e.g., Hitler, Stalin, Mao) encouraged enthusiastic mass support. Inverted totalitarianism encourages and reinforces apathy, as the masses are perpetually entangled in myriad private dilemmas (job worries, the rising cost of health care, etc.).

In the past, yes, online dissent was tolerated. Films like *The Matrix* got made and widely discussed. Perhaps the kleptocrats did not see these as much of a threat. But on the night of November 8, 2016, that changed.

Just recently, YouTube removed thousands of conservative-leaning and “conspiratorial” videos. As I write, the site's

owners are purging anything seeming to promote guns and gun-ownership. The former is part of the ongoing campaign against “fake news,” i.e., the cyberwar against online truth-telling which began right after Donald Trump’s “populist” victory blindsided the kleptocrats and became the biggest threat in over a generation to their path through globalizing economics to a world state that would answer to their corporate empires (some called this state of affairs the *New World Order*, a phrase sullied from overuse).

This war’s opening shots were fired [here](#): with unnamed “experts” alleging the presence of espionage-level “Russian propaganda” on some 199 alternative news/commentary sites including the one you are now reading, recommending a federal investigation, but presenting no evidence to back up their charges. The article’s credibility should have been zero. The reportage was *National Enquirer* quality. But we weren’t reading *The National Enquirer*. We were reading the front page of *The Washington Post*.

There’s part of our problem. Credibility by longstanding position and name-recognition, not to mention the vastly superior resources of an owner, Jeff Bezos (founder of Amazon.com), with a [net worth now over \\$105 billion](#). If you believe position, name-recognition, and massive wealth (now accrued through ownership of Amazon stock) provide guarantees of truthfulness, the Real Matrix still has you.

Do we now have any insight into who or what was behind PropOrNot? [This](#) might enlighten you. Warning: it’s not pretty!

It was primarily in response to the PropOrNot stunt and the publicity it generated that Google changed its search algorithms, making “alternative news” harder to find. Many sites, including this one, saw their web traffic drop precipitously over subsequent months.

My initial publications on this site (“The Real Matrix” series

mentioned above) garnered hundreds of emails, including requests to reprint, talk radio invites, and an all-expenses-paid speaking gig at a [national meeting](#) (original website long gone, interestingly).

For well over a year now, my articles have been doing well to receive a dozen responses, most from long time readers. Invitations to speak have vanished.

The sites removed from YouTube include those of Mike Adams, better known as the [Health Ranger](#). Still available, at least as of this writing, is Alex Jones's [InfoWars channel](#) which at one point had two complaints against it (three and you're gone). Jones has threatened to sue if his channel is removed. Such a suit would strike another blow for freedom of speech on the Internet, and its outcome would speak volumes about whether free speech will continue to exist in any meaningful form. Whether you like Jones or not, he's less of a pushover than a James Damore, if only because as an Internet entrepreneur instead of an ex-employee he has greater visibility and commands more resources.

Jones is [being sued](#), however, adding yet another layer of intrigue to our story. Brennan Gilmore, who filmed the car plowing into the crowd in Charlottesville, lodged a complaint alleging that he's suffered harassment and threats, and that members of his family have been harassed as well. He blames "conspiracy theorists" generally and Jones in particular. Jones and others (myself included) suggested last August that as a former employee in Hillary Clinton's State Department and known Hillary supporter, as well as an employee of a Virginia Democrat partly funded by George Soros, his presence at that exact spot seemed like something more than pure chance. This is *not*, as his suit alleges, to make the simplistic charge that he "planned the attack." This is on a par with inferring from the holes in the official story of the 9/11 attacks the idea that "George W. Bush planned 9/11" which no one with a brain believes.

A statement from Gilmore's attorney, of the very well-connected Georgetown Law Civil Rights Clinic: "We don't think the First Amendment protects blatantly defamatory speech that inspires violence and hatred of victims of terrorist attacks and mass shootings." This statement's dishonesty is literally off the map. Gilmore made himself a public figure. [He wrote articles.](#) Defamation accusations hold water only if its targets really said those things. This has not been shown. At what point did anyone visible expressed "hatred" for the victim of the car attack? Perhaps such statements can be found on a few extreme-right forums where anything goes. As I don't visit such sites I have no idea what's on them. Jones is surely not responsible for their content, and I doubt he threatened anyone in Gilmore's family which is, of course, reprehensible.

But if YouTube were to get away with shutting down Alex Jones's channel, or if Gilmore and his Deep State connected law firm can wage the increasingly common practice of "lawfare" to harm him monetarily nevertheless, think what these and other powerful players could do to us lesser-knowns who are struggling financially – mainly because of our truth-telling activities!

Are we nearing a day when anyone branded a "conspiracy theorist" on, say, CNN, or demonized as a "hater" by the equally well-connected SPLC, will have no First Amendment protections?

When the First Amendment is interpreted by the Supreme Court as protecting huge campaign contributions from billionaires (*Citizens United*), but a court will not protect criticisms of radical feminist assumptions by a James Damore, has free speech not become as big of a joke as the idea of a free press?

Do you really believe you have freedom of speech on social media?

(To be Continued in Part 2).

© 2018 Steven Yates – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Steven Yates: freeyourmindinsc@yahoo.com

Guns, Culture, And The Last Century's Seismic Shift

The other day, having followed the aftermath of the latest school shooting (Douglas High School, Parkland, Fl.), I recalled a conversation between my late father and late uncle. I think I was in junior high school (I'm not sure). That's how long the left-liberal effort to control gun ownership has been going on, and this gives me hope that the Second Amendment is safe.

Today, of course, the issue has exploded again. We are regaled in every news broadcast by those emotionally proclaiming that "we need to have a conversation about guns," especially assault weapons.

I need to say up front: Second Amendment issues, types of firearms, the specifics of gun laws, their histories, etc., are not my areas of expertise. I've thus tended to steer clear of them. But our present situation is about more than guns. The upsurge of deadly violence involving firearms over the past couple of decades has not happened in a cultural vacuum. This I *can* write about with confidence.

So to continue: my two elders were recalling how they shot at rats moving in, out, and around a large dumpster behind the house where they grew up. My dad was born in 1923; his

brother, in 1925. They became Depression kids, in other words. I also recall stories of their retrieving coal for the stove, which was the only way their parents could keep the place warm during winter months. Depression kids did things like shoot rats to amuse themselves, and it might have even kept the rat population in check (my dad once said he got to be a fairly good shot back then).

Arguably, guns were more prevalent then than they are now, and kids had greater access to them.

No one gave this a second thought.

And as bad as things were for many families during the Depression, there were no school shootings. There were no epidemics of seemingly random mass murder. There were instances of violence, but they were traceable to specific events, such as unionized worker strikes and responses to them.

A kind of cultural maturity existed back then that does not exist today. Kids learned early that guns are not toys. They acted accordingly (neither my dad nor my uncle would ever have pointed a gun at one another, or at some other kid, not even in jest).

No one acted as if the masses having guns was a danger to the body politic. Why not?

Because the overall mood of the 1930s was considerably more optimistic than that of today.

All one need do to see this is listen to the music of the period. One of the best indices of a culture's mindset is its music. Is it upbeat? Does a culture's music stress positive and uplifting themes, or negative and destructive ones? Are artists performing *to* audiences, or *at* them? Are they celebrating what is good in this imperfect world, or at least appealing to human benevolence? Or are they trying to raze

everything to the ground?

The 1930s saw the rise of the big bands in the wake of the “jazz age” of the 1920s. We saw variations like swing. A popular dance of the era was the “jitterbug.”

[Listen to this YouTube Video](#)

My parents owned copies of many of those recordings. This was the music on their old record players (which had 78-speed capabilities) when I was a child. These songs, whose individual themes may differ, communicate a sense of tranquility and inner peace that does not exist today.

Now listen to this, [Judy Garland’s signature song](#), from later in the decade:

Her theme is escaping from troubles – but there’s no negativity! No harshness! She is singing *to* her audience. Having listened, you feel uplifted and not like crawling into a closet.

Now compare what you just heard [to this, released last year](#):

I selected this track because British recording artist Gary Numan is intelligent and knows what he is doing. Note the desolation from the first frame. Instead of rainbows, we see a wasteland. Not a blade of grass anywhere; nothing to suggest hopefulness. We hear of “ruin,” “vengeance,” and “no one is calling.” The constantly shifting camerawork, moreover, seems calculated to put you on edge and keep you there. The harsh nightmarishness of the music reinforces and is reinforced by this. The point is, in this track/video there’s no peace, no tranquility; there are suggestions of troubles aplenty but no escaping them. It’s all negativity. Having listened (assuming you made it all the way through), you don’t feel uplifted. You might instead feel like breaking something!

It’s a long way from the 1930s to 2017, of course, and popular

music has had its uplifting moments and its downcast ones all the way through. But the general trend is clear.

The rock and roll of the 1950s was mostly upbeat. I would argue that cultural optimism in rock continued through the 1960s and early 1970s even if it was infused by psychedelic drugs and went in several directions from the soft and melodious folk-rock classics of Simon & Garfunkel to the “prog” of groups like Yes and ELP to the harder edges of Led Zeppelin.

But in the mid to late 1970s, with “punk rock,” things turned dark:

[Compare this YouTube Video from 1970](#)

[with this YouTube Video from 1977](#)

“Johnny Rotten” is “singing” *at* people, of course, not *to* them. And yes, next to him is “Sid Vicious,” who lived up to his stage name by murdering his girlfriend with a butcher knife a year or so later and then, out on bail, dying of a heroin overdose before his trial date. He was 21.

Punk rock groups had names like the Clash, the Dead Boys, the Damned, Suicidal Tendencies, etc. They tended to not rehearse, because their purpose was not to make music but mayhem. Their shows involved not “jitterbugging” with real dance moves requiring actual ability, but “slamdancing” in which audience members jumped up and down (this was called “pogoing”) flailing their arms in circles or careening into others. Fistfights were common; shows were sometimes stopped because of violence.

There were hints of darkness before, of course (especially in New York City “underground” bands), but it was around 1977 that such groups caught on and began to draw a major following, helped by the mainstream rock press, e.g., *Rolling Stone* which promoted punk rock incessantly. The 1980s

partially recovered, but a dark underground remained. Rap, of course, was also violent, with its incitements of attacks on police, on white people, etc. – also to be contrasted with the uplifting *soul* which dominated black music in the 1960s or the jazz of someone such as Ella Fitzgerald that prevailed earlier. With very rare exceptions, I could not post exemplars of rap because of their streams of casual obscenities.

Television followed a parallel trajectory once it got started. The 1960s saw family oriented series (e.g., *Leave It To Beaver*) and variety shows (e.g., *The Jackie Gleason Show*) that were wholesome fun for the whole family. In the late 1970s, popular nighttime “soaps” like *Dallas* introduced cynicism and casual cruelty into their plots, personified by the character J.R. Ewing who acted without conscience using people and situations to climb to the top of the oil business. By the 1980s, police dramas (e.g., *NYPD Blue*) were bringing graphic violence into people’s family rooms on a regular basis.

By the 1990s, TV had descended to the studied absurdity of *Seinfeld*; comedy more broadly had been taken over by “performers” who couldn’t speak three sentences without curses or scatological references. They “performed” in clubs because if television had grown progressively coarser there were still limits, if only because of legal liabilities. Cable had arrived the decade before, of course, and soon offered pay-per-view movie channels some of which dispensed hard core pornography which was, in any event, was readily available on the Internet by the 2000s.

This, of course, doesn’t begin to cover the avalanche of violence in films during this same period. We have also come along way from *The Wizard of Oz* (1939) which featured Judy Garland’s song to *Pulp Fiction* (1994), *Natural Born Killers* (1994) and *American Psycho* (2000).

Obviously, Anglo-American popular culture underwent a long-term seismic shift during the last century. A single article

can't begin to cover all its effects, from music to film and television to technology and its effects.

The materialist worldview had dominated the scientific-philosophical world for at least three decades by the time of the Depression, of course. Leading British philosopher Bertrand Russell had penned [this](#) classic defense of science-based atheism back in 1903. He was not the first to announce that ethically, we were essentially on our own with our "ideals."

Philosophies such as French existentialism (major exemplars: Jean-Paul Sartre and Albert Camus) were responses in a broad sense to materialist atheism. They focused not on "ideals" so much as on the condition of the human person in a world rendered meaningless and absurd – where we have (as Johnny Rotten would "sing" years later) "no future" except the grave.

The world of the 1930s was still fundamentally Christian, especially in the U.S. Common people looked to Christianity's transcendent values for morality, for support, and for hope. A Christian worldview was built into most families, into education, and into communities.

This was reflected in the era's music.

One institution after another, beginning in the early 1950s, removed Christianity from its center – relying on bogus interpretations of the First Amendment's Establishment Clause that ignored "the free expression thereof." The elimination of prayer from public schools was the most visible and controversial of these moves.

So what does all this have to do with guns?

There aren't significantly more guns per capita today than there have ever been, but there are more people willing to use them to kill. Why is that? Not simply because guns are available, I argue, but because of the growing sense of

absurdity as well as frustrated expectations: the sense even in the mainstream that all we exist for is to earn money to survive or by helping someone else get rich, the overseas wars fought at taxpayer expense most of them unnecessary, have all cheapened life. The legalization of abortion in 1973 was a quantum leap in devaluing human life.

The divine spark in all of us rebels against this in one way or another.

But some will argue, we've always had war, and in the past we had well-known acts of genocide.

The answer is that such acts always provoked horror and revulsion. Today, abortion is proclaimed in feminist classrooms as a "woman's reproductive right" as we stand on the remains of over 60 million unborn babies slain in their mothers' wombs.

A significant fraction of what would have been the millennial generation has been aborted. What does that tell us about the value of life not in Soviet Russia or in Nazi Germany, but rather in liberal-secularist America?

Our problem is not guns. Our problem is our prevailing philosophical and cultural ethos, which is nihilistic and destructive.

Get to the point! some will retort. People with criminal backgrounds, or who have diagnosed mental illnesses, should not be legally able to obtain firearms.

Maybe not, but we beg to ask: just what is behind the epidemic of mental illness in this culture? Some (e.g., [this writer](#)) blame the avalanche of pharmaceuticals in the marketplace and invite you to observe that every third television commercial today advertises a drug. While there is abundant evidence that at least some mass killers (those at Columbine in 1999 come to mind) were under Big Pharma's "loving care" – there's a

problem.

While I'm no friend of Big Pharma's, millions of people take its products and do not become mass killers. That tells me that trying to establish cause-and-effect here is premature.

Our problem is not pharmaceuticals, unhealthy though they may be, and however unhealthy may be a medical marketplace in which corporations can rake in billions dispensing this stuff.

Still others will argue that all we need to do regarding guns is go back to the basics: reaffirm our Constitutional right to keep and bear arms (Second Amendment). This Amendment was not written to protect the rights of hunters to shoot ducks. It was written so common people could organize (the "militia") and protect themselves from encroaching tyranny, should it come to that. Either you believe in an inherent right to defend yourself or you do not. Period.

I agree completely, in the abstract. One problem, however, is that being based on logic instead of emotion, this argument brings a knife to, er, a gunfight. For that reason alone it will probably fall on deaf ears. The more important issue, for my purposes here: it, too, misses the larger point.

Our problem is not mere departures from the Constitution, bad as these are. It is the prevailing philosophy and the cultural ethos it has enabled.

I do not mean philosophy in the *academic* sense. Most academic philosophy is worthless (trust me: I was there). Academic philosophers traded relevance for job security long ago, and then – also beginning in the 1970s – threw a big part of the next generation to the wolves. My generation. That's a different article. The point is, they fumbled the ball. The nihilists in music, art, television, cinema, and other arenas picked it up and ran with it.

One other factor is worth discussing briefly. American culture

today is hypercompetitive. It is more money-focused than ever before. These factors also tend to isolate people from one another, especially impressionable teens. The emphasis on some having more wealth than others, better lives than others, more fun than others, better sex than others, etc., etc., triggers resentments. Social media offers a bogus sense of connectedness that often exaggerates this fear that *you* are the one losing out.

Financial problems, moreover, tend to break up more families than any other single isolable factor. For over three decades now, many teenagers – many of whom never had the stable family life that is requisite to a truly healthful development – have been left to fend essentially for themselves, without moral guidance, and so have little trouble deciding that if material reality gets the last word in a world of scarcity based on money and competition where some win and some lose, there is nothing fundamentally wrong with not mere indifference to others but actually hurting them if that's what it takes to be one of the winners.

Capitalism may have done better than any other economic system at producing wealth and prosperity, but its marriage to a materialist worldview has been a cultural and educational disaster, encouraging psychological isolation, seething resentments, kleptocracy among the elites, and sociopathy within the masses.

For a damaged and isolated teenager, angered by additional personal factors (in Nikolas Cruz's case, losing a girlfriend to a breakup last year) and with access to firearms, it is not many more steps to the idea that it is "okay" (or at least, not "wrong") to express one's rage by using them to kill.

The problem, again, is not capitalism or hypercompetition or teenage isolation or the hurt that is often par for the course when immature teen relationships end: things that have happened to most of us at one time or another. The problem is

the philosophy that tells us that in the *final analysis* it doesn't mean anything, that human life has no *intrinsic* worth because there are no *fundamental* rights or wrongs, and that therefore if you *want* to do something, such as pick up a gun and kill your classmates, there can be no *ultimate* judgment against it.

The line of thought here may seem startling or harsh or perverse, but is not that different from those in a kleptocratic political class, or in the global corporatocracy, who woke up one day years ago in their plush circumstances having decided that given the absence of *fundamental* accountability to a Higher Power, there is nothing *wrong* with them increasing their power on Earth and ruling as they see fit, by whatever means are necessary.

As Thrasymachus the worldly sophist scornfully told Socrates in Plato's classic *The Republic*, "justice" is just the will of the stronger party, who defines the term to his advantage.

Without saying that Cruz was consciously thinking any of this – who knows? – philosophy is *not* irrelevant to culture: to the kind of culture that breeds a select number of mass killers who use guns simply because they are available.

A philosophy that dominates intellectual centers (universities) will seep outward by a kind of cultural osmosis, as those they train move into positions of influence. It will work its way through mediating institutions and change them from the inside out. People who are not even aware of its principles intellectually will nevertheless begin to live them. If a replaced worldview expressed and allowed for cultural optimism and the replacing one encourages nihilism and rage, the new cultural products and practices will reflect that.

I submit that this philosophical seismic shift – and not the prevalence of guns in America – bears the brunt of blame for

“gun violence”: which includes not just school shootings, of course, but the fact that thousands of people will die violently in cities like Chicago this year, and their survivors will not be paraded on camera as have been the kids of Douglas High School as if they had suddenly become experts on why government should immediately institute new gun control measures (even though law enforcement agencies including the FBI had received numerous warnings that Nikolas Cruz was a walking time bomb and did nothing!).

No, more gun bans are not the solution.

Our problem is the culture’s prevailing philosophy, which (among other things) tells us we are animals with big brains, that there is no God to Whom we answer, nor any Afterlife, and that some of us are damaged victims and others are victimizers and villains, and that if “we” are to get *justice* (conveniently left undefined) it must be gotten in *this* life, *here* and *now*!

Since most of us are relatively powerless in this life, such a philosophy is a recipe for chaos!

The solution is easy to say but will be very hard to implement.

Debunk materialism. Work to undo its long-term effects. Restore the Christian ethos that once prevailed (minus that era’s admitted faults, such as racial discrimination).

What will make this hard to do is not merely the heated emotions of those shouting hysterically that “we need to get rid of guns!” What will make it hard is the fact that our educational system is dysfunctional from top to bottom. Kids are graduating from places like Douglas unable to do basic math, much less understand the intricacies of legal reasoning, whether about guns or much else. The type of conversation we need will therefore be light years over the heads of those currently making the most noise.

It is very difficult to get worldviews discussed publicly. Universities don't teach the concept. The percentage of the population that understands it is vanishingly small. Much of the mainstream is probably unsalvageable. We are told there is a small "remnant" that is reachable (Isaiah 1:9), and it will be this "remnant" that rebuilds whatever is left of this culture – possibly in the guise of localization-focused efforts of the sort I've written about [previously](#). If we are to have any chance of reaching them, we need to start *now* – not tomorrow, not next week, not at the next election – but *now*!

[Author's Note: *if you believe this article was worth your time, please consider supporting my writing with a \$5/mo. pledge on [my Patreon site](#). If the first 100 people who read this all donate, my goal of just \$500/mo. would be reached in no time! And if we're honest about it, we all waste that much money each day.*

This is an attempt to raise money to publish and promote a novel, Reality 101, to be marketed as the first serious novel of the Donald Trump era, which, so far as I know, it is. In it, a ex-Wall Street globalist technocrat defends his views on elitism and oligarchy before a community wracked by the effects of globalization in a voice filled with irony and dripping with cynicism – to be contrasted with the possibility of freedom outside the world as he sees it.

Promoting a book, in my case, means the necessity of international travel which is not cheap.

I do not write for an audience of one. I write for you, readers of this site. If you believe this work might make a contribution to the world of political-economic ideas, please consider supporting it financially. I am not a wealthy person, and unlike the leftist groups I often criticize, I do not have a George Soros funneling a bottomless well of cash my way.

If I reach the above goal of \$500/mo., I may be able to speak at an event in your area (contact info below).

I allowed myself (via a handful of reader emails) to be talked out of going into retirement at the end of 2017, to give this at least one more year, but due to my own situation, that will be the best I can do.]

© 2018 Steven Yates – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Steven Yates: freeyourmindinsc@yahoo.com

To Save America And The West, Get Rid Of Identity Politics

The responses / reactions to President Trump's State of the Union address reflect a divided nation. Trump's supporters loved the speech – and in all honesty, while it contained claims I found dubious, it was the most riveting State of the Union address I've seen in years.

On the other hand, the usual suspects hated *everything* about it, finding in it all manner of “racist” red flags, evidence of “xenophobia,” “white supremacy,” etc., etc., *ad nauseam*.

It may be that Trump exaggerated the performance of the economy, and that numbers he once decried as “fake” (e.g., the official, U-3 unemployment rate) he now accepts as givens. *Every* recent president, however, claimed the economy was doing better than it really was. Trump is no exception to this.

But from what I can gather, from keeping in touch with friends back home, the U.S. economy really has improved over the past several months! Trump was able to cite the lowest black and

Hispanic unemployment rates ever recorded. No one challenged these numbers; major media and left-liberal black groups simply ignored them. Whether you credit Trump for this, for having encouraged a business-friendly environment able to create jobs for all Americans, or whether you think these tendencies began under Obama, appears to depend on which side of the divide you are on.

I don't wish to talk further about economics here, though. I wish to discuss the continued allegations of Trump's "white supremacy," etc. I wish to discuss what I consider an ill-advised response to the situation white males now face, which is to be openly demonized in corporate media and in academia (e.g., most recently at length [here](#)).

Much of the prevailing discussion turns on identity politics. What, precisely, is identity politics? It is, in a word, the retribalizing of the West, with preferential policies (e.g., affirmative action) and unlimited immigration via open borders as its two main tools.

More specifically, identity politics means labeling persons as group members first, and everything else second, with one's political interests tied directly to group identity. The original groups were racial/ethnic, but feminists soon embraced it; then came religious minorities (e.g., Muslims) and sexual minorities (homosexuals and now transgenders).

Only members of a group can speak for that group, and those who do so must tow an official line, such as playing the role of victim. Those who step out of line, even accidentally, face verbal attack and sometimes severe punishment. Think of black teenagers who study, make good grades, and then are beaten up on school playgrounds for "acting white." Or think of [this young woman](#), who appears to have weathered the storm that surrounded her last year – protected, somewhat, by the obvious circuslike ambience now surrounding academic leftism.

Identity politics has its roots in a 1965 essay by Frankfurt School educated cultural Marxist philosopher Herbert Marcuse, [Repressive Tolerance](#). (For a good recent overview of the historical roots of cultural Marxism, go [here](#).) Marcuse argued in that essay that equal opportunity for black Americans required more than mere nondiscrimination mandated by the 1964 Civil Rights Act and 1965 Voting Rights Act. It required they be given special advantages. These included ensuring that their opinions be favored in the so-called marketplace of ideas while those of the majority group (i.e., whites) be actively repressed. "Repressive tolerance" in practice tolerated leftist voices but not conservative ones.

Feminists soon embraced the idea, and preferential policies quickly expanded to include women. They ceased merely demanding equal pay for equal work and started calling for special treatment, e.g., favoritism to achieve equal representation on university faculties, corporate boards, etc. Soon, treatises were appearing on "women's way of viewing the world" as incommensurably different from that of men's: kinder, gentler, more nurturing, etc. This became the root of today's lamentations about "toxic masculinity."

In some areas, of course, men and women *do* see things differently. I don't believe men and women view relationships the same way. Women are probably more empathetic than men, because their capacity to nurture very young children depends on this. *Radical* feminists took a fundamentally sound idea and ran off the cliff with it. They began spreading claims, absurd on their face, that the sciences (especially biology!) contained built-in "sexism" because most famous scientists had been / were / are men. They saw "under-representation" of women in work forces as due to "gender discrimination" and "misogyny" instead of inherently biological and psychological differences of "wiring" that incline the sexes to different roles not just in family life but in their professional lives. Most nurses and other caretakers are women, because arguably

more women have the relational orientation that makes one a good nurse or caretaker. Most engineers and programmers are men, because these disciplines require more abstract thought at which men tend to excel. (Do note: I said *most*, because obviously there are exceptions.)

Identity politics embraces that idea that all such differences are “social constructs,” not products of biology. The same for race/ethnicity: differences are cultural, with the presumption (for which there is no evidence) that since all groups are inherently equal, European whites soaring ahead in recent centuries can only be explained due to their racism and the slave trade, ongoing hate, and massive discrimination – exemplified today in criticisms of preferential policies such as affirmative action and resistance to open borders immigration policies. According to identity politics, differences exist because one group, “straight white Christian males” has enslaved, discriminated against, hated, etc., all other groups. This legacy shapes the other groups’ thought and identity. The solution, for leftists, has been to disempower white males.

Today’s divisions, including the Trump era itself, are explained in identity politics as panicked “white male backlash” in the face of white males losing their cultural and political power.

“Whiteness,” of course – white identity – is *verboten* except to be deconstructed in accordance with Marcuse’s “repressive tolerance” thesis. White males are still the “dominant group,” after all. “Whiteness” thus comes under attack within academia and related circles as equal to “privilege”; we are expected to ignore that most whites have no special privileges, and that as a whole they have lost economic ground as well as population over the past three decades or so while every other group has registered gains.

The alt-right rejects the idea of “white privilege” but not

white identity. It advocates for whites / white males embracing identity politics, directly or indirectly.

I've discussed the alt-right's Hegelian intellectual-cultural roots at length [in this essay](#), so I won't repeat those claims here. What I want to do is suggest a better solution for a divided nation than what the alt-right proposes.

Get rid of identity politics!

Acknowledge that it was a bad idea – not *progressive* but *regressive*.

From the day Herbert Marcuse put pen to paper, it was a guaranteed divider of groups and ultimately of nations, as it would foment resentments that would lead first to lawsuits (the first of which by a white male was *Bakke* in 1978), then to pushback of various strengths, and finally to the situation we have today, in which violence is breaking out between the preferred and their defenders, street-level cultural Marxists such as Antifa, and those which it is now acceptable to demonize as fascists or neo-Nazis (conservatives).

Thomas Sowell has documented at length (e.g., [here](#)) that explosive hostilities are inevitable whenever governments offer privileges to some at the expense of others, on whatever basis, for a sufficient length of time.

Today's battles over free speech on campus, where efforts to suppress conservative speakers now erupt into violence and sometimes cost campuses as much as \$500K trying to ensure security, offer one variation on this theme. What we see are leftists (e.g., Antifa) getting violent as they attempt to shut down conservative voices – in accordance with Marcuse's call to repress such voices back in 1965. ([It happened again](#) at the University of Washington campus just the other day as I write this.)

This is going to continue, and probably worsen, until one of

these melees gets sufficiently out of hand that people get killed. All it will take is one or two Antifa members showing up with handguns – or, for that matter, if one group of whites decides to take matters into their own hands and retaliate against a physical attack on one of their number with deadly force.

A rational view of our present situation therefore compels getting rid of identity politics, along with the policies of favoritism it tries to protect.

The present problems will not be solved simply by proclaiming conservative values, though. It is necessary to lay bare the roots of efforts to shut down conservative speech, and note that given those roots, pushback leading to the present stark divisions was inevitable.

What might seem surprising is that there is a sensible *leftist* argument against identity politics. A handful of voices (e.g., [here](#) and [here](#)) have noted that identity politics has not just demonized the right but *divided the left*, with each victim group pursuing its own agenda. In his book *Achieving Our Country: Leftist Thought in Twentieth Century America* (1998), center-left philosopher Richard Rorty (1931 – 2007) distinguished the reformist left (focused on the alleged failures of laissez-faire capitalism, on poverty, and on class-based inequality) from the cultural left (focused on race/ethnicity, sex/gender, abortion, homosexuality, etc.). Identity politics came out of the latter, of course. He criticized identity politics as having made the left less relevant in a broad sense, compared to efforts that achieved concrete results with staying power such as the New Deal. Rorty believed the cultural left's swinging "white privilege" as a blunt club against whites *en masse* would one day generate a counterassault. He is thus sometimes credited with foreseen the rise of Donald Trump and of the alt-right (accessible summary of the basic idea [here](#)).

Rorty and others have noted, moreover, that as identity politics demands “equal representation” of every group on the boardrooms, etc., of the global corporatocracy, a *credible* left would challenge the legitimacy of the global corporatocracy itself. I pause here to note that a *credible* right should be doing the same thing, even if working from different premises. Identity politics effectively plays into the hands of globalists seeking to establish a world state that would serve the global corporatocracy’s interests. This explains why globalists by and large approve of identity politics: not because they care about blacks and Muslims and women and homosexuals, but because identity-political activists are perfect *useful idiots* in Lenin’s sense. They distract the masses with an endless parade of events such as campus disruptions and ridiculous nonissues such as which bathrooms transgenders should be able to use, all the while globalists get ever closer to their real goals (not to mention richer and richer).

Getting rid of identity politics won’t be as easy as arguing these claims, of course.

It is possible that some kind of tribalism is our human default setting. Only the Christianized West rose out of tribalism, having developed such Enlightenment notions as Universal Reason (based on Aristotelian logic) and Universal Human Rights (based on the Christian idea that all persons were created in God’s image). While numerous other cultures reached stability, sometimes lasting for thousands of years, practically none applied basic moral categories to peoples outside their tribe.

I’ve considered this problem [previously](#), and found myself wondering if the conversation of the West, especially its deterioration into a dialogue-of-the-deaf, suggests that Enlightenment notions such as Universal Reason (based on Aristotelian logic) and Universal Human Rights (based on the Christian idea that we were created equal in God’s image) have

run their course.

After all, as a reader once reminded me, whatever Western philosophers have had to say on these matters, the fact remains: the rest of the world does not think that way!

With rare exceptions (fully Westernized enclaves such as Hong Kong and Singapore), he was right. Western ideas, moreover, cannot be forced on peoples against their will.

Tribalism cannot be suppressed, but we surely do not need ideologies that encourage it, or to force together, into the same cities and onto the same streets, peoples whose basic worldview rejects tribalism (Europeans) with peoples whose worldview embraces it, at least by implication (Muslims are the obvious example in Europe; but think of Black Lives Matter in the U.S.).

Our present moment thus leaves us with a stark choice.

We either get rid of the cultural forces that are retribalizing the West, e.g., identity politics, or the West will pass into the history books. The foundational ideas that built Western civilization will not be sustainable.

European civilization is clearly in decline, courtesy of the unlimited immigration (*colonization* would be a better term!) of unassimilable Muslims, and the use of political correctness / identity politics to protect them even as they destroy the dominant culture while terrorizing local populations. These are official policies of EU power elites and a political class that is well protected from their stupidity and shortsightedness.

This trend is actually far more dangerous than just assaults on free speech. Native Europeans, for numerous reasons, are not having children, while Muslim immigrants are – at a rate likely to ensure that within 30 years, Muslims will be a numerical majority and Europe will be a Muslim subcontinent

with a population likely to vote itself into Sharia Law! Europe is just a few years ahead of the Americas on this curve. American whites, withering under the dual assault of cultural Marxism and globalism, are also not reproducing at a rate sufficient to sustain themselves demographically, while again immigrants / colonizers are doing so. Had Hillary Clinton been elected president, the U.S. would have seen conceivably tens of thousands of Muslims settled on U.S. soil, ensuring that in just a few years, the U.S. would look like Europe does today! We can thank Donald Trump for at least trying to put the brakes on open borders (there's a saying: if you don't have borders and border protections, you soon won't have a country)!

If this be "xenophobia," make the best of it!

For it should be clear: unless *all* these tendencies can be reversed – and soon! – by 2050 the West will cease to exist in any meaningful sense, and Western Enlightenment philosophies and values will be gone except as historical curiosities. What will remain? We will likely have a world state, its global controllers able to do as they please, dining on caviar while the various tribes fight each other in the streets over any table scraps tossed down at them.

[Author's Note: *if you believe this article was worth your time, please consider supporting my writing with a \$5/mo. pledge on [my Patreon site](#). If the first 100 people who read this all donate, my goal of just \$500/mo. would be reached in no time! And if we're honest about it, we all waste that much money each day.*

This is an attempt to raise money to publish and promote a novel, Reality 101, to be marketed as the first serious novel of the Donald Trump era, which, so far as I know, it is. In it, a ex-Wall Street globalist technocrat defends his views on elitism and oligarchy before a community wracked by the effects of globalization in a voice filled with irony and

dripping with cynicism – to be contrasted with the possibility of freedom outside the world as he sees it.

Promoting a book, in my case, means the necessity of international travel which is not cheap.

I do not write for an audience of one. I write for you, readers of this site. If you believe this work might make a contribution to the world of political-economic ideas, please consider supporting it financially. I am not a wealthy person, and unlike the leftist groups I often criticize, I do not have a George Soros funneling a bottomless well of cash my way.

If I reach the above goal of \$500/mo., I may be able to speak at an event in your area (contact info below).

I allowed myself (via a handful of reader emails) to be talked out of going into retirement at the end of 2017, to give this at least one more year, but due to my own situation, that will be the best I can do.]

© 2018 Steven Yates – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Steven Yates: freeyourmindinsc@yahoo.com

“Sh*thole Countries” The Fate Of Modernity And The Case For Localization, Part 2

Modernity, like Schumpeterian capitalism, must grow or fall into crisis. Hence the global obsession with growth as a sign of economic health. As the (Western-centered) “global economy” grows, it overwhelms cultures some of whose members may

welcome the promise of a high standard of living but become uneasy and then rebellious when it costs them their traditional beliefs and practices, their land, and their autonomy. They see their traditions becoming little more than curiosities that inspire trinkets sold to tourists on sidewalks in big cities filled up with rootless cosmopolitans, no longer motivating any serious societal dialogue: Cox's "bypassing" of religion.

Meanwhile, the real power is on another continent, as it pillages the land for natural resources and wantonly pollutes lakes and streams that have been sources of food or water for farm animals and crop irrigation for generations. If indigenous locals try to mount opposition, they may face deadly retaliation. Perkins strongly suggested (Part One) that opposition leaders are assassinated when they cannot be bought.

Sadly, the "ugly American" stereotype has a basis in fact.

Whether Americans want to face it or not, the (often CIA-directed) insurrections, revolutions, and wars, dating at least to the overthrow of Jacobo Arbenz in Guatemala (1954, also discussed in Part One) or that of Iran's democratically elected Mohammed Mossadegh government in 1953, were undertaken so Western corporations could have access to cheap national resources and remove the profits from those countries. In Iran, Western educated and U.S. backed Reza Pahlavi, the fully secularized Shah of Iran, proceeded to force modernity on the country while brutalizing its people for a quarter century. An international revolutionary underground incubated and mobilized. It responded to brutality with more brutality. The rest, as the saying goes, is history.

It's all coming to an end. Maybe.

Whether modernity as understood in Part One is just experiencing growing pains, or has run its course, is becoming

one of the most important conversations of the present and near future.

There are *rational optimists* such as Matt Ridley (see his 2010 book of that title) for whom the world is getting better and better, thanks to global commerce, technology, and the spreading mindset of modernity. His message to the Pankaj Mishras of the world: stop being so impatient and obstinate about its possibilities. Is it not amazing, the “rational optimist” might ask, that I can log onto Skype and have a live conversation with a friend on another continent? Or send a text message to someone in Singapore and get a response ten minutes later? And as the globalization of technology and commerce lifts more and more peoples, is this not just the start?

The rational optimists have a point. Forget allegations about *neoliberalism*. Their claim is that if we engage the world with intelligence, proper planning, and a spirit holding that even our worst problems have rational solutions, the world will reward us – sometimes in ways we could never have predicted. (Imagine Voltaire looking at an Android. Imagine us looking at devices a hundred years from now; will we know what we’re looking at?)

Consider Chile, rebuilt along Friedmanian lines by the “Chicago Boys” (who attended the University of Chicago to study economics under Milton Friedman) during the Pinochet era. Pinochet was not the nicest guy in the world, especially if you were a communist, but he oversaw the rebuilding of what became the strongest economy and most stable democracy in Latin America. He did unto a thousand or so communists what communists had done to millions elsewhere; for this he is still demonized. When the time came, he oversaw a democratic election. When he lost that election, he accepted defeat and stepped down. Think about that for a minute. A man who had been at the helm of a military dictatorship holds an election, and when he loses it, he bows to the will of voters. How often

does that happen? Chile has its issues, as do all countries, but as already implied, it has become a magnet for peoples who have given up on their “sh*tholes” and seek to better themselves. (Venezuelans are also coming to Chile in droves.)

One of the implications of *The Fourth Turning: An American Prophecy* (1997) by William Strauss and Neil Howe is that Crisis we have been in will resolve itself into a new High, with institutions of renewed strength, the anarchic individualism of recent decades restrained, and a newfound optimism about the future for those willing to work to achieve it.

I know of Trump supporters who instinctively see Donald Trump as the vanguard of this resolution, as the U.S. economy improves, the Dow soars, entrepreneurship surrounding new technology (e.g., the blockchain) creates new millionaires who in turn create new jobs, new technology, new products spreading everywhere.

But then again, on the other hand there are those who cite writers from Spengler to John Bagot Glubb (about whom I wrote [here](#), [here](#), and [here](#)) who see civilizations not just moving in cycles but as self-destructing during an inevitable age of decadence (Glubb’s term), which in this reckoning the U.S. is presently in. The rootless cosmopolitanism, the filling up of cities with unassimilable immigrants, the obsession with celebrities, and the fascination with gender-bending of all kinds are crucial signposts. One issue with Glubb’s work is that the Anglo-European West has gone through periods of decadence before; early 1920s hedonism figures heavily into the background of a work such as Fitzgerald’s *The Great Gatsby* (1925).

Indeed, we’ve gone through severe crises before (the War Between the States, two World Wars, the Great Depression). We’ve always survived.

But at no time in previous history have we literally been awash in a sea of financialized debt. Money created out of thin air by central banks, even if we use for it the euphemism *quantitative easing* (QE), literally props up Western economies. The Dow has soared because much of this printed money went into corporate buybacks and not into general circulation; otherwise we would have had soaring price inflation during the Obama years. The U.S. national debt cracked \$20 trillion last year and shows no signs of slowing down under Trump, whose pick for Janet Yellen's replacement at the helm of the Federal Reserve is another mainstreamer with the same philosophy of central bank micromanagement as Greenspan, Bernanke and Yellen.

I presume Trump has figured out, or his advisors have told him behind closed doors in no uncertain terms, that if the fiat money creation stops, the economy immediately tanks.

One need not see this as an *immediate* threat, and perhaps it isn't, but eventually it will exact its consequences. I do not want to be anywhere near the line of fire when it does (one reason I save precious metals, which unlike bitcoins have a track record as a permanent store of value going back thousands of years, and not a mere digital existence)!

What is likely to happen? I don't know. No civilization has ever been in this predicament before.

I do know that a few worried individuals and groups are indeed moving to get out of the putative line of fire. In some respects, I am one of them, although I am still in a major city and not on a farm or similar isolated setting.

There is, however, interest in forming small, self-sufficient communities, some on U.S. soil, others elsewhere such as in Chile. [One of these](#) has all but bitten the dust, for reasons having little to do with the basic idea of forming such a community. [Another](#), by someone who worked at the first and

observed what went wrong first hand, is looking very promising.

Borrowing from “alternative” economist E.F. Schumacher, small may turn out to be beautiful. Schumacher learned from having studied (and studied with) Leopold Kohr, whom I discussed in [my last article](#) (and at greater length [here](#)). Kohr, writing in the 1940s when Americans wore the white hats, was the first to predict that the U.S. would become everything it had once rightly opposed.

What does all this have to that hypothetical fellow in Rappoport’s piece who’s seen corruption and ruin, and whose major concern is whether his sick daughter will make it through the night?

Answering this question brings us to *localization*, a counterpoint to *globalization*, and getting past modernity (and I don’t mean into *postmodernity*, which is really a gesture of intellectual and spiritual despair).

Rappoport described what I mean by localization when he said:

“You know how to fix your country. Get back all the stolen land. Make small farms out of it. Return the land to the people who worked it and lived on it for centuries. That was the answer then and it’s the answer now.” (Italics his.)

He continued: “You may not know the word ‘Globalism’ but you do know you’re a pawn and a target in a big operation, and the operation involves stealing everything your family once had. The big criminals may have fancy ideas about why it’s a good thing ‘for the world,’ but you don’t know about that, and you wouldn’t care if you did...”

We’ve been talking about two different things, both products of the rebellion against the worst results of globalization and modernity. There are us first-worlders who no longer identify with a power that, in accordance with Kohr’s

prediction, turned into the world's biggest bully. Some have apocalyptic worldviews and see the financial system as likely to take a tumble "any day now"; others think such views are absurdly melodramatic. Many of us are as worried as the progressives about extreme and growing inequality, which is just the rising power of a relative handful of globalists (as I write this, getting ready to meet in their annual conclave in Davos, Switzerland, to discuss just this issue among others); one does not have to be an egalitarian to see that massive consolidations of wealth and power are both destabilizing and prone to abuse.

Most of us, moreover, are fed up with overseas wars of choice that are just making Americans more enemies. We are fed up with Washington's career kleptocrats whose primary motivation is their own reelection and who play by their own rules. (Members of Congress can legally engage in insider trading, for example.) We are sick of America's celebrity culture, and see it as very dangerous if by some chance we go from Republican Donald Trump to a credible Democratic Oprah Winfrey candidacy which would breathe new life into identity politics, which is all the Democrats presently have (as they routinely evade confronting *real* power, on which they are as dependent as the mainstream Republicans).

So much for us first-worlders. The other group, the one Rappaport emphasizes, consists of indigenous peoples who would happily reclaim their land from corporate predators if they could. They want only to live out their lives as they see fit and be left alone.

The point of localization: instead of thinking that *bigger* and *bigger* is *better* and *better*, think *small* and *smaller*! Think of building autonomous, self-governing communities, while encouraging indigenous peoples around the world to do the same.

This means kicking out the global corporations, of course.

This might not be as hard as it sounds at first glance. Corporations go where they can invest, build freely, and then tally up the profits unimpeded. Even in a place with abundant natural resources, if they believe for whatever reason they will lose huge amounts of money, they'll pack up and leave.

But the people must be ready. Otherwise, they'll end up like Venezuela, a resources-rich country which kicked out the billionaire investment class but whose leaders had no idea what to do next. Chávez had charisma but no viable vision, and since his death Venezuelans have ended up under the heel of yet another sociopathic lunatic (Maduro). Surprise, surprise: those who can are fleeing.

Localization calls for an assumption of responsibility, attention in advance to problems that will need to be addressed immediately when the big players are gone. The first, obviously, is ensuring that they can feed themselves.

When I posted Rappoport's article on my Facebook page, one reader criticized my emphasis on agriculture. I pointed out in response that if members of a community can grow vegetables and raise chickens and livestock, they are self-sufficient. If they can't, they will end up dependent on those who can – or worse.

A self-sufficient community *must* have a sustainable agrarian base. Period.

Such a base also makes extended families possible. Extended families can remain in place and divide their labors more effectively than nuclear families, even those with one breadwinner (now impossible, given the first world's fiat currency's loss of its purchasing power).

Other than such general rules, the specifics must be left to the community members themselves. This includes whether to be Christian or something else, and whether to consider themselves capitalist free traders or something else. What to

do with existing technology must also be their choice, rather than something imposed from the outside. If they retain it, they can more easily keep track of what their neighbors and the powers they fled are up to, but this must still be their choice.

Rappoport again, describing how matters look to that hypothetical person with a sick daughter clinging to hope that something better than the awful present is possible:

“Sir, you called my country a sh*thole. It is really a beautiful place. It was. But you’re right. It’s turned into a sh*thole. Can you help us do something about that? Perhaps I see a glint of light, because finally a powerful leader used an accurate word to describe what has happened to us. You used a word that cut through many fairy tales. So, can you help us reclaim the land that was once ours? Forget about building roads and airports and hospitals and office buildings and malls. We just need our land back, and then we’ll figure out what we need to do ourselves.”

Can it happen? Again, I don’t know. We’re talking about a change in thinking as great as that which led to modernity in the first place. Another such change, in light of what is to be learned from the past, will doubtless occupy decades and possibly more. Some attempts will doubtless flame out spectacularly. The players involved will be dismissed by the mainstream as fools. But we did not get to our present moment overnight, and we will not find our way forward overnight. Those of us studying and theorizing and writing about what to do will almost certainly not live to see the outcomes. But if we do not start making specific plans for our futures, the corporate-government oligarchs, the billionaire power elites, will continue to do it for us. Since nothing this class does is ever done with *our* interests in mind, I very much doubt those who inherit the world we leave them will like the results.

[Author's Note: if you believe this article was worth your time, please consider supporting my writing with a \$5/mo. pledge on [my Patreon site](#). If the first 100 people who read this all donate, my goal of just \$500/mo. would be reached in no time! And if we're honest about it, we all waste that much money each day.

This is an attempt to raise money to publish and promote a novel, Reality 101, to be marketed as the first serious novel of the Donald Trump era, which, so far as I know, it is. In it, a ex-Wall Street globalist technocrat defends his views on elitism and oligarchy before a community wracked by the effects of globalization in a voice filled with irony and dripping with cynicism – to be contrasted with the possibility of freedom outside the world as he sees it.

Promoting a book, in my case, means the necessity of international travel which is not cheap.

I do not write for an audience of one. I write for you, readers of this site. If you believe this work might make a contribution to the world of political-economic ideas, please consider supporting it financially. I am not a wealthy person, and unlike the leftist groups I often criticize, I do not have a George Soros funneling a bottomless well of cash my way.

If I reach the above goal of \$500/mo., I may be able to speak at an event in your area (contact info below).

I allowed myself (via a handful of reader emails) to be talked out of going into retirement at the end of 2017, to give this at least one more year, but due to my own situation, that will be the best I can do.]

[Click here for part 1](#)

© 2018 Steven Yates – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Steven Yates: freeyourmindinasc@yahoo.com

“Sh*thole Countries,” The Fate Of Modernity, And The Case For Localization, Part 1

Donald Trump’s supposed remark about “sh*thole countries” created outrage around the world and at home. I should begin by noting three important points: (1) Trump denies using the phrase, (2) there is no hard evidence that he said it (e.g., a video or audio recording), and (3) what those with him at the meeting in question claim to recall depends on whether they are his friends or his enemies.

The allegation originated with avowed Trump enemies: Sen. Dick Durbin (D-Ill.), and *The Washington Post* whose writers, Republican or Democrat, hated Trump’s guts from the get-go. Others present claimed Trump spoke bluntly, as he often does, but do not recall any such phrase. Sen. Tom Cotton (R-Ark.) stated that Trump was annoyed by immigration proposals based on where people were from instead of what skills they brought to the U.S. While conceding that Trump’s language was harsh, he called Durbin’s description a “gross misrepresentation.”

Be all this as it may, the controversy has kicked open doors for discussions worth having.

Before we go further, I recommend you go [here](#) and read alternative journalist and author Jon Rappoport’s observations on the subject. Read every word from start to finish. Take your time.

I’ll wait.

Have you read it? Good. If so, let’s ask with Rappoport: how

many people in those countries even *begin* to care about a shouting match between folks all of whom take for granted that their water will be clean and their food safe (relatively speaking), and who have ready access to medical care if a child gets sick?

People in these countries *know* they are living in “sh*tholes” and – if they had the leisure to do so (they don’t) – would ask who we blame for that, and why no one is doing anything likely to make a real difference?

Sensible questions, and I don’t think many Westerners are going to like the answers.

Rappoport’s answer in a nutshell: once, long ago, most peoples in pre-industrialized countries were doing fine, or as well as common people in such places do. They labored in their fields and did not live in palaces by any means, but they lived mostly stable lives, and they had beliefs and traditions to give them meaning. Their countries were not “sh*tholes.”

Their problems started at the top, and spread downward, as such problems usually do.

As industrialization came, Western corporations, first those of Great Britain but later of the U.S., with the full backing of their governments and governments abroad, began pillaging these countries. The pillaging continued for decades and in some cases centuries. The result destroyed local economies and often local environments with polluted water tables, poisoned soils, contaminated foodstuffs, etc. Local political arrangements were also destroyed, as trusted local leaders were replaced by corporate-backed sociopaths.

This is how a non-industrialized but stable country becomes a “sh*thole”!

Problems mount if there is local footdragging against corporate-state predation. There might even be a political

assassination or revolution, events not exactly conducive to stability, much less to prosperity.

Are we making this up?

Consider John Perkins's revelations in his now-classic *Confessions of an Economic Hit Man* (orig. 2004; there's a more recent edition but I've not read it; the first version was a huge wake-up call). Perkins offered stunning accounts of how the "consulting firm" he worked for sent him to leaders of "third world" countries with vivid promises of building up "first world" infrastructure: highways, bridges, dams, airports, skyscrapers filled with office cubicles, hospitals and clinics with Western-trained doctors dispensing pharmaceuticals and vaccines, and shopping malls to encourage Western-style mass consumption – paid for via massive loans from the IMF or another such global entity.

The loans would only nominally go to the country. Corporations such as Bechtel claimed the dough. In fairness, they did what they said they would do, and when they were finished, the country had one or more new economic hubs with skylines as "first world" as downtown Atlanta.

The countries, however, found themselves strapped with a massive and unrepayable debt which became a rope around their necks used to control them. As a condition of refinancing such a debt, a country would be forced to allow, e.g., a U.S. military base on its soil, or to vote with the U.S. in the UN on crucial matters.

Why was the debt unrepayable? Because most of the profits made by foreign corporations had been taken out of the country.

Empowered local elites could live like kings if they played ball, and some did, even though it meant turning their backs on their own people. (Think: House of Saud.) Others (e.g., Jacobo Arbenz of Guatemala, Jaime Roldós of Ecuador, and especially Omar Torrijos of Panama) realized their autonomy

was gone and stood up to predatory corporations like United Fruit Company in the case of Guatemala.

Result: in 1954 a CIA-backed revolution, following a Western corporate media campaign demonizing Arbenz as a communist. A thug named Carlos Castillo Armas was placed in nominal power. United Fruit Company, which had run Guatemala for decades, was back on top.

This, by the way, is the origin of that colorful phrase *banana republic*.

In the cases of Ecuador's Roldós and Panama's Torrijos, the result was two very suspicious fatal plane crashes.

My wife and I were visiting friends in Panama during October 2016. Torrijos is still considered a national hero there. We met a tour guide in Panama City who opened up to us when he saw that my wife is Latin American and that although I'm a gringo I don't worship at the altar of the U.S. governmental / corporate oligarchy.

What I'd figured out on my own was reinforced: to this day there are Panamanians who don't believe for a minute that Torrijos's death was an accident. The fact that his death and the nearly identical one of Roldós were just two months apart back in 1981 only fuels suspicion. (Incidentally, the U.S. government and corporate media also lied about the number of Panamanians killed when the first George Bush ordered the military strike on Panama City that ousted Manuel Noriega in December 1989. The real figure was in the thousands, not a few hundred.)

Living and traveling overseas gives you a perspective you don't have if you've never been outside the U.S., especially if you've picked up enough Spanish to rub shoulders with the locals (e.g., taxi drivers, tour guides) instead of corporate bigwigs and academics.

I've not been to Haiti. I corresponded with a Haitian on Île de la Gonâve off the main island (was trying to help him raise money for a Christmas event for kids there), and also with a few gringos who have been there. It's a country filled with impoverished, desperate people.

What we know: Haiti has had its share of sociopathic tyrants (think of the Duvaliers), and at present, Haitians who can muster the resources are leaving in droves. Some are coming to Chile and taking menial jobs (e.g., sweeping floors, cleaning bathrooms) that are better than anything they could find back home, which was typically nothing. They probably appreciate the political-economic stability that exists here. Incidentally, Chile has specific immigration laws and policies, and they are enforced. These are legal immigrants, and the immigration department here is literally overwhelmed, with lines wrapping around city blocks! Is Chile's opening its doors to these people a good thing? I honestly do not know yet.

Modernity has been a mixed bag. What do we mean, *modernity*? What scholars and historians tend to mean by that term are the systems of governance, economy, infrastructure, and overall mindset characteristic of "first world" civilization, based on promises inherent in the European Enlightenment. Modernity respects science and technology, develops institutions intended to promote stable mass democracies and capitalistic economies, typically with social safety nets and public education. What results are large, bureaucratic organizations. The economy becomes consumer-oriented, allows for upward mobility for those able to fill needs or satisfy demands, and eventually, ideally, creates and maintains a flourishing, financially independent middle class. Its educational systems are diverse and, at their best, serve both vocational needs and pure scientific and intellectual research in large universities. "Well-adjusted" citizens identify with such ideals as equal treatment of all citizens under the rule of

law and come to regard departures from this as wrongs to be corrected. They thus believe in progress, are interested in new technology, and welcome social change when it is necessary to correct a wrong such as racial or sexual discrimination.

There are, however, some major downsides. While their expressions often come from artists, poets, musicians, sociologists, a few philosophers, and other lefty-types, and are therefore easily mocked as products of those who just don't want to work at real jobs, they are not nothings.

Start with the fact that mass civilization breeds mass anonymity: the individual person becomes a cipher encircled by structures he/she did not personally sign off on or vote for. He/she exists as a name/number in government and corporate databases. Most of us complain at some point about inefficient and indifferent bureaucracy, but large and highly centralized, hierarchical organizations, laden with generalized rules and filled with people there primarily to collect a check every two weeks, are characteristic of modernity: career bureaucrats are also ciphers in the larger scheme of things. Since none of us is truly a cipher – each of us sees the world from a his/her own central point, the central character in his/her own extended narrative, as it were – prolonged meditation on the contrast between how we see ourselves and how we are supposed to see “our” mass democracy, versus the anonymity of the surrounding systems in which all but a tiny few of us are relatively powerless, soon breeds alienation and cynicism. That, of course, is only the start. Some speak of the rootless cosmopolitans of the “blue culture” of the big cities, whose loyalties are limited to some combination of pleasure (often sexual), whatever is trendy (political or technological), and especially money which can buy the others.

Capitalism*, as economic historian Joseph Schumpeter observed in his classic *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy* (orig. 1942), is always changing. He coined the phrase *creative destruction* for the constant, chronic churning at its core,

driving it to create the new and obliterate the old. The problem: systems (of which the individual person is one type) tend towards equilibrium – stability within themselves and with their immediate environment – not constant change. This basic truth of systems theory explains why we have had cultures that remained essentially unchanged for thousands of years (e.g., ancient China) and why we will eventually have tensions in any system based on constant change. Schumpeter believed – and what is interesting is how he worked this out in the early 1940s, not the 1960s – that capitalism would create conditions for its replacement by socialism: its masses would vote themselves into it. Mass democracy would legislate its way into socialism.

He got this largely wrong, of course. Although he'd doubtless been thinking of how New Deal measures were likely to expand, he didn't anticipate the rise of the Mont Pélerins who were just getting started in the 1940s. Thus he did not foresee how neoliberal political economy would carry its own brand of capitalism forward amidst spreading collectivism in the culture.

Schumpeter also did not imagine the world of financialization, made possible when Nixon killed the gold standard (1971) and the dollar became the world's reigning fiat currency. Financialization really got going in the 1990s as market speculation in an ocean of easy credit replaced actual production which was offshored, sometimes to a "sh*thole country," because labor was cheap and environmental regulations were lax. The increased mobility of capital which creatively-destructive technological change made possible furthered this process. One important result: the steadily increasing concentration of wealth in the hands of an ever-smaller transnational billionaire class we have seen over the past three decades and even more since the financial crisis of 2008 (this is an economic lefty preoccupation, I know; but don't take my word for it, check the readily available data).

This process slowly eliminates the jobs that made a rising middle class possible. Also eliminating jobs is automation, via AI and robotics – more Schumpeterian creative destruction, as labor itself becomes expendable.

Of course, what's happened in modernity's "developed" world hardly holds a candle to what's occurred elsewhere, everywhere Western corporations (with the backing of all governments involved) have gotten their claws in. The tensions between rising expectations and economic realities are very real, not just in the U.S. and Europe but in every non-Western country globalization has touched, which is most of them.

There is also the invariable secularism inherent in modernity. Its systems' focus on money and other matters of *this* world invariably push religious institutions and believers to the margins, whatever their beliefs, whether planned or not. No one described this better than theologian Harvey Cox, who wrote in his major work *The Secular City* (orig. 1965) how secularization "bypasses and undercuts religion and goes on to other things.... It has relativized religious worldviews and thus rendered them innocuous.... The gods of traditional religions live on as private fetishes or the patrons of congenial groups, but they play no significant role in the public life of the secular city.... The [secular] world looks less and less to religious roles or rituals for its morality or its meanings."

It trends towards materialism, in other words, with (as I've noted previously) all this involves.

In *Age of Anger: A History of the Present* (2017), essayist Pankaj Mishra evaluates modernity from the standpoint of a thinker born and raised in rural India, educated in the West, but not losing touch with his non-Western roots. His thoughts are darker than Schumpeter's or even Perkins's. He tries to chart the clash between modernity's promises and its results. Modernity's expansion accelerated during the neoliberal-

neoconservative era that began when the Soviet Union collapsed, “history ended” (Fukuyama), and its globalized advocates saw democratic capitalism as heralding a technological Utopia. What is clear is that as modernity has expanded to cover the globe, it has been welcomed by secularized regional elites but eyed skeptically by deeply religious masses – and those who invariably rise to lead them (literary, philosophical, etc.).

Mishra draws on both Western philosophers (especially Rousseau, contrasted with Voltaire’s enthusiastic embrace of what was coming), non-Western ones (Hindu, Buddhist, Muslim, etc.), and a few caught in deeply traditional orders that were modernizing (e.g., Dostoevsky). He offers a common-denominator explanation of Western “populism” (Brexit, Donald Trump / Trumpism, European nationalism), the rise of Islamist militancy, and Hindu nationalism in his native land, as resulting from this clash between expectations and reality: there are the promises of modernity, but only a small minority actually reaps its rewards. The masses experience only dislocation and upheaval, losing not only their traditions but their land – sold to the highest corporate bidder – as even the seemingly prosperous in the new cities experience the alienating rootlessness of modernized city life commuting between daytime work cubicles helping a corporation get richer and nighttime cramped apartments helping a landlord get richer (sometimes they are one and the same). Yes, there is economic mobility, but the fact that occupations and markets get saturated ensures that only a few will enjoy it. Creative destruction ensures turnover, but also guarantees that present-day successes are temporary; under developed modernity, like the system itself one cannot stand still. One must continually “reinvent oneself.”

All of this creates and abets the “anger” of Mishra’s title. It is a pushback against globalization and modernity as not only having failed to deliver on their promises but for having

turned countries into impoverished, politically unstable “sh*tholes.”

[*I know there are readers who will object that we have not had “true capitalism” in the West for a long time. I use the term mainly because we are all familiar with it, and because as it turns out, there are valid reasons for doubting that the abstraction for which libertarian academics and other defenders of capitalism wish to reserve the term for can even exist in the world as it is. This is another article, however.]

Coming soon, Part two

© 2018 Steven Yates – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Steven Yates: freeyourmindinsc@yahoo.com

Why Donald Trump Won – Brief Review Of The Past Quarter Century

One does not need any special prognostication skills to know that 2018 will see even more intense attacks on Donald Trump and his administration, even given the growing happy talk about the economy. After all, the kinds of numbers that impress mainstream economists – Dow hitting new highs regularly, very low (official) unemployment, low inflation, rising consumer spending, etc. – are all manifest.

Hence insidious counterattacks like the Michael Wolff book *Fire and Fury: Inside the Trump White House* (just published). Jake Tapper of CNN interviewed Trump advisor Stephen Miller

about the book [here](#), and I recommend watching the full video. Miller occasionally gets a few words in edgewise, his intent being to offer more than a couple of soundbites on behalf of those whose point of view is not heard on CNN. For this he was told, "I've wasted enough of my viewers' time," and his mike cut off.

What interests me about this video is that it is a microcosm for how corporate media elites deal with the alternative voices to which the Internet created space, voices which by the early 2000s were challenging then-dominant corporate media with far fewer resources, and whose influence with voters culminated in the present administration.

Intellectual and media elites would have you believe we have entered a "post-fact world." Leftists (and some mainstream Republicans) want you to believe Trump is a racist, a fascist or at least proto-fascist; that he is incompetent; that he is mentally unstable; that he plays to a "conspiratorial" view of the world; etc., etc., *ad nauseum*. That his supporters continue to stand by him drives the media elites nuts. Trump doesn't always play his hand in the best way. The fact that he doesn't sing corporate media's tune but continues to call the shots as he sees them often works against him as his tweets and words are ripped out of context. The wise know that sometimes it is best just to shut up, especially when enemy hawks are circling. Why give them ammunition?

But on the other hand, most Trump supporters couldn't care less what the media elites think. Their values are not elite values. Their perception of what the facts are is entirely different from what the elites believe. For example, as I write, Trump is being denounced all around the globe for what he said about Haiti and African countries. Did he really say it? I have no idea. I would have to have been in the room to be sure one way or the other, apparently. But if he did, then if his description of, say, Haiti is factually wrong, then why are so many Haitians fleeing? I doubt they are trying to help

the diversity bean-counters.

What we are in is a battle over who has the facts: dominant corporate media outfits such as CNN, or upstart challengers (Breitbart, NewsWithViews.com, ZeroHedge.com, PaulCraigRoberts.org, etc.); and which set of values are most defensible.

I therefore decided that my first column of 2018 should review the past instead of trying to look ahead, as so many others are doing. I've long held that if we don't know where we came from, we won't know where we're going or why. I stated a *quarter century* because I needed to pick a reasonable time frame. Obviously I'm not saying our problems began just a quarter century ago. But the specific trends that led to the Trump upset went into high gear around the time the Soviet Union collapsed, or shortly before.

Let's begin just with the fact, for fact it is, that the progression – Bush the Elder, Clinton, Bush the Younger, Obama – reveal uniform directions regardless of the party differences. The first: into *globalism* and *corporatism*, via “free trade” deals and the neoliberal / neoconservative coin (these two being flipsides of one another). The closely related second: into *Greenspanism*, one might call it: enhancing the financialization of the domestic economy by flooding markets with cheap credit, which drives up the Dow and encourages consumers (also college students!) to go into debt. This has been the true consolidator of wealth and power over the past quarter century, as artificial wealth flows to the top and the general population fills with debt slaves. The third: *wars of choice* (Iraq under the first Bush, Kosovo under Clinton, Afghanistan and Iraq under the second Bush, etc.) and other interferences often destroying nations (Libya). The fourth: the *destruction of real education at all levels* with political correctness. A fifth: domestic *police-statism*, as for the past four years, police have killed an average of over 1,000 citizens per year, often on the slightest provocation.

[This site](#) offers specifics.

Leopold Kohr (1909 – 1994) authored *The Breakdown of Nations* (1957) a treatise that deserves more attention than it will probably ever receive, because he put his finger on the problem as well as anyone before or since. Empires are a bad idea by their very nature, Kohr argued. Their natural tendency is to grow aggressive and destructive. They aggress against other nations and their own people, as neither has sufficient resources to hold their power in check or mount effective pushback. This has nothing to do with any particular political party or program; the problem, Kohr believed, is systemic. The U.S. was on its way to becoming an empire after World War II. It had achieved this status in spades by the 1960s. Anglo-America was clearly the dominant political economy when the Soviet Union collapsed. Kohr's basic thesis is confirmed, except for the one thing he got wrong. We have seen pushback with varying amounts of effectiveness. Kohr wrote well before there was an Internet, which makes it possible to get messages heard and organize outside the domains of power with very few resources.

Alternative media, most of it Internet-based, has been a major form of pushback against dominant corporate media. It was, after all, an alternative site (Drudge Report) that broke the Clinton-Lewinsky story when the Clinton-infatuated mainstream was ready to bury it. We have alternative media to thank for exposing Bill Clinton as the sexual predator he is, which radical feminists (starting with his wife) would have covered up – exposing how that movement is about power, not justice for women. Through alternative media we learned more of our existence in “the matrix” than ever before: the dominance of those I called *the superelite* in my [Four Cardinal Errors](#) (2011) and how all major institutions are structured so as to conceal this dominance from public view.

The Internet made the soft censorship of manufactured consent that existed before the 1990s much more difficult. Alternative

views rose and flourished online. They offered a worldview able to compete directly with the dominant one. According to this worldview, mainstream economists and their media shells consistently portray the economy as doing better than it really is; mainstream thought routinely suppress certain facts that don't fit its narrative on, e.g., race (black-on-white violent crime, for example); it promotes a globalist agenda in which There Is No Alternative to job outsourcing, open borders, diversity engineering in universities including suppression of conservative thought, etc.

In case my repeated usages of *globalist* are unclear, I use the term to refer to those who, knowingly or not, are promoting transnational authoritarian structures, beginning with (but hardly limited to) those of trade and commerce that require ever more complex systems of agreement and top-down regulation. No one truly believes a "global free market" is even possible, much less would resolve the problems and dislocations resulting from encircling globalist trade policies. The latter are not free market policies in any event but policies designed to further enrich a billionaire ownership class (the superelite). The *telos* of globalism is a world state: a globe-spanning empire, which, in line with Kohr's observations, would tilt totalitarian as totalitarian control will be necessary to force cooperation from all the footdragging nations and recalcitrant populations. (My guess: the latter are already being starved into submission as their local economies are shattered.)

It was this, I submit, that Trumpism reacted against, as more and more of those left behind by globalist outsourcing came to question it based on what they could read online, and more and more white males came to question dogmas about diversity social engineering however it manifests itself ("affirmative action," or "we need more immigrants"). Trumpism in the U.S. has hardly been the only instance of pushback. Brexit, obviously, is another. So is the Viktor Orbán administration

in Hungary and the Law and Justice government in Poland headed by Andrzej Duda. Both, obviously, are at odds with the globalist narrative of the EU and its corporate media, which has therefore demonized them and orchestrated attacks condemning them as “anti-democratic” and “fascist” (a favorite word among those who have no idea what *fascism* is).

Not all pushback succeeds, of course. Geert Wilders lost to the mainstream candidate Mark Rutte in the Netherlands, and Marine Le Pen lost to France’s mainstreamer Emmanuel Macron. Back in the U.S., Judge Roy Moore, a federalist in the original sense of that term, lost in Alabama following a savage corporate media attack based entirely on unprovable innuendo repeated incessantly 24/7 in the weeks leading up to that special election. The allegations against Moore were far weaker than those against Bill Clinton back in the 1990s, with one of Moore’s accusers [admitting](#) she added material in a high school yearbook Moore allegedly signed to enhance its credibility. Moore’s signing the yearbook is not a crime, of course, and to this day no one has produced evidence he assaulted anyone. But this is how corporate media works: when you don’t have facts, *simply make them up! Repeat them ad infinitum. Then declare that the other side has created a “fact-free world”!*

And declare, via anonymous groups using unsourced material given credibility in mainstream outfits like *The Washington Post*, that [we are all under seize by “fake news” originating with “conspiracy websites.”](#)

Finally, put a Michael Wolff on the Trump administration’s tail.

So again – after his first full year in office – why did Trump win – which might very well have been unexpected (the one claim from *Fire and Fury* that is somewhat plausible is that Team Trump did not really expect to win the November 2016 election)?

First and most obviously was Trump's superior command of both mainstream and alternative media. His media savvy vastly outstripped that of other Republicans, Hillary, and CNN's skill commentators. He could command center stage even from those who hated his guts. He was ratings, and they knew it. Using his Twitter account, he could bypass the haters in mass media and communicate directly to his base of supporters, as he has been doing ever since.

Trump, I would argue, had two different but overlapping constituencies. The first consists of those described above, the so-called "losers" of globalization especially following the start of the NAFTA era (NAFTA, let us remember, was supported by both the first George Bush and Bill Clinton). These communities, [even the Washington Post has acknowledged](#), are in serious trouble. They struggle with unemployment, underemployment, political neglect, and health problems ranging from depression to substance abuse issues (alcoholism and drug addictions) – all a price tag of not "reinventing themselves" as tech-savvy serfs for the "global workforce."

In addition, these people get to hear about their "white privilege," which brings me to the second constituency that supported Trump.

To put it bluntly, this group (with whom I identify the most) is fed up with reverse biases of various sorts and the political correctness that has been used to protect them from criticism for around 30 years. They tend to have college educations, but supported Trump anyway (however reluctantly in some cases) because he represented pushback against leftist professors and leftist student groups they had to kowtow to while getting those educations. Now, given how tech-era corporate America (think Google and Facebook, though these are hardly alone) are dominated by leftists, they find themselves *still* having to kowtow or lose their jobs, as did [this fellow](#) who has filed suit against Google. The discovery process has blown the whistle on the hard cultural left mindset that

dominates the corporation that controls the world's leading search engine.

There is a battle of worldviews going on. One favors consolidation, technocracy, and a near-worship of prevailing "experts." The other wants decentralization, autonomy, and freedom of thought. The first, it goes without saying, is *de facto* materialist in its larger worldview of reality. The latter contains (but is not limited to) a lot of Christians—though I hasten to add, there is no logical connection here and I know of people who call themselves Christian who I'd have to put in the globalist camp because they support some version of the neoliberal / neoconservative axis (theologically the latter are usually dispensationalists, though that is a larger issue I cannot get into here).

The first worldview, dominant in mainstream media and universities, favors globalism and leftism, portraying them as "sane" and "responsible" and "centrist." While not altogether unified, it is united on what it supports. The other, represented by alternative media, has been incessantly exposing these efforts while promoting individual freedoms. Alternative media is, ironically, very diverse intellectually. Too much so, I'd argue. There are "left" alternative sites opposing globalism as well as "right" ones doing so. A conversation between the two would be very desirable, but I don't see it happening.

The battle over which side is presenting "fake news" in a "fact-free" environment will continue, as mainstream corporate media fights to regain the credibility it lost after openly backing Clinton and claiming she would win in one of history's biggest landslides. At present, the mainstream's weapons include labeling alternative media as "hate sites," platforms for "conspiracy theories," etc. It also includes the soft censorship Google is conducting, designing search algorithms in such a way that alternative sites simply don't come up anywhere near the top in Web searches. The designers know that

busy people usually don't look past the top ten items that come up in a search.

This battle has already claimed career casualties (Steve Bannon being the most recent, given how he appears to have opened his mouth to Wolff about things he cannot possibly have known first hand), and we can expect that the Trump administration will continue to take new hits almost daily. Trump doesn't always help himself with his mouth. I'm not thinking here of his lack of political correctness. I worry that he is taking credit for the numbers behind the happy talk about the economy I mentioned at the outset. Last I knew, how these numbers are calculated (e.g., the BLS's U-3 "headline" unemployment number) did not change on November 8, 2016. Nor did the financialization of the economy change. Wall Street is still in a huge bubble, courtesy of QE. Massive spending on credit has not ceased to leave a person massively in debt. Trump's pick for Yellen's replacement, Jerome Powell, is another mainstreamer, moreover, and this is hardly encouraging. If Trump claims to own a real economic recovery, should the economy go into a recession at any point, for any reason, while he is in office, he will own that as well.

We would do best to realize: this battle of worldviews goes beyond Trump, and will outlast his presidency no matter what. Its outcome will determine the future: whether we start to develop peaceful, decentralized communities on an enlarging scale based on such principles as local autonomy and control, voluntarism, and the rule of law, or return to the path we were on for the past four presidencies, which was towards the marriage of Huxley's *Brave New World* and Orwell's *1984* that is likely if globalism ever delivers us into the hands of a world state.

[Author's Note: if you believe this article was worth your time, please consider supporting my writing with a \$5/mo. pledge on [my Patreon site](#). If the first 100 people who read this all donate, my goal of just \$500/mo. would be reached in

no time! And if we're honest about it, we all waste that much money each day.

This is an attempt to raise money to publish and promote a novel, Reality 101, to be marketed as the first serious novel of the Donald Trump era, which, so far as I know, it is. In it, a ex-Wall Street globalist technocrat defends his views on elitism and oligarchy before a community wracked by the effects of globalization in a voice filled with irony and dripping with cynicism – to be contrasted with the possibility of freedom outside the world as he sees it.

Promoting a book, in my case, means the necessity of international travel which is not cheap.

I do not write for an audience of one. I write for you, readers of this site. If you believe this work might make a contribution to the world of political-economic ideas, please consider supporting it financially. I am not a wealthy person, and unlike the leftist groups I often criticize, I do not have a George Soros funneling a bottomless well of cash my way.

If I reach the above goal of \$500/mo., I may be able to speak at an event in your area (contact info below).

I allowed myself (via a handful of reader emails) to be talked out of going into retirement at the end of 2017, to give this at least one more year, but due to my own situation, that will be the best I can do.]

E-Mail Steven Yates: freeyourmindinsc@yahoo.com

© 2018 Steven Yates – All Rights Reserved

From Charles Manson To Sutherland Springs: How The Materialist West Is Killing Its Own

Charles Manson, who orchestrated one of the past century's most brutal mass murders, passed away mostly unmourned in prison last month. He was 83. Since he'd had brushes with the law going back into his childhood (was sent to reform school at age 8), and never spent a day outside prison following his arrest for the Tate / La Bianca murders in August 1969, most of Manson's life was spent behind bars.

Which is doubtless just as well. For the influence he wielded can only be described as demonic. He'd not killed anyone himself, but directed others, the young girls of his "Family," to do his bidding after supplying them with generous doses of LSD.

The would-be assassin of then-president Gerald Ford, a few years later, turned out to be a "Family" member: Lynette "Squeaky" Fromme.

Having read the Yahoo.com article about Manson's death, I found myself browsing the comments section out of curiosity. One comment brought me up short.

What it said, in essence: if the Manson killings happened today, in an environment following Las Vegas and Sutherland Springs, Texas, they would get perhaps a week of news coverage before mass media went on to the next ghastly event.

My thought: what a statement on American society today, as opposed to 1969-70!

Back then, a mass murder on that level shocked us to the core. The country, especially its youth, still held to an idealism about human nature and what was socially possible. Today, in 2017, much of the secular-derived hope that existed then is gone, whether we know it or want to admit it or not.

The better elements of the youth movement of the late 1960s, united *for* civil rights and feminism understood as nondiscrimination and basic workplace fairness, and *against* an ill-advised and massively unpopular war in Southeast Asia, arguably were cosmic optimism's last culturally viable gasp. Afterwards, the above movements were hijacked and turned divisive. Wars became popular again. We fell into confusion and justifiable doubt.

Some would trot out the technology revolution of the 1990s as a sign of cultural optimism, but its most popular fruits have been the self-absorption and self-indulgence represented by (what else?) selfies and Facebook. But no, technology has not saved us. However much we can use Skype and WhatsApp to communicate conveniently, sometimes across oceans, the Internet's dark side reveals a world of trolls (some paid), hackers, scam artists, cyberbullies, and hard-core porn sites easily accessed by young teenagers. On the so-called dark web, not accessible through common search engines like Google, there is worse, or so I am told: kiddie porn sites done by and for pedophiles, Satanic rituals, and films of animals and humans being tortured to death.

While much went wrong in the 1970s, the seeds of destruction had been planted long before. Because for decades, materialism as a theory of reality (or *metaphysics*) had been taught as truth – substantiated by science or inferred by Enlightenment reason – and when not promoted in universities, assumed as a basis for educational policy (behaviorism in psychology, which sees children as little stimulus-response machines, is an application of materialism.) Everything else was rejected as superstition, unreason, pseudoscience, psychological

aberration, fantasy, etc. A latent commitment to materialism – not a brand new reading of the First Amendment’s Establishment Clause – stood behind such events as the removal of prayer from public schools and the effort to eliminate Christianity from the public square.

If we were talking about a mere philosophical abstraction, the matter wouldn’t be of much importance except for scholars. But materialism is not just an abstraction. It has important consequences, some of which I’ve discussed [previously](#). For our purposes here, the most important consequence is that human life – *our* lives as persons – has no transcendent value or significance. Morality is, at best, a cultural artifact, a set of socially approved habits which bind a culture together via authority.

If this interpretation of morality and of the significance of individual human lives is assumed, then a cultural ethos in which moral rules are easily flaunted is increasingly acceptable, and becomes progressively easier as we “define deviancy down.”

At this point I could invoke abortion as a perfect example. Legal abortions have now taken the lives of roughly 61 million unborn babies since the Supreme Court’s *Roe v. Wade* decision in 1973. If an evaluation of the prevailing moral ethos of a civilization can be made by how it treats its most vulnerable members – and who is more vulnerable than an unborn baby? – then any honest evaluation of ours comes to look very bad! (I am not saying, incidentally, that we shouldn’t look at factors that tempt girls and women to end unwanted pregnancies, ranging from poverty to cultural hedonism and extramarital sex. We are talking about many overlapping systems here, but some of them are products of a materialist worldview.)

It also looks bad when we think of a civilizational ethos that seems to be producing more and more people able to plan cold-blooded mass murder of their fellow adult citizens, then pick

up an assault weapon and carry out the plan, which is what happened in Sutherland Springs, Texas: before last month a town no one outside the area had heard of, as it is little more than a major intersection with a stoplight, a few homes, a few stores, and a certain First Baptist Church.

A person can only do this if he is a sociopath, or has been trained – or has trained himself – to depersonalize his “targets.” Such training is conducted as a matter of course in war. Few soldiers are sociopaths who can just pick up guns and kill strangers. They have to depersonalize the enemy. Those then slaughtered on battlefields are not seen as men like themselves, with families waiting anxiously for them back home. They are ciphers to be taken out before they take you out. Many of our returned Veterans never fully recover from this experience. As a college student in the 1970s I recall encountering Vietnam Veterans who were tormented by things they’d seen. Now we have Veterans from the disastrous wars in Afghanistan and Iraq suffering from PTSD, with recurring nightmares and unpredictable reactions to loud noises (there is even a [heavy progressive rock song](#) by an intelligent group, Dream Theater, the harsh edginess of which offers a surprisingly moving account of what some of these people are going through).

It is not normal to pick up a firearm and kill strangers without a very, very good reason!

(And lest I be asked, the Sutherland Springs saga is an embodiment of why more gun control is not the answer. First, *existing* laws should have prevented Devin Patrick Kelley, 26, from obtaining an assault weapon. He had been dishonorably discharged from the Air Force following a domestic violence conviction and period of incarceration. A bureaucrat neglected to enter this in the national database. Gun control laws cannot be made idiot-proof! Second, had a neighbor also *with* a gun not accessed the situation quickly and taken action, forcing Kelley to flee the scene, the death toll inside the

church would have been much higher.

Incidentally, too, I've encountered nothing to suggest that the Sutherland Springs killings were anything other than what they appeared to be, and trust me, I was looking. Sometimes, as I often say, a cigar is just a cigar. The Vegas shootings are a different story. Here we have an official narrative full of unanswered questions, ranging from sightings suggestive of multiple shooters, queries why no one injured subsequently died of their wounds which given the numbers vastly stretches probability, the mystery of how the sheer quantity of guns and ammo found in Stephen Paddock's suite got there in a building wired with secure-cams and no one reported anything suspicious, and what Paddock's motive could possibly have been. But we need not deal with these to make the point I am interested in here: someone – maybe more than one someone – was willing to mass murder their fellow human beings, whatever the reason!)

Materialism has far less dramatic effects, obviously. It is hardly news that many millennials are turning from capitalism and trying to embrace socialism. For the first time last year, a man who called himself a democratic socialist posed a viable challenge to an establishment candidate. The superficial criticism of the Bernie Sanders millennials would be that the Soviet Union collapsed before they were born, and that the impoverishment of education and their own tech-induced myopia blinds them to the present realities of North Korea's brutal prison camps or how Venezuelans, despite living in a resources-rich country, have been reduced by the insane policies of their socialist government to digging through garbage for scraps of food.

These snarky responses no longer seem to me especially fair. They miss the real question: *why* the relatively sudden (since 2008) hostility to capitalism by significant voices of a generation? A plausible answer is that the present neoliberal corporatist capitalism globalists have embraced sees one's

worth as a person as what one can contribute to the global economy. Do note that the elderly, the infirm, many disabled, not to mention “fetuses” (and for that matter, small children) cannot contribute. I have encountered Libertarians (many of whom are *de facto* materialists) who wouldn't seem to have much of a problem with nonparticipants in the marketplace starving, although obviously they wouldn't say so; they would point to charities, etc., etc., indicative of the need for institutions operating outside the marketplace, understood as economic space for exchanges of goods and services for money.

Neoliberal ideology, which now controls university administrations, has been described as “capitalism with the gloves off”: currently empowering the global billionaire ownership class – with more wealth than the entire bottom half of the world's population – which has shrunk over the past couple of decades until it would fit comfortably into a high school auditorium.

I don't think you have to be a socialist to see something wrong with this picture.

The problem is not *socialism* and it is not *capitalism*, it is the *materialism* that the most important incarnations of each one share. Materialism, again, as a theory of reality holds that God does not exist, that morality is a cultural artifact, that our lives have no transcendent significance, that death is the end of personal identity and consciousness after which your body is dropped in a hole and covered over, and that therefore there is nothing fundamentally wrong with amassing as much wealth you can by whatever means are available – including buying easily-corrupted political elites, treating your employees as expendable, and otherwise stepping on anyone in your way.

That's our wonderful global corporate capitalist engine as it exists in the twenty-first century.

Small wonder some of our young people are “rediscovering” Marx!

Small wonder others, their brains addled by identity-politics, are turning “alt-right” and claiming for whites what the cultural left has foisted on over a dozen academic disciplines (several of which would not exist without identity politics).

The most visible response to our materialist moment has been the populist anger that put Donald Trump in the White House and empowered movements both “left” and “right” elsewhere in the world, from Arab Spring all across the Arab world and the Syriza Party in Greece prior to its being strongarmed and neutered by the EU central bank, to Brexit, to the current leadership in Poland and Hungary. What all have in common is a desire to live as they see fit, without the structural coercion globalist elitism entails. This includes rejecting open borders and incursions by unassimilable foreigners who commit violent crimes including rape and murder.

Most populist rage, whether of the “left” or the “right,” is inchoate and inarticulate. Were it to find a philosophically-informed expositor, the result might go something like this: If God does not exist and there is no transcendent morality and no life other than this material one, then if any of us are to get *justice*, however we define it, it has to be gotten in *this* world – by whatever means are necessary, including those other groups will define as *unjust*.

In this kind of ethos, groups politicized by identity are apt to fly at each other’s throats. I won’t wade into specifics because I am more interested in the unspoken commonality: *my group has been shafted and we’re not going to tolerate it anymore!*

Into this arena walks the occasional sociopath, or the man who simply “snaps” – or who is willing to kill other persons to advance a hidden agenda.

Into the same arena, of course, walk *known* sexual predators: the Bill Clintons, the Harvey Weinsteins, the Al Franken, the Charlie Roses, who did what they did because in *their* reality, women are used for men's sexual gratification and then rewarded with jobs or movie roles, for it's just business, right? Sexual predation being a sanctionable "bad thing," unproven and unprovable allegations can then be used in efforts to destroy those whose worldviews threaten the status quo, [due process being expendable](#). Judge Roy Moore of Alabama comes to mind.

The enemy behind the headlines is materialism – which can be an abstraction, an obsession with wealth and possessions or power, or as the depersonalizing of persons that is possible when one sees them as evolved big-brained mammals or as objects existing for one's profit or gratification, or as lumps of flesh in a womb.

Advancing civilizations have features that tempt them to materialism. Empirical science, which rightly focuses on physical reality, offers credible and useful explanations for many phenomena. Prosperity *does* result from technology turning raw materials into consumable ones, and from trade. Increased wealth *does* establish comfort levels enabling the comfortable to forget where they came from and just bask in their surroundings, and their children to grow up with, e.g., no idea that their food comes from anywhere except the grocery store.

Capitalism never lifted everyone equally, however, and it never will – for reasons too numerous to get into here. But socialism, invariably built on a capitalist base, will *not* even things out. These abstract ideologies are nowhere seen in their pure forms in any event. What we need to reflect on (millennials, I am talking to *you* if *any* of you are reading / listening):

The ideology of modernity, whether understood in capitalist

terms or as something else (e.g., the “mixed economy”) cannot deliver on its progressive promise to bring paradise to Earth because human nature is inherently sinful (Rom. 3:23). Think about both the plusses and negatives of the Internet I cited earlier, and then tell me there is no such thing as sin. Think about our seeming inability to organize ourselves socially and economically in a way that does not screw *somebody*, and tell me there is no such thing as sin. Globalization and technology have conspicuously failed to lift the world’s masses out of poverty, although they have further empowered the billionaire ownership class (my term, in [Four Cardinal Errors](#), is the superelite) that has orchestrated it.

If what has happened to the West is any guide, when materialism takes over a civilization, that civilization begins to self-destruct. Its rich grow richer, more corrupt, arrogant, and indifferent to those thrown under the bus by their policies. The latter grow increasingly irrational and destructive. They create a debt-fueled system to sustain spending in an economy in which the decent jobs have disappeared because no one really *makes* anything anymore. They initiate wars not from just causes but because war is profitable! Educational systems are ruined, because those in power can’t abide a population of critical thinkers. Entertainment is corrupted and turned increasingly tawdry. Just compare the comedians of long ago, such as Red Skelton and Jackie Gleason, to the talentless, foul-mouthed losers who dominate comedy today. Or compare the upbeat jazz and soulful black music of the 1960s-early 1970s (anyone recall the Temptations, or Diana Ross and the Supremes?) with the lewdness and violence of rap.

The materialist West is killing its own, and where once, long ago, the killings shocked us (Manson), today they result in a few days of coverage and then are remembered with yawns by all except neighbors and surviving family members whose lives have been permanently altered (Sutherland Springs). And it is

killing itself. The West's collective philosophical problem, like Camus's (see his 1942 essay "The Myth of Sisyphus"), is suicide. The West is committing educational and cultural suicide. Even if it doesn't go out with the horror of a nuclear war, it threatens ever-greater degrees of *de facto* totalitarianism – Trumpian populism notwithstanding – followed by long-term collapse (a process, not a singular event) as its institutions become unsustainable.

Maybe the test for the future is to see if we can overthrow *materialism*, not just *globalism*. For if we were to overthrow the latter and ignore the former, within a generation or so we'd be back where we started. It won't be easy. Materialism is probably more deeply woven into the fabric of our civilization than the profit motive in global corporations or the power motive in governments. Formally educated men and women dismiss those of us who speak of the God of the Bible as irrational and backward, or as would-be theocrats: "dominionists" driven by a lust for power ourselves. There may, of course, be Christians who fall into this trap. Speaking just for myself, I have no interest in seeing a theocracy established, which I see as one more species of hierarchical, top-down power politics. My interest is in promoting the only worldview and guide for life that might have some hope of sustaining bottom-up self-governance by providing a core of stable morals that apply to every area of life, from governance to personal finance to family and relationships, and containing the lust for power as much as is humanly possible. Separating ourselves, rather than trying to "take over the government," might be the most viable long-term strategy at this point.

As against materialism, we must affirm both that God exists as the Creator of all things (Gen. 1:1; John 1:1), that we were created in His image (Gen 1:27) – and that He knows even the unborn (Jere. 1:5). God does not reject rightful knowledge-seeking (Hosea 4:6). What limited knowledge we have of the

physical world, and what capacity we have to use its resources, are as they are because of this. We were indeed given “dominion” over the world (Gen. 1:28-30), where *dominion* means *responsible stewardship*. Morality is a provision of God’s (Micah 6:8), not commanded because He is some kind of cosmic tyrant, but because living according to His commands is, in the final analysis, the only means to a life at peace with oneself, in harmony with others, and with the world as it is. We may be fallen: we inhabit a fallen world, but we are redeemable through Jesus Christ our Lord and Savior (John 3:16, Rom 3:23 and 6:23, Eph 2:8-9, and elsewhere).

Christian ideas are not to be forced on anyone. What may apply are the words Jesus had for the “lukewarm church” – perhaps helping us avoid the temptations to lukewarmness in ourselves: “Behold, I stand at the door and knock: if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me” (Rev. 3:20).

In this age of wanton killings and technological distractions, does anyone still hear His voice?

[Author’s Note: if you believe this article was worth your time, please consider supporting my writing with a \$5/mo. pledge on [my Patreon site](#). If the first 100 people who read this all donate, my goal of just \$500/mo. would be reached in no time! And if we’re honest about it, we all waste that much money each day.

This is an attempt to raise money to publish and promote a novel, Reality 101, to be marketed as the first serious novel of the Donald Trump era, which, so far as I know, it is. In it, a ex-Wall Street globalist technocrat defends his views on elitism and oligarchy before a community wracked by the effects of globalization in a voice filled with irony and dripping with cynicism – to be contrasted with the possibility of freedom outside the world as he sees it.

Promoting a book, in my case, means the necessity of international travel which is not cheap.

I do not write for an audience of one. I write for you, readers of this site. If you believe this work might make a contribution to the world of political-economic ideas, please consider supporting it financially. I am not a wealthy person, and unlike the leftist groups I often criticize, I do not have a George Soros funneling a bottomless well of cash my way.

If I reach the above goal of \$500/mo., I may be able to speak at an event in your area (contact info below).

I've allowed myself (via a handful of reader emails) to be talked out of going into retirement at the end of this year, to give this at least one more year, but due to my own situation, that will be the best I can do.]

© 2017 Steven Yates – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Steven Yates: freeyourmindinsc@yahoo.com

What Is Really Going To Happen On November 4, 2017?

At present, the best answer to the question in my title is probably, *No one knows for sure*. What we know: Antifa (shortened from “Anti-Fascist”) and Refuse Fascism, both Communist-inspired groups, are gradually being recognized as far more dangerous than any alt-right or white nationalist or neo-Nazi or Klan groups, have promised major disruptions beginning on that date. A few weeks ago, a few Antifa members [shut down a major interstate highway](#) in the LA area holding up

signs that read, "NOV 4 IT BEGINS."

The militant left's stated purpose is to drive the Trump-Pence administration from office by any means necessary.

Is the threat for real, or is it hype? Do we dare assume the latter?

What we know: leftist militants including Antifa and Black Lives Matter were able to mobilize [as many as 40,000 protesters](#) completely shutting down a free speech rally attended by perhaps two dozen people in Boston. That occurred the weekend after the Charlottesville melee.

Were such assemblages to appear in, say, six or seven major cities instead of just one on November 4, and were they to halt normal traffic flows, interfering with ordinary commercial activity – and if these mass protests exploded into violence that could overwhelm law enforcement when the latter tried to disperse them – things could very easily escalate into a very dangerous situation.

[Mass protests, and worse, have been threatened openly.](#) The clear purpose is to try to force the Trump-Pence administration from office: the first administration not vetted by the globalist-leftist alliance of convenience.

The impression should be spreading right about now that groups such as Antifa and Refuse Fascism are potentially as dangerous to American Constitutional conservatives (and Christians) as ISIS is to Christians (and many Muslims) in the Middle East.

What these extreme-left groups are threatening amounts to civil war against an administration and overall national situation *they* have deemed illegitimate – a situation in which the left can't dominate the narrative. To be sure, they deem Constitutional conservatism illegitimate: the product of wealthy straight white Christian males. After decades of pandering to the extreme left, culminating in a complete

mainstream media blackout on the role of Antifa and Black Lives Matter in the Charlottesville violence, this is where we are!

Brandon Smith has contended [in several articles](#) that leftists and conservatives are being *herded* toward violent confrontation. While most on-the-ground leftists in Antifa, Refuse Fascism and Black Lives Matter might well be mindless followers, the overall effort has [George Soros money written all over it](#). Should the effort culminate in an outbreak of mass violence, it could easily begin the final destruction of the last great bulwark against the corporation-controlled world government which Soros, the Rockefellers, the Rothschilds, and other powerful families have been working towards from day one. Smith believes that when Trump's popularity with the GOP base rose in 2015, the superelite (my term, not his) saw something they could use. Thus they did nothing to discourage 24/7 mainstream media coverage. If Trump sneezed, it was reported. Smith believed Trump would defeat Hillary Clinton long before many of us thought that would happen. He believed a Trump presidency had become a superelite strategy to set up conservatives and "populists" for a fall, because when the time was right, they would yank their investments from the economy which would go into an immediate tailspin for which Trump and all his supporters would be blamed.

If violence erupts on November 4, however, matters might not reach that point. What results would not be communism. No one need worry about that. These groups would not be able to stand up to the U.S. military, were it to come to that. But anyone who thinks there either would be or could be a return to business as usual after such a confrontation is kidding himself.

Before going on, keep in mind that no one has *absolute proof* anything will happen on November 4. Naturally, [mainstream sources](#) are pooh-poohing the whole thing with their usual

that's-a-conspiracy-theory mantra. These are the same people who told us Hillary Clinton would win last year in a landslide.

That said, it isn't as if Antifa and Refuse Fascism are organized armies. They might have point men with marching orders, however; many members of such groups are doubtless tech-savvy millennials able to coordinate using social media and WhatsApp, able to form mobs in less than a half an hour if they spot a local vulnerability and disperse just as quickly in the face of solid opposition.

The bottom line is: we won't know for sure until November 4 gets here.

So what should *you* do on that date?

A friend of mine who lives in Florida – very much fed up with the constant pandering to the left we see in both corporate media and academia – dropped the following suggestion:

“Put up Trump posters on your yard along with Confederate flags, then sit in your deer stand armed to the teeth and wait for them to take the bait ...”

I don't know that I recommend *that*, although I understand the frustration. I've felt it myself. There is indeed a contingent out there – groups of Constitutional conservatives especially – that has *had it* with leftists and would take matters into their own hands if it comes to that. One reason we've not seen oft-predicted gun confiscation is that there are entire regions, especially in states like Texas and Montana but hardly limited to them, where nearly everyone owns at least one firearm and knows how to use it. Some of these folks are Veterans whose firearms knowhow exceeds that of law enforcement, not to mention Antifa or Refuse Fascism (almost none of whose members have served in the military or have other legitimate weapons training). Were these groups to aggress in any of those places, they'd not know what hit them!

Survivors would run screaming back to their parents' basements!

For that reason, I don't think we ever see Antifa or Refuse Fascism activity in those areas. In big cities and suburbs filled with soft, complacent yuppies with no such knowledge or training, however, protesters wielding clubs and metal objects turned into weapons could be very dangerous!

Keep in mind that whatever disruptions that occur on November 4 cannot serve any purpose if conservatives do not react. Therefore, my thoughtful recommendation is that on that day, which falls on a Saturday, conservatives do: *nothing*. Take precautions, of course. Staying indoors might be a good idea. Maintain high situational awareness. In down-to-earth language, if you live in a big city or large suburban area and for some reason you *have* to go out, pay attention to everything going on around you. Be proactive, not reactive. Pay attention to alternative media, which will likely report suspicious public gatherings ahead of corporate media. Do not drive into those areas. Instead, put your car in a garage; do not leave it parked on the street. Your best interests will be served by avoiding places where protests are occurring, or are likely to occur.

Finally – and especially if November 4 comes and goes without anything major happening – the growing hostility leftists are expressing toward conservatives will not have gone away and the danger of an explosive confrontation will remain. So it is helpful to gain the right perspective. Ultimately, this is not about *left* versus *right*. Antifa, Refuse Fascism, and Black Lives Matter are tools, and so will be conservative groups who take their bait. The world's real powers, however, simply don't think in terms of *left* and *right*. They are pragmatists, not ideologues. For them, the ends justify the means. They are uninterested in debates over, e.g., “capitalism” versus “socialism.” Nor do they care about ethnicity or other categories popular today. They will use whatever groups or

interests or incidents that serve their purposes at a given time, including false flag events. Their main goal: establishing a corporation-controlled world state (which will include a global digital currency, total surveillance, population control, etc.).

We are seeing the culmination of a long-term clash between worldviews, a clash I outlined in my book [*Four Cardinal Errors: Reasons for the Decline of the American Republic*](#) (2011). Ultimately this clash is between Christianity and materialism. The former is the source of all our basic ideas about our rights, responsibilities, and how to organize our societies in ways that respect both, whatever disagreements we might have over specifics. [Materialism](#) began to replace Christianity in the 1700s and even more in the 1800s. This process was almost complete in the dominant intellectual-educational centers and other centers of influence by 1900. The ethos which reduces all valuation under capitalism to money and power is a product of materialism no less than any form of Marxism. Although the latter's rejection of God is far more explicit, neither does present-day neoliberal "capitalism-with-the-gloves-off" have room for transcendent moral truths.

Sadly for so-called secular humanists, what has happened during modern times is not the evolving of a rationally-justifiable "secular morality," however based, but modernity's gravitation towards a system in which the strong and unscrupulous are able to control and often trample on everyone else, including the innocent, is why we now have the global state of affairs many economically-aware leftists are lamenting, that perhaps 62 people control more wealth than the entire bottom half of the world's population.

The superelite, or super-oligarchy, are – at the very highest level – *not* materialists, however. We see some evidence for this in [the bizarre rituals](#) that have sometimes been performed at the culmination of some of their major triumphs.

Get your Bible and go with me to Matthew 4:1-11 (or Luke 4:1-13). Satan is tempting Jesus, his effort leading to his offer of “all the kingdoms of the world and their glory” (Matt. 4:8). It has long fascinated me that Jesus doesn’t tell him, “Those kingdoms are not yours to give!” but rather just says, “Get thee behind me, Satan, for it is written, You shall worship the Lord your God, and Him only you shall serve’ (Matt. 4:10).

The highest behind-the-scenes powers of this fallen world are *not* and *have never been* materialists. That materialism is credible is, in fact, the biggest “fake news” hoax of all time!

We are often told that Christianity is losing ground in contemporary America, especially among millennials ([some of whom are turning to astrology and witchcraft](#)). That is not to the advantage of a country from which God may be withdrawing His protections, perhaps (among other things) in the wake of the abortion deaths of between 50 and 60 million unborn babies!

Times are likely to get worse before they get better!

It thus behooves us to end with what has become one of the most important passages in Scripture, a warning worth quoting in full for our precarious times:

“Finally, my brethren, be strong in the Lord and in the power of His might. Put on the whole armor of God, that you may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. For we do not wrestle against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rules of the darkness of this age, against spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places. Therefore take up the whole armor of God, that you may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand. Stand therefore, having girded your waist with truth, having put on the breastplate of righteousness, and having shod your

feet with the preparation of the gospel of peace above all, taking the shield of faith with which you will be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked one.” Ephesians 6:10-16

This should be in your mind as you awaken on November 4. What happens could be nothing, or next to nothing, or the beginning of the final planned destruction of what is left of Constitutional government in the U.S. as globalists maneuver to take back by force what they lost on November 9, 2016, and then some!

Author's Note: if you believe this article and others like it were worth your time, please consider making a \$5/mo. pledge on [my Patreon site](#). If the first 100 people who read this all donate, my goal of just \$500/mo. would be reached in no time! And if we're honest about it, we all waste that much money every day.

Telling the truth can have negative consequences. Last year my computer was hacked – it wasn't the Russians, either! Repeated attempted repairs of the OS failed, the device became unusable, and I had to replace it off-budget.

This is also an attempt to raise money to publish and promote a novel, Reality 101, 99% finished as of this writing. In it, a globalist technocrat speaks in a voice filled with irony and dripping with cynicism – contrasted with the possibility of freedom outside the world as he sees it.

Promoting a book means, in my case, the necessity of international travel which is not cheap.

I do not write for an audience of one. I write for you, readers of this site. If you believe this work makes a worthwhile contribution to the world of political-economic ideas, please consider supporting it financially. I am not a wealthy person, and unlike the leftist groups I criticize, I do not have a George Soros funneling a bottomless well of cash

my way.

If I reach the above goal of \$500/mo., I may be able to speak at an event in your area (contact info below). On the other hand, if this effort fails, I am considering taking an indefinite "leave of absence" beginning later this year to pursue other goals. EDIT: thus far this effort has garnered just \$62/mo. If it does not reach \$250/mo. by the end of this month, it will be time to complete my farewell-and-good-luck piece.

To sum up, these are your articles (and books). I don't write to please myself. No one is forcing me to do it, as sometimes it brings me grief instead of satisfaction. So if others do not value the results enough to support them, I might as well go into retirement while I am still able to enjoy it.

© 2017 Steven Yates – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Steven Yates: freeyourmindinsc@yahoo.com

Reality 101

Time for something different. I've written a novel. As I write this, it's 98% finished (all but massaging and embellishing). It will be marketed as the "first novel of the Trump era." Well, one can hope. I'd been planning to try my hand at fiction if Hillary Clinton had won last year. Even though she didn't, the idea had taken root, and since I needed no precognitive abilities to know how the Establishment would react to the Trump victory, I decided to run with it anyway.

I've been directing my own effort to raise money for an international promotion effort. So far, the effort hasn't met

with as much success as I would prefer. Without promotion there is little point, though. So whether this will actually be published if it does not find its way into the hands of a major publisher is iffy. I am not a wealthy person.

Why write fiction?

The late philosopher of science and historian of ideas Paul Feyerabend (discussed briefly in my last article) once penned a short essay entitled “Let’s Make More Movies!” (1975). Despite the playful title [it isn’t light reading](#). The basic idea: there are ways of getting a point across other than didactic argument. Authors, playwrights, and writers for cinema have all used them. So – and these are the cases that interested Feyerabend – have scientific geniuses such as Galileo who presented his ideas in dialogues (as did the philosopher Plato well over 1,500 years before). Feyerabend actually studied theater briefly during his youth under the tutelage of German playwright and theater director Berthold Brecht.

Storytelling involves showing and not merely telling: presenting how things might look, or events play out given a situation, instead of arguing for this or that abstract point. Instead of an author arguing a thesis, characters speak, act, and interact. Properly drawn characters have histories of their own including crucial events which shaped them, just as our backgrounds and events in our lives shaped us. An author wants to create a kind of movie in the reader’s mind. He or she sets the conditions, then gets out of the way as the characters assume center stage. Often, they turn out to have experienced things the author did not anticipate, have complicated and sometimes conflicted motives, and do things he/she did not plan for—all required by the story’s own dynamic. This is how creativity sometimes works.

So without wanting to give away the whole thing...

Imagine a convinced globalist – convinced because his education and line of work brought him into continuous contact with globalist actors and instruments, year after year – has decided that it is time to tell the truth, or at least as much of it as he knows. He believes a world state answering to global corporations is inevitable – the next stage in the evolution of modernity. All we peons can do is prepare for it, “retooling” ourselves to be innovative and competitive in the coming global mass-consumption marketplace. Retired and with plenty of money, our globalist has written a tell-all book of his own and gone on tour to promote it. His tour brings him into our story’s purview.

There are such people in the actual world, of course. Georgetown University School of Foreign Relations macrohistorian Carroll Quigley wrote such a work, but his *Tragedy & Hope: A History of the World in Our Time* (orig. 1966) is an intimidating tome of over 1,300 pages, and while he discusses globalism and its emergence in international finance and central banking, his revelations are more part of the backdrop of his sweeping modern history of civilization. Only here and there do they assume a central place in his discussion.

Quigley’s is just the first major work I became aware of that writes history with this idea as background that the most important directions modern civilization has taken were not accidents. My fictional globalist shares with Quigley the idea, contrary to those he will call “conspiracy writers,” that the emerging world state will be a *good thing*. He regards those he calls the global oligarchy as “benign philosopher-kings” who [invented capitalism](#) by originally investing in, i.e., putting up the money for, capitalist endeavors (e.g., factories in England, Germany, and eventually in the U.S.). Capitalism’s early apologists, in their private correspondence (my fictional globalist observes) encouraged, in their private correspondence, forcing independent farmers from their land

and into the new factories in the cities because, in those days, capitalists needed laborers.

In other words, my fictional globalist has written a poor man's *Tragedy & Hope*. He is appearing by invitation at the local university in a county ravaged by the effects of globalization, and proclaiming something [major business publications are no longer even bothering to hide](#), but placing it in a larger context.

Now imagine him stating that the most dangerous result of the modernist capitalist consensus was its building up a financially independent middle class in the 1950s and 1960s, so that too much leisure and time on their hands allowed the children of that class to begin to challenge elements of the system in the 1960s. And how it was decided, within the oligarchy, that the American middle class was dangerous to their goals for the world and so had to be destroyed. Imagine him laying out, step by step, exactly how this was accomplished.

The young man who narrates this story, of millennial age and native to the county, has suffered directly from the results, and again without giving away too many details, he does not take kindly to being told all this. I did not set out, initially, to create a central character whose father committed suicide following the loss of his career with the county's largest employer when it shuttered and went south of the border, followed by a string of professional and business failures; it just happened (that's that creativity thing I mentioned, with characters taking on lives of their own). I can do this both because studies have shown that suicide in such communities has grown by leaps and bounds over the past 20 years or so, and I have known people who have tragically lost a parent to suicide, in one case seeing the emotional devastation up close. It isn't pretty! The point in this context: few ordinary people can simply "reinvent themselves for the New Economy." That's more a fantasy than anything in a

novel.

By the way, lest I forget: my globalist character has no use for Donald Trump. Well, surprise, surprise.

He comes under verbal attack. A complex character and not a sociopath, he stands his ground – not out of a desire to be cruel and indifferent but out of a sense that the truth must be faced. He does not believe that the “global marketplace” can regulate itself, and does not think “free trade” deals are enough. Not to mention the dangers of war in a world of peoples who are very different from one another, some with nuclear weapons; and, of course, there is human-caused climate change which he endorses as real based on the authority of science: a problem calling for a top-down coordinated global solution.

Is such a character credible? For some time now, some writers have been declaring the nation state outdated and arguing for some kind of global federation if not an out-and-out global state. Some such statements are quite eloquent (one current example [here](#)).

The location of this story is an imaginary Oklahoma county not too far from where I lived for a time, so I know the history and lay of the land at least somewhat. This place has its own political economy, stemming originally from the actions of its own aristocratic family who build the county, but could not keep one scion from helping to destroy it. Invented long ago to tell a different story which did not pan out, this imaginary place just sat in my mind for a long, long time. It seemed logical to use it now for this different purpose.

Incidentally, this being Oklahoma, an indigenous population lives there. Through them, we become conscious of the possibility of a localist alternative based on separation.

In other words, anyone thinking this novel will somehow defend “white supremacy,” assuming this means anything these days

other than disagreement with the cultural hard left, is mistaken. I am not “alt-right” (I explain why not [here](#)). And although I’ve barely written on the subject as I’ve never been able to make it a priority, I’ve long believed that the minority group with the greatest claim to have been harmed by the “white man” and his modernity is the one that has been the most silent: Native Americans, whose land was taken from them, every treaty made with them by the U.S. federal government broken, many dying from diseases brought from Europe to which they had no natural resistance, with those who survived the wars and attempts at extermination typically sinking into poverty even when not herded onto “reservations.” Although many Europeans dismissed them as savages, some Native Americans built civilizations on a par with those of the ancient Mediterranean world (the Toltecs, the Maya, the Inca, are examples). A few invented writing, and one group (the Iroquois, with their [League or Confederacy](#)) actually had a form of representative government.

Not being an anthropologist I don’t know, but I have often wondered what we could still learn from the remnants of cultures which modernity has largely erased. These cultures surely merit attention. In addition to physical architecture including pyramids, they developed rich mythological narratives designed to do what worldviews always do: give them a sense of place in the universe, something modernity has taken from us all.

Returning to my story line, which draws on such a narrative when the time is right, the Christian Gospel puts in a strategic appearance. So does the Austrian school of economics, which portrays free market capitalism as the “unknown ideal” – a self-regulating system able to operate completely free of government interference, whether through regulation or through subsidy. Also appearing, as I was unable to resist, is a Marxist critique of globalized capitalism in its current globalized form, whose defender contends that the

“pure” capitalism of the Austrians is an impossible fiction, that the “crony capitalism” they criticize just *is* capitalism; there is no other. Incidentally, while not opposing it, this character has little to say about *cultural* Marxism.

My speaker is not a Christian, not an Austrian, not a Marxist. He considers himself a realist, a rare animal in today’s world. Hence the title. He’s also a transhumanist, who believes we will eventually use technology to transform not just the world but ourselves. So he’s an optimist who believes we can save ourselves by trusting in the benign nature of our betters, the philosopher-kings of modernity, the movers and shakers who make things happen behind the scene, who will deal with problems like war and climate change in their own way. This despite how the county his visiting to promote his own book has become a wasteland since NAFTA, and even more so since the Meltdown of 2008. Like many such places.

My narrator is a damaged soul, a seeker still trying to find his way. He knows he wants nothing to do with any of the above! What he comes to realize is that modernity in its current form offers him (us) no future. Not really.

There’s no sex or violence; readers interested only in cheap entertainment had best look elsewhere. There is, however, a unique love interest, between my narrator and his girlfriend, as one cannot have compelling characters without that. She is a member of the indigenous population. This opens some interesting doors. Through the narratives of her people there are intimations of the world beyond our familiar one, perhaps in light of Hamlet’s ever-intriguing remark that “There are more things in Heaven and Earth, Marcellus, than are dreamt of in your philosophy.” Some of these suggest that in the long run, evil indeed meets with an appropriate fate.

What matters most is the *warning*, about a view of the world and our place in it: an economics-*über-alles* view of human beings as infinitely malleable, like lumps of clay; of common

people as little more than cattle to be used to enrich their self-anointed betters, and then discarded when they are no longer of use; and especially of our arrogant belief that we can save ourselves from our own many follies. Where can this view lead, except to technocratic *de facto* totalitarianism where not just freedom but privacy are things of the past, not even missed if generations grow up without them. Present-day globalism is not the end, just the most important stepping stone. (Incidentally, you don't *have* to be a Christian to believe all this – but it helps!)

Is such a warning credible?

I submit that slightly over 25 years ago, I began warning anyone who would listen what political correctness would do to the body politic if allowed to spread from the universities through the rest of society's institutions almost unimpeded, defended with brain-paralyzing phrases like *social justice*. Guys like me weren't listened to, and just look at campuses today, with their "safe spaces" and "trigger warnings," and now the open assault *by students themselves* on Constitutionally protected free speech (they've grown up with the cults of diversity and social justice).

Twenty-two years ago I merely lost a teaching job from having spoken against race and gender preferences. Today I would fear for my safety.

This book is another warning. Will it, too, be ignored? Will it even be published? Assuming it is, the questions readers are invited to confront: how much of what my speaker says of the near future is *absolutely true*? Biblical and other prophecies speak of a coming totalitarian world state, or an equivalent, in which you will be forced to adopt "the mark of the beast" to be able to buy or sell (Rev. 13:16-17). What will be *your* Plan B?

Author's Note: *if you believe this article and others like it*

were worth your time, please consider making a \$5/mo. pledge on [my Patreon site](#). If the first 100 people who read this all donate, my goal of just \$500/mo. would be reached in no time! And if we're honest about it, we all waste that much money every day.

Telling the truth can have negative consequences. Last year my computer was hacked – it wasn't the Russians, either! Repeated attempted repairs of the OS failed, the device became unusable, and I had to replace it off-budget.

This is also an attempt to raise money to publish and promote a novel, Reality 101, 99% finished as of this writing. In it, a globalist technocrat speaks in a voice filled with irony and dripping with cynicism – contrasted with the possibility of freedom outside the world as he sees it.

Promoting a book means, in my case, the necessity of international travel which is not cheap.

I do not write for an audience of one. I write for you, readers of this site. If you believe this work makes a worthwhile contribution to the world of political-economic ideas, please consider supporting it financially. I am not a wealthy person, and unlike the leftist groups I criticize, I do not have a George Soros funneling a bottomless well of cash my way.

If I reach the above goal of \$500/mo., I may be able to speak at an event in your area (contact info below). On the other hand, if this effort fails, I am considering taking an indefinite "leave of absence" beginning later this year to pursue other goals. EDIT: thus far this effort has garnered just \$62/mo. If it does not reach \$250/mo. by the end of this month, it will be time to write my farewell-and-good-luck piece.

To sum up, these are your articles (and books). I don't write to please myself. No one is forcing me to do it, as sometimes

it brings me grief instead of satisfaction. So if others do not value the results enough to support them, I might as well go into retirement while I am still able to enjoy it.

© 2017 Steven Yates – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Steven Yates: freeyourmindinsc@yahoo.com

Of Climate Change, Science, Experts: A Meditation

A few months ago, a friend of mine, his son who had swung left, and a few others, debated man-made climate change (MCC) over email. Being in this group, I was copied on each installment, but did not participate. I was asked why, and have been asked on other occasions whether I had anything to say about MCC.

I tend to reply that I've not researched the topic extensively, and can't speak to it with any confidence. There's abundant information online, of course; what's missing are hours in the day sufficient to research everything out there. The topic has come up again, as MCC proponents have a field day in the wake of two destructive hurricanes, Harvey and Irma. A third, Maria, may have hit by the time this is posted. All of us (I hope) are praying for those who lost loved ones in these storms, for rebuilding efforts which may take years in some cases, and that tragedy and hardship not be turned into an opportunity to score political points (for a change).

What research I've done on climate matters was mostly to inform students in contemporary moral issues and critical

thinking classes, where I isolated three perspectives: (1) Global warming is not real. For whatever reason, scientists are misreading their data, seeing something that isn't there, perhaps generalizing falsely from local events such as glaciers in retreat after a few years of unusual warmth. (2) Warming is indeed happening on a long-term, global scale, but *we're* not the cause. Earth's climate has warmed and cooled *many* times over planetary history, from various causes including fluctuations in solar energy; the climate, in any event, is far too vast for our paltry activities to affect it significantly. Volcanoes affect it more than we do.

The third perspective – (3) – holds that global warming or climate change is happening, that human activity, especially burning fossil fuels for energy and expelling the byproducts into the atmosphere for well over a century now, *is* causing the planet to heat up. (3), as I understand it, does *not* say every single year will be hotter than its predecessor, or will manifest violent hurricanes like this year has, just that over a long period of time, *average* temperatures will rise, sea levels will rise as polar ice fields melt, and *on average*, weather phenomena will increase in destructive force, be it hurricanes, severe winter storms, or droughts leading to forest fires.

So will it be door #(1), door #(2), or door #(3)?

Here is where I cannot speak with the confidence I have when speaking about, e.g., elite directedness of modern times, or philosophical critiques of secular ethics.

What I *can* say is that #(3) appears to be the one chosen by the majority of scientists and scientific organizations, something dissent alone can't negate. Unfortunately, #(3) also has immense globalist appeal, given the adage that "global problems call for global solutions."

If (3) is by some chance true, then claims like those of Naomi

Klein in her [*This Changes Everything*](#) (2014) have to be considered. Whether you agree or not with Klein's view that "the free market" is at fault in creating the present situation (I don't, as I don't think we've had anything remotely resembling actual free markets in decades), the conclusion remains: we find other ways of powering our civilization or face the consequences: a hotter, more hostile world; what author James Howard Kunstler calls [*The Long Emergency*](#) (2005) highlighted by dislocations that will make the present ones look tame by comparison as millions of people abandon flooded coastal cities, others migrating *en masse* from regions turned uninhabitable.

Alarmist? Perhaps, but many scientists will tell you that MCC is an established fact. Major scientific organizations including the [American Association for the Advancement of Science](#) have endorsed it. At least one [online course](#) I ran across earlier this year dispensed for free, presents information intended to debunk (1) and (2) above. The course's main architect, [John Cook](#) of the George Mason University Center for Climate Change Communication, had earlier created [this site](#), organizing information he maintains refutes "climate change denialism."

Cook and his associates have assembled some interesting information. But they packaged it within an image of science I found rather naïve and dated. (Cook's views on the "scientific consensus" are criticized [here](#).)

Again, a brief disclaimer: I am not a scientist, climate or otherwise. I am a trained philosopher who for a number of years specialized in history and philosophy of science – especially the physical sciences – turning to moral philosophy and political economy only later.

This I can certify: what is found in most science texts is an image of a neat, disciplined, pristine method of formulating hypotheses to explain neutral data, testing them step by step

whether by further observations or by experiment, then pronouncing them confirmed or disconfirmed – almost as if done by robots instead of human beings subject to all the biases and frailties human beings are subject to, including being forced to work in organizations that do not fund themselves.

So MCC aside for the moment, how well-confirmed are most scientific results, really?

One can point to “studies” in various disciplines that clearly reflect the biases of those who put up the money, because the researchers wanted or needed further grant money, and one of its conditions was obtaining “acceptable” outcomes. They overstate what evidence validly permits, and may bury contrary findings. Does at least some science work this way?

Please allow me to digress ...

As a bored public high school student in search of real intellectual stimuli I chanced to run across a curious volume in a local library: *The Book of the Damned* (1919) by one Charles Fort (1874 – 1932). Fort had a curious hobby. Upon receiving an inheritance, it became his career. A voracious reader, he'd mastered several scientific disciplines just by reading leading texts. He combed scientific journals and periodicals, antiquarian newsletters, and newspapers. Whenever he found something that did not fit the prevailing theories, he made a note of it. Soon he had thousands of notes, organized by subject matter: astronomical curiosities, unexplained weather and aerial phenomena, out-of-place artifacts, medical mysteries, etc. “Anomalism” was born: assemblages of “facts that don't fit,” with wry commentary on the “scientific” manner of dealing with them: shoving them into the cognitive equivalents of windowless museum basements and forgetting about them.

Fort used his notes as the basis for four books: the above-mentioned *The Book of the Damned*, *New Lands* (1925), *Lo!* (1931)

and *Wild Talents* (1932). He commented drily on “dogmatic Science” (cap S) as surrogate for God. Fort was more a provocateur than a serious theorist. He formulated intentionally ridiculous notions which left whole ranges of obvious facts unexplained and claimed them to be as well supported as the dogmas he saw imprisoning the minds of scientists.

The history of ideas manifests *system-builders* and *system-smashers*, one might call them. Among the system-builders: Plato and Aristotle, Aquinas, Newton, Lavoisier, Adam Smith, Kant, Darwin, Einstein, who left their respective disciplines large, logically-structured edifices of thought (systems). Among the system-smashers: the old Sophists who taunted Socrates in Plato’s dialogues, modern “outsiders” such as Kierkegaard and Nietzsche, aggravated skeptics such as Fort, and a couple of folks we’ll encounter below.

Modernity was a system-building endeavor. Postmodernity has been a system-smashing one.

It is not clear why some thinkers are drawn to one and not the other. Fort’s biographers state that his father was an abusive tyrant, from whom he fled as a teenager. His hostility to the authority of Science was then a projection. How very Freudian.

System-builders are confident of human reason’s capacity to grasp reality (or some part of it) as it is. System-smashers are just as convinced that the effort is delusional. They point to the smorgasbord of conflicting and competing systems in every domain, this being a problem even if we’ve mastered a certain instrumental rationality by manipulating objects into technology.

System-building takes itself seriously, is carefully argued, etc. Much system-smashing is literary provocation. Its purveyors use irony and rhetoric. They play mind games with their audience. Postmodernists, whatever else one says about

them, are good at this.

Fort's books sold reasonably well. At the end of his life, his health and eyesight failing, he was said to have laughed aloud upon learning that his writings had a cult following, organized as the [Fortean Society](#), dedicated to continue poking holes in the pretenses of "scientistic" positivism. The Society published Fort's unused notes and continued collecting anomalies that seemed to surround every major theory in every field of science. Fort's books have stayed in print, and though for obvious reasons he was roundly dismissed as a crank, his work continues to fascinate those who have followed in his footsteps compiling anthologies of "misfit" facts such as physicist William R. Corliss (1926 – 2011), founder of [The Sourcebook Project](#) and editor of anthologies such as *Ancient Man: A Handbook of Puzzling Artifacts* (1978) and *Unknown Earth: A Handbook of Geological Enigmas* (1980); or more recent writers with substantive alternative hypotheses on ancient and unknown civilizations such as Graham Hancock (1950 –), author of *Underworld: The Mysterious Origins of Civilization* (2002), *Magicians of the Gods* (2015), and other works.

As a university student (still bored), I encountered the far more orthodox [The Structure of Scientific Revolutions](#) (1962, 1970, 2012) by Thomas S. Kuhn (1922 – 1996). My first exposure to Kuhn's ideas was in a world history class. The professor discussed them with all the calm and neutrality of a leftist professor going off on conservatism. My curiosity was piqued, and I tracked the book down.

Kuhn's thesis was that a mature "normal" science is always governed by a conceptual system embodied in concrete problem solutions he called a *paradigm*. Paradigms – exemplified in works such as Newton's *Principia* or Lavoisier's *Chemistry* or Darwin's *Origin* – guided research in the science, its first premises not tested or challenged. Paradigms dictated use of the language of the discipline, as well as guiding authors of textbooks used to train the next generation who "stood on the

shoulders of giants" as it were. Invariably a paradigm could not solve every problem it faced, however. These became anomalies – defined more precisely as violations of expectation. Eventually enough would accumulate to jeopardize allegiance to the paradigm (particularly among the young!). The science would enter a "revolutionary" crisis that ended with its embrace of a new paradigm able to solve the problems, often with new terms or old ones used in new ways. A new period of "normal" science would begin.

Physicist and early quantum theorist Max Planck (1858 – 1947) observed: "A scientific truth does not triumph by convincing its opponents and making them see the light, but rather because its opponents eventually die and a new generation grows up that is familiar with it." That's the basic idea.

Kuhn denied that scientific practice could be shoehorned into the formal-logical methods positivists taught. He experienced the wrath of colleagues who had Science on a pedestal, was accused of "irrationalism" for saying the decision to embrace a new paradigm was a matter of "faith." Despite a couple of careless uses of that word his overall message was nothing of the sort, and he spent the rest of his life trying to clarify the complex rationality of an enterprise conducted by fallible humans working in organizations.

More extreme was the unabashed system-smashing of Paul Feyerabend (1924 – 1994), who authored the controversial *Against Method: Outline of an Anarchistic Theory of Knowledge* (1975, 1988, 1993, 2010). Although Kuhn's and Feyerabend's names are often linked, both classified as "historicists" (i.e., those who see science as a historical phenomenon operating within institutions, and not a formulaic, frozen-in-time abstraction), Feyerabend's views differed from Kuhn's. For one thing, he rejected the idea that "mature" scientists should embrace a single paradigm. He advocated pluralism: multiple paradigms. Conformity of thought, he argued, might fit the needs of a *church* but is totally inappropriate for

science.

He argued extensively that the most important scientific advances had not proceeded according to an single, identifiably rational method. Scientists had opportunistically used a variety of sometimes incompatible ideas and methods at hand, so that early modern physics and astronomy incorporated ideas from Christianity, Platonism, astrology (Newtonian “action at a distance”), mysticism, and so on. Some of their claims seemed contrary to “plain fact,” as when Copernicus removed the Earth from the center of the universe in the absence of a physics able to make sense of such an idea (he was dead well over a century before Newton came along). Positivism’s naïve just-the-facts-ma’am view of science would have stopped physics and astronomy 1543 – 1686 in its tracks! With “plain fact” not on their side, early physicists advanced their main claims not just through argument but with storytelling and propaganda (Galileo wrote dialogues; some of his “experiments” as with dropping objects from the leaning tower of Pisa probably never took place).

Feyerabend’s point was that if science was more “anarchic” than “rational,” “anarchism” might help us in the present! It might free us from the “tyranny” of a “dogmatic Science” that was stifling our creativity within the cubicles of industrial civilization and robbing us of the potential richness life might have. According to him, the only abstract “rule” that could be guaranteed to work independent of situation was “anything goes”: not a rule but a jocular, system-smashing *rejection* of abstractions. The idea: “*proper scientific method*” is always *situation-specific*. Feyerabend (unlike Kuhn) did not suffer fools gladly. He ridiculed critics who misread “anything goes” as an abstract rule. He mocked them by openly defending “relativism”: resulting from comparing the richness supplied by history and anthropology to the desiccated requirements of positivist abstraction. (One of his favorite targets was George Soros’s hero Karl Popper.) He has since

been called “the worst enemy of science” by those who haven’t read him, but believe “scientific” minds should get the last word on all things human, including designing (or redesigning) societies.

Arguably, Feyerabend put an end to a certain way of viewing science – at least, if we look at the enterprise as it is, a human-all-too-human endeavor, instead of accepting the mythology that has surrounded it (touted by positivists, atheistic materialists, and technocrats).

End of long digression. Why this dissertation? Because there are abundant reasons for rejecting the presumptions of those who believe MCC on the mere authority of a naïve empiricism: who see science as mere data aggregation and integration, using a “method” frozen in time; and have occasionally been caught seeming to “cheat”: fudging data so that MCC seems better supported than it really is (e.g., “Climategate”: for contrasting views see [here](#) and [here](#)). As critics of MCC have pointed it, the scientists behind it receive government grants as well as lavish funding from elite foundations. In fairness, MCC “deniers” also receive substantial support from private sources (e.g., the Koch Brothers and Exxon).

Scientists are supposed to be the experts. But can we trust the objectivity and neutrality of the experts? Among the phenomena of the Trump era is a profound skepticism towards “expertism” as a repository of biases (most of them left-liberal, or globalist, these two often going hand-in-hand). The experts predicted Trump would lose in a landslide. Their major pronouncements about the economy going back well over two decades were wrong. They did not see the end of the tech bubble in 2000. In 2008, Federal Reserve Chair [Ben Bernanke](#) failed to anticipate the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression, embarrassing himself in January of that year saying that the Fed “is not currently forecasting a recession.” The experts fail to see [the role of top-down financialization](#) in consolidating wealth and power at the

(globalist) top via a system that removes labor's share of national income. Their "paradigm" blocks their view of the forest so that they see only the trees.

Skepticism about experts isn't limited to political economy, obviously. These days it crosses over a wide range of topics: so-called scientific medicine based on invasive procedures and the use of (expensive!) pharmaceuticals, which rejects alternative practices such as nutrition-based "holistic" or "integrative" healing, the use of dietary supplements, acupuncture, chiropractic, etc.; whether GMO foods pioneered by powerful global corporations such as Monsanto are proven safe for human consumption and for the ecosystem; whether there is a causal relationship between vaccines (e.g., the MMR vaccine) and autism; whether the theory of evolution is as well-established as the scientific community maintains, well enough established to exclude intelligent design, and whether it is truly empirical or the product of a ([materialist](#)) worldview; whether there is a correlation between race/ethnicity and measurable average intelligence; and whether it is true that men and women have the same innate cognitive predispositions, so that workplace "imbalances" can be attributed to sexism/misogyny. There are doubtless others I haven't thought of.

Again, a few of these I've looked at. Most I have not, at least not at length. But there is a discernable pattern running through nearly all of them, which is the same as the pattern often employed to circumvent careful consideration of the idea of history being [directed](#) by a globalist superelite or super-oligarchy. The pattern includes dogmatism and just-the-facts-ma'am appeals: "It's true (or false) because we say so or because our studies say so" (the right rejoinder to any such study is to ask, "Who funded it?"), followed by ridicule ("that's a conspiracy theory!"), or a similar device to avoid dealing with specifics offered, ending with an authoritarian gesture and a return to the [official narrative](#).

In the case of MCC, this progression now sometimes ends with a threat: that “climate change denial” be criminalized, “denialists” prosecuted and jailed, just as those who deny that Hitler and his minions killed 6 million Jews in the Holocaust, as opposed to some smaller number, are jailed for the thought crime in some countries. This, in fact, is the origin of the term *denialism* in the context of MCC: a propagandistic term intended to invoke Holocaust denial in the reader’s subconscious.

When ideas, questioning authority, and independent thought generally are criminalized, watch out! Just recall the line *attributed* to Voltaire (1694 – 1778) (he probably didn’t say it, but it’s true nevertheless): “To learn who rules over you, simply find out who you are not allowed to criticize.”

Applying: if you want to know if specific ideas or theories or policies have been afforded a special, unmerited status in institutions (academic, governmental, or corporate), find out if you can question them without the roof caving in – without, that is, being [fired from your job](#), having your reputation trashed by social media trolls, etc.

Skepticism toward expertise has caused sufficient alarm that there is now pushback. Authors speak, often at great length, of “how we lost our minds” and of “American stupidity,” not just in articles ([here](#), [here](#), and [here](#)) but books (e.g., [this one](#) and [this one](#)). What these authors are *dead set against* is the possibility of *epistemic equivalence* suggested by the idea that what we have is a *clash of worldviews*, not just a resentful rebellion of “the stupid” against “the informed,” or “uneducated bigots” versus “educated cosmopolitans,” etc. Very similar is the authoritarianism of those who reject *moral equivalence* between conservatives and historical preservationists currently demonized as white supremacists and neo-Nazis versus leftists who self-identify with “progress” (which Trumpism has so rudely interrupted!).

You're probably wondering: where does all these leave MCC? What should we conclude about it??? Especially given that if we conclude wrongly, either way, we could end up paying a steep price!

I will say – reminding readers of my disclaimers! – I don't see MCC as crazy, or crackbrained, or false just because globalists like it and can make use of it! Another topic I studied was systems thinking, and one of the things I noticed is how sensitive complex systems are to what can perturb them. It also became clear: complex systems *adjust* themselves to perturbations. The largest complex system in our civilization's proximate environment, the ecosphere, *could* adjust our civilization out of the picture! I therefore dissent from many of my fellow alternative writers, including a few on this site. No need to take *my* word for anything. I recommend readers go to the sites linked to above and see if they have refutations for what they find there. Was "Climategate" real, or blown out of proportion?

I cannot decide for you! I don't have that kind of authority!

What I believe we *do* have is a *new knowledge problem* of some magnitude. What was the "old" problem? Just the philosophical question of how we acquire knowledge (through the senses, pure reason, or some other means including revelation). Its presumptions are problematic. I will not dwell on them here, as this discourse is already too long. The "new" problem: our own institutions and their hierarchical structures, enabling epistemic authoritarianism to pass for truth, *are in the truth-seeker's way*, made worse by the fact that the circumstances necessary to decide complicated problems like MCC cannot pay for themselves in a fast-paced society devoted to instant gratification and mass entertainment. Nuanced debate and discussion, based on a careful but slow weighing of many opinions and considerations, is not "marketable" in a culture of WhatsAppers and Twitter addicts.

This is a problem because few have the time, skills, or inclination to do their own research. *We need institutions we can trust.* I have extensive notes on this problem, in the context of the general breakdown of academia in our time, which I hope to incorporate into a future slim book – a story in itself! Suffice it for now, I am *not* a postmodernist, like Fort or Feyerabend, however much I sympathize with their crusades against epistemic authoritarianism. Truth exists; and we must not do what the postmodernists do in face of the difficulty of finding it, which is to conflate institution-bound authority with what is true and proven, cry foul when it turns out we were bamboozled, and then throw up our hands in gestures of despair.

What we could use is support for smaller, *parallel* institutions that have been growing for years in the face of the insufferable political correctness that has ruined academia and is now trying to erase everything that might offend some minority. In every *dominant* institution, *feelings* have trumped *truth*. If we had institutions of knowledge-seekers free from the need for money, and therefore from outside control, who did not answer to corporate donors, etc., there might be hope for (among other things) a trustworthy answer to the MCC question before it's too late, before our so-called leaders, whoever they might be, make decisions we will live to regret. Since we do not *have* such institutions on a scale large enough to matter, I am not all that optimistic.

Author's Note: *if you believe this article and others like it were worth your time, please consider making a \$5/mo. pledge on [my Patreon site](#). If the first 100 people who read this all donate, my goal of just \$500/mo. would be reached in no time! And if we're honest about it, we all waste that much money every day.*

Telling the truth can have negative consequences. Last year my computer was hacked – it wasn't the Russians, either! Repeated attempted repairs of the OS failed, the device became

unusable, and I had to replace it off-budget.

This is also an attempt to raise money to publish and promote a novel, Reality 101, 98% finished as of this writing. In it, a globalist technocrat speaks in a voice filled with irony and dripping with cynicism – contrasted with the possibility of freedom outside the world as he sees it.

Promoting a book means, in my case, the necessity of international travel which is not cheap.

I do not write for an audience of one. I write for you, readers of this site. If you believe this work makes a worthwhile contribution to the world of political-economic ideas, please consider supporting it financially. I am not a wealthy person, and unlike the leftist groups I criticize, I do not have a George Soros funneling a bottomless well of cash my way.

If I reach the above goal of \$500/mo., I may be able to speak at an event in your area (contact info below). On the other hand, if this effort fails, I am considering taking an indefinite “leave of absence” beginning later this year to pursue other goals. EDIT: thus far this effort has garnered just \$62/mo. If it does not reach \$250/mo. by the end of September, it will be time to write my farewell-and-good-luck piece.

To sum up, these are your articles (and books). I don't write to please myself. No one is forcing me to do it, as sometimes it brings me grief instead of satisfaction. So if others do not value the results enough to support them, I might as well go into retirement while I am still able to enjoy it.

© 2017 Steven Yates – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Steven Yates: freeyourmindinsc@yahoo.com

Why People Still Support Donald Trump

The scare quotes around the title are on purpose. This is a rejoinder to [an article](#) on the mainstream *Bloomberg View* with that title.

The author, Clive Crook (whose background includes stints with the super-oligarch voice *The Economist* among other elite publications and organizations) put forth two hypotheses to answer the question. One he rejects. The other meets with his approval.

The one he rejects: a substantial fraction of the U.S. population consists of “racist idiots” (his phrase). Enough said. This seems to be the view of a lot of leftists.

The one he likes: “a large majority of this large minority are good citizens with intelligible and legitimate opinions, who so resent being regarded as racist idiots that they’ll back Trump regardless. They may not admire the man, but he’s on their side, he vents their frustrations, he afflicts the people who think so little of them – and that’s good enough.”

It’s a start!

Crook continues: “I’m a liberal on immigration – but it isn’t racism to favor tighter controls if you believe that high immigration lowers American wages. It sure isn’t racism to believe that the laws on immigration should be enforced, and that “sanctuary cities” violate that impeccably liberal principle. It isn’t racist to say that many of the Charlottesville counter-protesters came looking for a fight. Casting Trump supporters as fearful of change is risible – he

was hardly the status quo candidate.”

All of which is helpful and in some cases, obvious. Crook might have noted that many of these people were genuinely fearful of some of Clinton’s proposals, such as bringing “Syrian refugees” to the U.S. by the tens of thousands. They follow current events. They know of the terror attacks by Muslim immigrants in France, the U.K., and most recently in Spain. They know Muslims are terrorizing native populations in Germany, Sweden, and elsewhere, committing violent crimes including gang rape. These immigrants are not going to assimilate. It would be against their religion. Thinking Americans realize that the EU establishment, committed to open borders, globalism, and multiculturalism, is out of touch with most ordinary citizens. They do not want this happening in the U.S. beyond the extent the combination of globalism and political correctness has already allowed it to happen.

Crook’s discussion criticizes the Democratic Party for its own bigotry, for regarding Trump voters as “bigoted” and “stupid,” terms embodied in Hillary Clinton’s now-infamous denunciation of the “deplorables.” Surely such attitudes explain why Clinton lost states Barack Obama had won handily four and eight years ago, even if Democrats still refuse to see it. Obama, whatever his faults, was smart enough not to run his initial campaign openly condemning his fellow citizens as “deplorable” and neglecting to campaign in their states. He came a hair’s breath away later, with his reference to “bitter clingers.” Because of the backlash he may have continued to think it, but he didn’t say it again.

Clinton came across as openly elitist, arrogant, and believing she was entitled to be the First Woman President. This in addition to her personal history of dishonesty and corruption. Her party establishment, moreover, had embraced the cult of identity politics including fetish-like obsessions with sexual minorities few normal people can identify with. That the mostly Democratic mainstream media jammed this down their

throats, gloating visibly when a Christian business was destroyed by a lawsuit from a lesbian couple or a woman jailed for refusing to sign marriage licenses that would violate the laws of her state, alienated those across the aisle. Their answer to this sort of coercion was to vote for Donald Trump. Even though he was a billionaire he seemed to identify with their concerns, not just when he talked about bringing back decent paying jobs but when he refused to be intimidated by self-righteous mainstream career talkers like Megyn Kelly.

Continued vicious gestures like the one from bimbo celebrities like Kathy Griffin, desperate for attention, their careers sinking due to their utter lack of talent, only reassured Trump's base that their decision was the right one.

I'd look deeper than even this for why many intelligent people supported and continue to support Donald Trump. The establishments of *both* dominant political parties have been in decline at least since 1990 if not earlier. In 2015-16, completely out of ideas, they simply collapsed. Common people wouldn't put it this way, of course. Most would probably have been open to a mainstream candidate if he spoke to their needs. But when they looked at those on stage, they saw only empty suits with nothing new to say. More than that, they saw reasons to withhold their support.

Hillary Clinton promised only a continuation of the policies of Bush II and Obama: policies of war and domestic economic stagnation, with more wealth and power concentrating at the top. Her relationship with Wall Street was obvious, and well-known. Neither she nor her husband ever saw a war they didn't like, and as "corporate Democrats" the latter's "welfare reform" began the repeal of what few safety nets had existed for the poor since the 1960s. Hillary might not have won the nomination had she not cheated Bernie Sanders with "superdelegates." Among the revelations of the infamous leaked emails was how DNC insiders worked directly to secure the nomination for her, when Sanders (for better or for worse) had

the support of the grassroots. Jill Stein, the Green Party candidate, received the most votes her party has ever gotten – slightly over 1.2 million, around 1% of the popular vote – because disaffected Democrats voted for her instead of Her Royal Clintonness. Others, of course, simply stayed home on Election Day. A few voted for Trump out of sheer spite.

With the GOP, the case for the collapse of the mainstream is even clearer. The GOP tries to self-identify as conservative in some sense of that term. Guys like Jeff Flake (R-Ariz.) write tomes trying to redefine it, so as to save it from an outsider like Trump and his “uninformed” base. But at least since the 1950s, much of what passes for conservatism in the Republican Party has been more about what is good for big business than a principled defense of liberty within the bounds of tradition, Constitutionally limited government, the rule of law, and a sense of the role of the transcendent in human life – all of which matter at some level in “red” states outside the Beltway and the corridors of the elites.

Conservatism in this sense (some now even have a separate name for it: *paleoconservatism*) follows the strain of thought that began with Edmund Burke’s criticisms of the French Revolution, went through Max Weber’s defense of “the Protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism,” continued through Russell Kirk’s *The Conservative Mind* (orig. 1953), after which it began to disappear. William F. Buckley had defended a version of it in his *God and Man at Yale* (1951), criticizing the leftist-secularist elitism of his alma mater, before opting to become “pied piper for the Establishment” (John F. McManus’s memorable phrase; see his 2002 book with that title). Mostly banished from visible corridors of academia well before the PC era, traditional conservatism also ran counter to the increasing incursions of vocationalism there. Patrick J. Buchanan may be its last visible defender. There are scholars like Paul Gottfried, author of *Multiculturalism and the Politics of Guilt* (2002) and numerous other books and

articles, long exiled to tiny Elizabethtown College and probably fortunate to be employed academically. A handful of other such people subsist at tiny, poorly funded think tanks or have been forced from intellectual professions altogether. (A guy I worked with briefly at a think tank now sells real estate, his talents going to waste.)

What replaced the earlier conservatism was *neoconservatism*, which began its ascendance in the Republican Party during the Reagan years at the hands of such thinkers as Irving Kristol, Norman Podhoretz, and eventually Irving's son William Kristol, the Robert Kagans and Paul Wulfowitzes and others who surrounded the Bushes and other establishment types. The neocons wanted power and influence, were good networkers, and by the 1990s had eclipsed their predecessors. They went on to form the Project for a New American Century. Neoconservatism was less about education, values, and social issues – one reason political correctness also ascended mostly unopposed – and more about imposing the “liberal democracy” of “the exceptional nation” on the world, at gunpoint where necessary. Neoconservatism was more about economics and war. With a nod to the ghost of Woodrow Wilson, it would “make the world safe for global capitalism” as the world's default economic system following the Soviet collapse. (To see how this brand of global capitalism really works, I recommend John Perkins, *Confessions of an Economic Hit Man* (2004)).

The U.S. (and British and Israeli) war machines went on to wreck the Middle East, killing thousands of people and displacing hundreds of thousands more. The neocon establishment supported “economic integration,” i.e., open borders, outsourcing manufacturing jobs to third world countries for cheap labor, and importing cheaply made Chinese goods that costed less but lasted less than six months on some occasions, forcing consumers to buy more.

It seems fair to say that with mass immigration, Democrats wanted peoples who fit their vision of multicultural Utopia

but especially the votes of people who had no idea what Constitutionally limited government even was and would support an expanding welfare state. Republicans wanted cheap labor for business. Was it not clear that this sort of thing would soon encounter pushback? Ask the thousands of people whose lives were turned upside down by the downsizing of U.S. manufacturing.

When Trump stood alongside his fellow GOP competitors, most of whom were political photocopies of one another, when all is said and done, he had little competition. When he responded to Megyn Kelly's query about his remarks about women with, "We don't have time to be politically correct," the base cheered. His brashness and utter absence of PC horrified the mainstream but struck them as refreshing! At last they had a champion, someone who spoke to their issues in their language!

I confess I did not take The Donald seriously at first. Assuming him serious, I, too, thought the attacks which began long before the start of 2016 would undermine his candidacy. I began to watch more closely when they didn't: when, if anything, the attacks backfired. I heard Trump provide a truthful description of American foreign policy as "a complete and total disaster." I also encountered [this](#), from an intellectual who realized that the country's political-economic mainstream had collapsed, and I knew Trump's candidacy would not be put down so easily.

Thus what we had were two party establishments, both of which answered to Wall Street and other corporate lobbyists and donors, both of whom furthered a globalist and technocratic agenda both at home and overseas, while feathering the nest of the U.S. / British / Israeli war machines. The "exceptional nation" flexed its muscles abroad over and over again, while the George Soros of the world of the super-oligarchs bankrolled the destruction of traditional American culture. Higher education seemed to have fallen into the hands of an increasingly militant cultural left.

Into this wasteland walked Donald Trump.

The “experts” were unanimous: he would lose. It would be the biggest landslide in history. I don’t think even he expected to win.

He did, of course, and on November 8, 2016, everything changed!

The establishments blew their gaskets, slowly when not rapidly!

The cultural left hated Trump because of his resistance to PC. The corporate-globalist establishment hated him because he represented massive foot-dragging against “free trade” dogma. Both, as we saw, wanted the borders open for their own reasons, and if traditional culture and communities was destroyed, well, those were the breaks: it was just the “inevitability of progress” or the workings of the global “free market,” after all.

The idea had been floated that Trump *could not have won without illicit help*.

Enter the Russian-hackers-influenced-the-election narrative!

It was true enough that someone had penetrated DNC computers and delivered damning information to WikiLeaks. Seth Rich, who had worked for the DNC, was murdered under somewhat unusual circumstances. D.C. police insisted it was a botched robbery attempt although Rich’s possessions had not been stolen. Despite the cries of *conspiracy theory*, we don’t know the truth here.

What we now know, as I [reported](#) following [Paul Craig Roberts](#), is that *there were no Russian hackers*.

The Great Fishing Expedition of 2017 continues, however, with former FBI chief Robert Mueller at its helm. Mueller is a leave-no-stones-untuned kind of guy, investigating not just

allegations that Russian agents colluded with the Trump campaign, but every business deal and contact Trump or members of his family have ever made or had that involves Russia in one way or another, going back as many years as it will take to find *something* illicit.

No one so far has produced a shred of publicly available evidence that any of these deals broke any laws. What we have are accusations, insinuations, and hearsay based on sources whose anonymity is telling.

The question arises: will that stop the Great Fishing Expedition? I very much doubt it. The events at Charlottesville, and more recently the Hurricane Harvey tragedy in southern Texas, have temporarily pushed it from center stage. It will be back, of that we can be assured.

The party establishments are determined to destroy this presidency if they can. Although he denies it, I believe Mike Pence is being groomed to replace him following the equivalent of a coup. Pence is basically an establishment figure. He won't have an easy ride, but I predict that should he become President, his Christian pretenses will slowly disappear and allow the cultural left to continue to dominate the domestic agenda. Globalism will get back on track and continue its march toward a world state.

So why do many people continue to support Donald Trump?

For starters, few outside the Beltway and "blue" areas believe in "Russian hackers" or other shadowy personalities that *allegedly* helped the Trump campaign. Even fewer believe the West should continue on a collision course with Russia that can lead only to war.

And whatever the fate of his presidency, those outside the Beltway and "blue" culture will go to their graves disbelieving the newer narrative about a sudden insurgency of "white supremacy" and "hate groups." They will go to their

graves rejecting official explanations of how great open borders are, because this conflicts openly with their lived experience as well as on-the-ground reports from around the world. They will continue to wonder not just about the reliability but the honesty of “the experts” in numerous arenas – just follow the money. This especially applies to the economy which many on Main Street do not believe the economy ever truly recovered outside elite enclaves in big cities and on Wall Street which has benefitted from QE monetary expansion and corporate stock buybacks.

None of the Russia investigations touted by inside-the-Beltway bigwigs, none of the scolding from left-leaning media about all those terrible white people, and none of the cooked unemployment statistics, are going to make this visceral skepticism go away. Look to the behaviors still coming from the party establishments, especially Democrats and other leftists, continuing their Clintonian arrogance when not rationalizing the open violence of domestic terror groups like Antifa, for why common people continue to support Donald Trump.

Author's Note: *if you believe this article and others like it were worth your time, please consider making a \$5/mo. pledge on [my Patreon site](#). If the first 100 people who read this all donate, my goal of just \$500/mo. would be reached in no time! And if we're honest about it, we all waste that much money each day.*

Telling the truth can have negative consequences. Around this time last year my computer was hacked – it wasn't the Russians, either! Repeated attempted repairs of the OS failed, and the device gradually became unusable. I had to replace it off-budget.

This is also an attempt to raise money to publish and promote a novel, Reality 101 (a globalist technocrat speaks in a voice filled with irony and dripping with cynicism). Promoting a

book means, in my case, the necessity of international travel which is not cheap.

I do not write for an audience of one. I write for you, readers of this site. If you believe this work makes a worthwhile contribution, please consider supporting it financially. I am not a wealthy person, and unlike the leftist groups I criticize, I do not have a George Soros funneling a bottomless well of cash my way.

If I reach the above goal of \$500/mo., I may be able to speak at an event in your area (contact info below). On the other hand, if this effort fails, I am considering taking an indefinite "leave of absence" beginning later this year to pursue other goals. EDIT: thus far this effort has garnered just \$36/mo. If it does not reach \$250/mo. by the end of September, it will be time to write my farewell-and-good-luck piece.

To sum up, these are your articles (and books). I don't write to please myself. No one is forcing me to do it, as sometimes it brings me grief instead of satisfaction. So if others do not value the results enough to support them, I might as well go into retirement while I am still able to enjoy it.

© 2017 Steven Yates – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Steven Yates: freeyourmindinsc@yahoo.com

Charlottesville: A Staged Event?

Since writing [this](#) on Aug. 14-15, information has continued to

come my way. Much of it comes courtesy of a friend who lives near Charlottesville and has her own contacts there.

None of this new information is good. In fact, it confirms that old adage that "when you think things can't get worse, they do!" It doesn't contradict my previous account of what happened on Aug. 12, although certain elements of it need to be ratcheted up in importance.

For example, I am told that one Jason Kessler applied for, and was granted, a permit to assemble a group of primarily pro-South heritage activists in Charlottesville in what became the Unite the Right Rally in Lee Park (in accordance with political correctness recently renamed Emancipation Park).

We will return to Mr. Kessler.

The purpose of the rally was to protest the planned removal of the statue of General Robert E. Lee. We can certify: the prospective rally did attract attention from white nationalist groups with names like the Nationalist Front and the Fraternal Order of Alt-Knights. While not seeking violence, the latter would have body armor and shields for protection. This was to be a public event. It was impossible to *guarantee* that *no one* from KKK or neo-Nazi groups would show up looking for trouble, any more than it was possible to keep leftists out.

The permit was revoked just days prior to the event by Wes Bellamy, Charlottesville's left wing Vice-Mayor who incidentally is a member of the radical Black Panther Party. The ACLU of Virginia sued and got the permit reinstated. Doubtless this rubbed Charlottesville's left wing city government the wrong way. Some leftists, as I've noted, go into spit-spraying apoplexy and violent rages when they don't get what they want.

In the meantime, mainstream media gave the projected event 24/7 coverage.

Antifa and Black Lives Matter assembled outside the park in far greater numbers than the rally attendees, some of them directly across the street. Shouts and insults began to be exchanged. Things escalated when the leftists began hurling bags of urine, feces, and paint, bottles, metal objects, and planks of wood with nails in them. A few of the rally-goers retaliated. Fistfights broke out, as well as fights with objects such as flagpoles.

At 11:30 am, police declared the rally an illegal assembly and ordered everybody out of the park. The governor, Terry McAuliffe, had just declared a state of emergency. Rally attendees found the exists barricaded in such a way as to force them into direct confrontation with Antifa and Black Lives Matter. More fighting ensued, including a few beatings when at least some of the rally-goers proved more than able to handle themselves. Police did nothing to prevent the two sides from pummeling one another into oblivion. They were following [a stand down order](#) most likely given by Charlottesville's leftist mayor Michael Signer. Eventually a few police tried to separate the groups. The rally-goers fled the scene as best they could, leaving only the leftists.

The Dodge Challenger, whose actual driver no one saw clearly because the windows were tinted, barreled down the street out of nowhere into the crowd and at least one other vehicle, killing Heather Heyer and injuring 19 more people (nine still hospitalized as of this writing). The driver then threw the damaged car into reverse and backed up expertly in a perfectly straight line for more than a city block, prompting my initial suggestion that this was a paid professional, not a wet-behind-the-ears kid acting out of spontaneous rage.

James Alex Fields Jr., 20, from Maumee, Ohio, was arrested for the crime. As of this writing I have seen no public interview statements from him about his motivations or the allegations he faces, which is – shall we say – odd. In the case of Dylann Roof, we had such statements within a couple of days of his

arrest confirming his identity and beliefs. From Fields, nothing. We are [told](#) he had a shady past: accusations of beating his mother, being on medication to control schizophrenia, and according to a former teacher having been fascinated with Adolf Hitler and the Nazis.

There are, however, loose ends. Is that his real name? To be sure, the Dodge Challenger was registered in that name. A [search](#) done by an NSA operative turned independent investigative blogger, however, turned up no one with the exact name *James Alex Fields Jr.*, age 20, living in Ohio. There are other inconsistencies between the information from Virginia and that which came from Ohio. The car registered in Ohio had a sun roof. The car on the Charlottesville video did not. The tinted windows made the driver very difficult to see. A single enhanced image appears to be the face of a man older than Fields, his facial features not matching those of Fields. My source had speculations about the identity of this man, but no hard evidence. The point is: there is a cloud of question marks surrounding the singular incident of violence mainstream media has been stressing.

<http://www.jimstone.is/pages/statedepcharlottel.jpg>

<http://82.221.129.208/pages/frameupch.jpg>

Was this a psy-op, a staged event from the get-go? Who would benefit from doing such a thing, at the expense of a life (and more than one could easily have been lost)? Let's look at it.

The fake news media: (1) has, from the start, portrayed the primary rally goers as neo-Nazis and white supremacists (or white nationalists), or not differentiating them from Southern heritage activists, and maintained the appearance that *they* initiated the violence instead of being the ones attacked; there is a near-total media black-out on Antifa's presence that day; (2) has kept President Trump under fire because he blamed both sides for the violence, then pointed a finger at

the “alt-left,” a term coming into currency for violent groups like Antifa and Black Lives Matter who operate outside the law; (3) has set the stage for the further erasure of Southern history by leftists, which began (also outside the law) before my first article appeared and has continued apace ([here](#), [here](#), [here](#), and [here](#), among others, although [some of these idiots](#) can’t distinguish Confederate symbols from those on other monuments); (4) has also created conditions for [more violent confrontations](#) between left and right; and finally and most importantly (5) has smoothly segued this entire sequence of events, with help from Trump’s enemies in Congress, into [isolating him](#) as well as [questioning his “fitness for office”](#) as well as [the character of those supporting him](#); fear of being tarred with the demonizing labels destroyed the business advisory council Trump had assembled to deal with the practical matter of rebuilding the nation’s infrastructure after years of neglect. This would have created thousands of jobs. Taken together, these seem intended to delegitimize any opposition to possible impeachment proceedings, on whatever grounds they are put forth, by completely isolating the president and portraying any continued support for him as steeped in white supremacy or neo-Nazism.

Who benefits? The Deep State, of course. And the globalists behind the Deep State who oppose everything Donald Trump stands for, could not stop his election, but have always had the resources to set him up for a fall. Leftists have been excellent foot soldiers for the Deep State and for globalists, as their cult of diversity plays into the hands of those who would erase all national borders and move populations around like chess pieces to disrupt traditional cultures and for economic gain.

Which is why it is important to get to the bottom of what my first account left aside: the man who spearheaded this event: Jason Kessler, whom I said we’d return to.

What none of us knew initially was that Kessler, who graduated

from the University of Virginia in 2009, [had been involved with Occupy Wall Street and was an Obama supporter](#). He also appears to have worked for CNN in 2011.

Following Trump's victory last November, he suddenly began rubbing noses with alt-rightists. He established a group called Unity & Security for America which the leftist Southern Poverty Law Center dubbed a white nationalist hate group.

People have changed political positions before, of course. I've done so myself.* But to change from card-carrying Obama supporter (Democrat, obviously) to alt-rightist and organizer of an event like this in one fell swoop? That is a bit much to swallow!

Did Kessler change his political stripes, or did the left give him a behind-the-scenes promotion? It may be worth asking, in this context, about the whereabouts of he and his immediate cohorts such as Richard Spencer during the melee. (Spencer spoke elsewhere in Charlottesville later.) Had either, or both, been spotted and targeted by Antifa or BLM, I am sure mainstream media would have pounced on it. But again, nothing. *Ergo*, they must have either not been present or exited the immediate scene with help unavailable to less-well-connected rally-goers. Kessler's whereabouts at different times that day might be an important key to whether this event was staged by the left in order to target the right and Donald Trump – which would have included attracting through online publicity the handful KKK types and neo-Nazis who showed up. Interestingly, Kessler insulted Heather Heyer, the woman killed by the Dodge Challenger, in a [tweet](#) that was completely over the top, which he later attributed to a combination of alcohol, pharmaceuticals, and stress from receiving death threats. His remark alienated Richard Spencer, who called Heyer's death "deeply saddening." If Kessler is a leftist in disguise, did he accidentally overplay the leftist-manufactured role of "right wing hater"?

Another person of interest in this saga is one Brennan Gilmore, conveniently on the scene, immediately [interviewed](#) by the *über*-mainstream MSNBC as a prime witness to the Dodge Challenger plowing into the crowd. During the interview Gilmore pushed all the right PC buttons. Who is he?

Gilmore worked in Africa as a [State Department foreign officer](#) under none other than Hillary Clinton when she was Secretary of State. He was involved in the [Kony hoax](#) in 2012. He is currently Chief of Staff for Democrat Tony Perriello, who is running for Governor of Virginia and – wait for it – [received \\$380K from George Soros](#).

Did a former State Department official (whose information was removed from State Department websites right after Aug. 12) who is presently working for a Soros-supported gubernatorial candidate and was previously involved in a propagandistic psy-op just happen to be in that spot by sheer chance?

At what point does Soros enter this picture? A Hungarian-born Jewish sociopath who has been accused of [collaborating with real Nazis](#) as a teenager resulting in some of his own people being sent to concentration camps, Soros is a superelitist's superelitist with no loyalties beyond money and power. He understands that American Constitutional conservatism is the one thing still in the way of what he and his fellow billionaire superelitists want: a world state answering to their leviathan corporations, able to impose a mass-consumption monoculture on a totally surveilled world, every transaction recorded and monitored (hence the global war on cash). I see Soros using leftist groups like Antifa and BLM as the most efficient means of tearing this last bastion of "populist" resistance apart. His billions, thrown lavishly into leftist groups starting with MoveOn.org (founded in the late 1990s to support Bill Clinton during impeachment for lying under oath to a grand jury), place him in a perfect position to advance superelite goals. The fact that so many people still see this as "conspiracy talk" just helps his

agenda.

Now, of course, Trumpism is the enemy.

The racial card we now see may prove more fruitful in stirring up opposition to Donald Trump than all the intrigue about Russian hackers and shadowy meetings with Russian agents. The grip of political correctness and identity politics on American culture is clearly much more powerful than antipathy towards Russia, and may well prove to be the country's undoing before the next orchestrated economic calamity has time to hit. All one need do is look at [the surging of an estimated 40,000 people](#) in Boston the next Saturday opposing – are you sitting down? – a *free speech rally*, an event attended by perhaps a few dozen people, mainstream media has portrayed with the epithet “[right wing](#)”; one can only hope people will actually look at the photos of those opposing “the right”! We're the “deplorables”???

Freedom of speech is written into the U.S. Constitution's Bill of Rights. The brand of leftism now taking to the streets opposes it in the name of, e.g., “fighting fascism.”

The PC / identity politics mindset, in just over a quarter century, has gone from being the province of a relative handful of left wing nut cases in academia who read Frankfurt School Marxist philosopher Herbert Marcuse to a new cultural consensus, controlling not just academia but law, politics, corporate journalism, entertainment media, the arts, much of the military, a substantial fraction of the economy including the tech world, and more besides. Even as I write, its foot soldiers are in the process of linguistically boundary-warping everything outside leftist approval into “white supremacy” or “neo-Nazism” or “fascism.”

Some of us tried to warn that this would happen (see [here](#) and [here](#))! We spoke of the day when a generation would come of age that had no memory of the world before political correctness

and identity politics. That generation is now of age. They vote, and when roused, they take to the streets in numbers rivaling anything seen in the 1960s. They are moving into positions of influence and sometimes authority in all major institutions.

A friend of mine paints a distressing scenario: whether in response to some further tweet or comment from Trump that corporate media can distort, or just as a development from recent events, massive leftist protests launch into the streets of all major cities, ground zero being New York City (perhaps outside Trump Tower) and Washington D.C. on Pennsylvania Ave.: throngs of tens of thousands in each place demanding either Trump's resignation or his immediate impeachment and removal from office by Congress (the rule of law be damned).

Were Trump to resign under duress or be forced from office in what would amount to a coup and Mike Pence sworn in, leftists would immediately turn their wrath on *him* for his anti-homosexual Christian convictions.

It's useful to remember: leftists are *never* satisfied!

[Some prominent voices](#) predict that we are looking at Civil War II. Such predictions seem a tad premature to me (though it's not impossible). But anyone who thinks things would get back to business as usual in the Land of the Free after any variation on the above sequence of events is kidding himself!

Among other things, the power elites would institute machinery to ensure that *never again* will an outsider be able to obtain a major party's nomination for national office. *There will be no more Donald Trumps*. Look for the Electoral College to be abolished.

I have, as I've sometimes said, no crystal ball. So I don't really know what this melee heralds for the immediate future. As I write, however, Steve Bannon [has returned to Breitbart](#),

where arguably he can do far more than he ever could as a White House staffer forced to keep his mouth shut most of the time.

I can envision a post-presidential Donald Trump doing something on a larger scale, using his still-considerable resources and savvy to create what I will call (I do not have a better name) Trump Media, which could continue the struggle on behalf of Americanism and Constitutional conservatism against globalism. We might not see Civil War II, but the stage would be set for an Information War on a grand scale, and with billionaires on each side able to use their resources (Trump is limited in what he can do as long as he remains in office), the fight would be a little more even. It would be easy to try to demonize a Trump Media, but difficult to shut it down without the result being a legal confrontation that would be dangerous to the cultural left, whose representatives on campuses are already facing several lawsuits for their censorship, not merely of conservative speech but departures from any of the latest leftist orthodoxy or proposals for how to deal with "whiteness" as [Bret Weinstein](#) (who isn't a conservative) learned the hard way at Evergreen State College.

If any sanity prevails in the U.S., it must eventually become obvious to more and more people: *it is the tens of thousands of cultural leftists, "educated" on today's campuses, acting like herd animals, demanding absolute conformity of thought and action, who viciously punish anyone [including their own](#) who deviate or stray from ideological purity, and not the comparatively few neo-Nazis or Klansmen who actually still exist, who are the real existential threat to America, its Constitution, and the rule of law.*

*I used to be far more Libertarian than I am now, having become convinced that Libertarianism is far too intellectual for today's masses, too abstract for the real world, and thus unworkable in a media-saturated civilization of 325 million people, with its many mindless followers, its sociopaths, and

just plain idiots. This is a much longer essay, of course.

Author's Note: if you believe this article and others like it were worth your time, please consider making a \$5/mo. pledge on [my Patreon site](#). If the first 100 people who read this all donate, my goal of just \$500/mo. would be reached in no time! And if we're honest about it, we all waste that much money each day.

Telling the truth can have negative consequences. Around this time last year my computer was hacked – it wasn't the Russians, either! Repeated attempted repairs of the OS failed, and the device gradually became unusable. I had to replace it off-budget.

This is also an attempt to raise money to publish and promote a novel, Reality 101 (a globalist technocrat speaks in a voice filled with irony and dripping with cynicism). Promoting a book means, in my case, the necessity of international travel which is not cheap.

I do not write for an audience of one. I write for you, readers of this site. If you believe this work makes a worthwhile contribution, please consider supporting it financially. I am not a wealthy person, and unlike the leftist groups I criticize, I do not have a George Soros funneling a bottomless well of cash my way.

If I reach the above goal of \$500/mo., I may be able to speak at an event in your area (contact info below). On the other hand, if this effort fails, I am considering taking an indefinite "leave of absence" beginning later this year to pursue other goals. EDIT: thus far this effort has garnered just \$36/mo. If it does not reach \$250/mo. by the end of September, it will be time to write my farewell-and-good-luck piece.

To sum up, these are your articles (and books). I don't write to please myself. No one is forcing me to do it, as sometimes

it brings me grief instead of satisfaction. So if others do not value the results enough to support them, I might as well go into retirement while I am still able to enjoy it.

© 2017 NWV – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Steven Yates: freeyourmindinsc@yahoo.com

Please visit Steven Yates' works

Please consider supporting my writing on [Patreon.com](https://www.patreon.com):

Buy ebook [PHILOSOPHY IS NOT DEAD here](#):

Buy my book [FOUR CARDINAL ERRORS here](#):

In progress: REALITY 101 (a novel); THE FIFTH STAGE OF CIVILIZATION (Beyond the Postmodern & Into the Future)

Check out my blog: [LOST GENERATION PHILOSOPHER](#)

[Does your manuscript need an extra pair of eyes?](#)

Charlottesville Violence: What Might Be Next

As everyone reading surely knows, open violence between left and right finally broke out in Charlottesville, Va. last Saturday when an alt-right group tried to hold what they called a Unite the Right Rally. The assembled group, as most groups do, doubtless included people from multiple perspectives no doubt including a few potentially violent KKK and neo-Nazi types.

Central to alt-right beliefs is the idea that the “conservatism” of the GOP mainstream is dead. What has collapsed, of course, is not conservatism but *neoconservatism*. Alt-rightists have no desire to revive what neoconservatism replaced. If they could tell you what it was, they wouldn’t agree with it. Alt-rightists are *not* conservatives, therefore. What they also believe – and here my disagreement with them deepens – is that whites need to embrace the identity politics that has been forced on society by the hard left. (I provide a lengthy diagnosis of the philosophical-historical origins and problems with such claims [here](#).)

I may disagree with the alt-right, but why it came about is not hard to fathom.

The organizers chose Charlottesville because of an effort to remove a statue of Robert E. Lee, the Confederate general who surrendered at Appomattox down the road. This effort is just the latest in the ongoing campaign to erase Southern history which has been occurring since the early 1990s. At Charlottesville, the effort to take down General Lee’s statue is part of a larger effort which includes purging Thomas Jefferson from the University of Virginia he founded. The reason: he owned slaves, and in today’s politically correct world, that’s “triggering.” Charlottesville’s leftist mayor (Mike Signer), moreover, declared the town a “capitol of resistance” following Donald Trump’s inauguration. He is a Berkeley graduate (surprise, surprise) who has been described as “a rising darling of the Left.” One of my sources accuses him of having given the stand-down order to police that allowed the violence to erupt, and continue until someone got killed.

According to boots-on-the-ground reports I will be relying on, there was an abundance of Confederate flags in evidence well before the rally was to begin, and the night before. If anything “triggers” leftists into apoplectic, spit-spraying rage, it is the Confederate flag.

South Carolina was the last state to remove its Confederate flag from its State House Dome. That was July 1, 2000. I was living in Columbia, S.C. then. The atmosphere was tense, but there was no violence. There would be today. The flag was moved to a Confederate monument in front of the State House. Groups such as the NAACP and other leftists weren't satisfied. They wanted the flag totally out of sight, perhaps in a museum – which would then have been attacked for keeping visible the “triggering” reminder of slavery in the antebellum South.

Then, in 2015, a psychopathic millennial named Dylann Roof, 21, walked into a black church in Charleston, S.C., and murdered nine innocent people in cold blood. Photos of Roof with displays of Confederate flags quickly surfaced. Almost the next day, then-Governor Nikki Haley signed a bill to remove the flag from the monument. I call Roof a psychopath not because I am an expert in psychopathology but because he neither expressed remorse for what he did nor sensed how badly he damaged whatever is left of the pro-South cause. That's good enough for me.

In any event, such causes persist among the alt-right, hated by mainstream Republicans as well as all Democrats (and most independents).

What has motivated the alt-right's anger is not just the worsening economic conditions for the white working class in the U.S., nor being disadvantaged in their job searches by affirmative action programs, but being consistently ridiculed and demonized in academia, in corporate media, and in post-'90s culture generally.

Coming back to what really happened in Charlottesville, I am not identifying my sources for obvious reasons: not only do they have families as well as jobs, we are at a tipping point where those who speak out have to fear for their safety. My main contact assures me that what follows is reliable. I have edited lightly for grammar and flow, but otherwise left it

intact. As I've sometimes said, if you don't want to believe any of this, then *don't!* It's no skin off *my* nose!

Friday night: there had been "people marching with tikki torches (no pitchforks). I didn't know why, so I watched for a while. It looked like a basic Patriot march. It was peaceful with no trouble. Then they started talking about Robert E. Lee and that another statue was coming down. That pissed me off. This stuff has to stop. You need to know your own country's history, so you don't repeat the mistakes. They announced they were having a rally in the morning."

The Unite the Right Rally was to begin at noon, but well before, leftist counterdemonstrators had assembled, and according to my source they outnumbered the rally attendees at least two-to-one. This is what that source says happened next:

" ... a cute blonde woman (can I still say that?) ... was interviewing people who said that white people are going to be replaced unless they stand up and not let our history and heritage be wiped out. I thought, yeah, I kinda noticed that happening, too. There were quite a few folks there and they were dressed like folks have to dress now to go to a rally or protest because of George Soros's paid agitators Antifa [shorted from *Anti-Fascist*]: you know, helmets and stuff... These folks don't want General Lee's statue down. Still peaceful with folks speaking their mind.

"THEN: I hear Antifa is here. They just show up in a huge group and station themselves across the street. The rally goers were pinned in on all sides with only one exit. As soon as Antifa got settled in, it began.

"It started raining balloons filled with urine, feces, paint, burning chemicals and boards with nails driven into them. Someone who had infiltrated behind Antifa's line was interviewed and said they had big coolers full of these balloons....

“THEN: Police lined up behind the rally and announced that they had now declared that this is an unlawful assembly and that if the people didn’t leave the park, they would be arrested. They protested that it wasn’t unlawful, they had a permit.

“They asked the police to take down the barriers in the back so they didn’t have to leave right into Antifa. The cops said *No, you have to leave the way you entered* and started moving in on them.

“They tried to leave peacefully and were immediately attacked and fought back. The ones that got past Antifa rounded the corner only to be greeted by Black Lives Matter with baseball bats. The ones that got through them and were trying to make it to their cars were chased by both groups and surrounded. They had to call the cops to come and protect them, which to my surprise, they came and got between the groups, but they were still surrounded and couldn’t leave... I went off and did something else and when I came back the rally goers were gone and Antifa and Black Lives Matter had taken to the street and were marching. I was waiting for the looting to begin.

“THEN: A grey Charger comes flying down the road and BANG!”

“Later I turn on the TV and hear a totally different story.”

Yes. All you heard for the next 48 hours was how *white supremacists* had torn up Charlottesville and killed someone, and how Donald Trump was personally responsible.

I watched the Clinton News Network (CNN) for two hours last night (Monday night), Anderson Cooper followed by Don Lemon, both overseeing round tables of the usual brand of chatterers, *and there was not one mention of Antifa or Black Lives Matter!*

Make no mistake: *leftists* instigated the violence. They always do. They appear to have been enabled by police. Mainstream media played its part. Had they not given the rally 24/7

coverage beforehand, the group would have assembled, made their statements, not bothered anyone else, and then been gone – probably uploading speeches, etc., to YouTube and other social media outlets. There would have been no violence.

Regrettably, videos appeared immediately on social media of “white supremacists” and “Nazis” attacking blacks. If the above account is credible, what was filmed was retaliatory. Who should be blamed?

Consider: Person A is walking in a group carrying a large Confederate flag and otherwise minding his own business, exercising his rights under the First Amendment.

Person B, an Antifa leftist, runs up and sucker-punches him, or hurls a urine-filled balloon in his face while screaming, “Fascist!” or “Nazi!”

Who is the aggressor here?

Come on, folks, this is not rocket science!

A couple of hours after the order to disperse, tragedy struck when the guy later identified as [James Alex Fields Jr.](#), 20, of Maumee, Ohio, drove his Dodge Challenger (not a Charger, the only confirmed error in the above report) into the crowd. He struck and killed Heather D. Heyer, 32, who had been crossing the street, and injured 19 other people before backing up at high speed and leaving the scene. He’d struck at least one other car. Police cornered his damaged vehicle a short distance away and took him into custody. He faces charges of second-degree murder among others including possible domestic terrorism.

At first there was confusion over who he was. Someone posted that the car was registered to a guy in Michigan, and somehow the guy’s son got accused of being the driver. One of the dangers of armchair investigation in our era of omnipresent social media is that in the heat of emotion, people jump to

unwarranted conclusions. The vehicle had been sold a couple of times. Obviously the kid in Michigan wasn't involved: he was at a wedding at the time, and surely wouldn't have been posting denials on Facebook if he was in police custody.

Be that as it may, (as usual) there are things that don't add up. My first thought, upon watching and rewatching the graphic video of the car striking the crowd and then backing straight up, went something like, "That driver was a professional." Others in my own social media circle agreed.

Today, I dunno.

An ordinary driver could do it, if he stayed focused. But as a friend of mine pointed out: Lee Harvey Oswald was a patsy. Sirhan Sirhan was a patsy. Timothy McVeigh and Terry Nichols look to have been patsies. Just three cases that come to mind. So is Fields a patsy? I don't know. All we can do is keep digging into this young man's background to find out who his associates were prior to this incident, and whether any might be Deep Statists who saw a golden opportunity to stage a false flag. I wouldn't ask [his mother](#), who comes across as a complete ditz. I would ask those for whom "Never let a good crisis go to waste," has special meaning.

On the other hand, sometimes a cigar is just a cigar.

If the kid *did* act alone, on impulse, out of rage at his group having had its rally shut down illegally by police and then terrorized by leftists attacking with clubs, ballbats, bags of urine and feces, etc., I still don't have a problem condemning his action as grade-A stupid in addition to being terroristic: *it played right into the hands of those who say the right is volatile and violent.*

Men and women who are right-of-center, whether they self-identify as conservative or as alt-right or pro-South or what-have-you, absolutely must be on their best behavior in public, and that means keeping their tempers if possible even when

provoked. This does not mean never defending oneself when physically assaulted, within the bounds of what the law permits. But overall: allow violence to be the *left's* way of doing things!

It might be a wise course not to have more public Unite the Right rallies until things cool down, as much as this might seem to be caving in to what the left wants. ([More rallies are planned.](#))

Instead, have conferences. Make videos. Post online news materials and commentary. Watch your language! That is, again, leave the f-, m- and c-words to the lefties. Dress professionally when appearing in public (that means putting away the bandanas, having a neat and normal haircut, covering up tattoos, not hiding one's eyes behind opaque shades). More bluntly put: don't look like aging punk rockers or disaffected troublemakers, much less like someone who admires Adolf Hitler! [Be more of a James Damore than a Richard Spencer!](#)

Keep in mind that social media is a two-edged sword. It is how I came by the above material. With practically everyone now having a mobile device with video capabilities connected directly to the Internet, these events can be broadcast live. But being seen at such an event can be a career-killer. People who were in attendance Saturday [have already been fired from their jobs](#) because they were visible on social media.

This is part of the left's strategy of intimidation, and it has the potential to be *very* effective at silencing opposition, however self-defined (the left, even as I write, is in the process of redefining all significant opposition as *white supremacist*).

The left, and its fellow travelers throughout government and corporate media played the media misrepresentations of what happened in Charlottesville immediately for all the mileage they could get from them.

Trump was basically ordered to condemn, unconditionally, the “white supremacy” on display in Virginia under the premise that the rally-goers had caused the violence.

What he said: “We condemn in the strongest possible terms this egregious display of hatred, bigotry and violence on many sides. On many sides. No matter our color, creed, religion, or political party, we are all Americans first!”

Left-liberals exploded with fury at that *on many sides*.

We are supposed to forget, that is, about the violence by leftists that went on all last year during the run-up to the election. We are supposed to forget that Black Lives Matter surged onto roadways and highways to block traffic trying to get to Trump rallies. We are supposed to forget that Trump once canceled a scheduled appearance on his own, in Chicago, out of fear for his supporters’ safety, when (Soros-bankrolled) organizers led a protest of thousands that surrounded the venue.

We are supposed to forget, moreover, that leftists did millions worth of damage at Berkeley in the process of shutting down an alt-right speaker, and that conservative speakers have repeatedly had appearances canceled because of threats.

Some (e.g., [this blowhard](#)) blame *Trump* for the violence – possibly referring to the handful of cases when he spoke approvingly of the physical expulsion from his rallies of the handful of leftists who showed up for no reason other than to cause trouble. I’ve no idea here. Reich presents no reasoning to support his opinion. A former Bill Clinton cabinet member, he is now a tenured professor at Berkeley. Well, surprise, surprise.

As if Trump had lost, the left wing multicultural paradise would have ensued ... any day now! Is Reich really that stupid, or does he think we are?

Leftists have always been more demanding, impulsive, and (when they do not get their way) violent than the majority of those on the right; I say *majority* because obviously there are exceptions. Somewhere, moreover, there are probably a few peaceful BLM members, and the handful of Bernie Sanders supporters I've encountered online struck me as nonviolent.

Be this as it may, a violent and militant left has arisen, and gets *very* little mainstream media attention (rare exceptions [here](#) and [here](#)).

To the left, there is only one legitimate side: theirs. [They've said so openly](#), not once but *many* times. They do not want dialogue with those who do not share their premises about, e.g., "social justice." That is to presume a "false moral equivalence," a term we've heard many times since Saturday.

Leftists in both government and corporate media are furious it took Trump 48 hours to issue the unconditional condemnation they've demanded ([here it is](#)). What he finally said: "Racism is evil, and those who cause violence in its name are criminals and thugs: including the KKK, neo-Nazis, white supremacists and other hate groups that are repugnant to everything we hold dear as Americans." Afterwards he (correctly) lamented that left-leaning corporate media "[will never be satisfied](#)."

What might be next?

First, it is still open season on Confederate monuments. [One statue was pulled down by leftists in Durham, N.C.](#) on Monday, in what can only be described as an act of public vandalism that will probably not be prosecuted as such.

There are still many Confederate statues and monuments scattered around the South. Expect [efforts to remove them to intensify](#); expect some to be vandalized openly now that the vandals know they can get away with it: police will stand down

out of fear of being demonized as racists and white supremacists themselves.

Expect more boundary warping of all conservative opinion and expression into those of the alt-right despite the clear differences, and a general pulling of everything and everyone to the right of Che Guevara into “white supremacy,” where disagreement is equated to “hate.”

Expect well-connected groups like the Southern Poverty Law Center to lead the way in helping demonizing everything outside left-approved limits. This will include those who criticize affirmative action programs and other policies of preference based on collective identity and ideologically-designated victimhood or marginalization or “voicelessness.” Expect increasing condescension towards those who speak critically of identity politics (example [here](#)).

Expect defenders of free speech to be pulled under this umbrella, along with those who explicitly criticize political correctness (expect to see that phrase in scare quotes, to delegitimize it). Expect increasingly overt attacks on the First Amendment as a relic ... and expect the millennial generation to be open to these attacks because so many value feelings over freedom of speech and assembly, and they vote. (Last year, millions of millennials were willing to vote for a self-described socialist.)

I imagine the mainstream GOP will be partly exempt from this general demonizing, as it doesn't appear to stand for much of anything.

What U.S. citizens ought to fear – and I mean genuinely *fear* – is that what happened in Charlottesville will be recalled as one of the opening shots in a looming civil war between right and left, a war able to be averted only by a lethal, police state response. Liberty (except for the usual tiny corporate, governmental and media elite) will be vanquished, as Americans

of whatever ideology live under police state conditions for the foreseeable future. The globalist superelite will doubtless welcome this development as they quietly watch from their investment banking corporations and other private enclaves.

Author's Note: if you believe this article and others like it were worth your time, please consider making a \$5/mo. pledge on [my Patreon site](#). If the first 100 people who read this all donate, my goal of just \$500/mo. would be reached in no time! And if we're honest about it, we all waste that much money each day.

Telling the truth can have negative consequences. Around this time last year my computer was hacked – it wasn't the Russians, either! Repeated attempted repairs of the OS failed, and the device gradually became unusable. I had to replace it off-budget.

This is also an attempt to raise money to publish and promote a novel, Reality 101 (a globalist technocrat speaks in a voice filled with irony and dripping with cynicism). Promoting a book means, in my case, the necessity of international travel which is not cheap.

I do not write for an audience of one. I write for you, readers of this site. If you believe this work makes a worthwhile contribution, please consider supporting it financially. I am not a wealthy person, and unlike the leftist groups I criticize, I do not have a George Soros funneling a bottomless well of cash my way.

If I reach the above goal of \$500/mo., I may be able to speak at an event in your area (contact info below). On the other hand, if this effort fails, I am considering taking an indefinite "leave of absence" beginning later this year to pursue other goals. To sum up, these are your articles (and books). I don't write to please myself. No one is forcing me

to do it, as sometimes it brings me grief instead of satisfaction. So if others do not value the results enough to support them, I might as well go into retirement while I am still able to enjoy it.

© 2017 Steven Yates – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Steven Yates: freeyourmindinsc@yahoo.com

The Real Matrix Is ... Still Real

The most popular piece I ever wrote for an online site continues to be "[The Real Matrix](#)," my 7-part debut on *NewsWithViews.com*. The day it appeared I was inundated with email, including requests for reposting on other sites, etc. The series won me radio interviews and speaking invites, one of them at a national meeting all-expenses-paid, and an offer of print publication I regret passing up to this day (I wanted to add back a couple of sections I'd deleted because of the length, started tinkering, added still more material, the project snowballed, and a year later had a manuscript of over 150,000 words that was collapsing under its own weight).

"The Real Matrix" triggered useful and informative correspondence. I still get occasional favorable email about the series, which I added to more recently, but the new installments did not generate as much interest. I had more planned, but the material was bogging down, and it was clear, especially with the rise of Donald Trump, that the editor and readers had other priorities. So, for that matter, did I.

The problem is, "The Real Matrix" is still, well, real: one of

the pre-eminent facts of life in Anglo-European civilization, and all other places around the world that have adopted the forms and slogans of modernity (“liberal democracy,” “the liberal global order,” “economic integration,” “free trade” or “liberalized trade,” “the global marketplace” or “market capitalism” or “consumer capitalism,” etc.).

What was “The Matrix”? To save time I’ll let Morpheus, the main character of the most important film of the 1990s, tell you:

Now obviously, I don’t think there’s an AI controlling our perceptions. The film presents an superb allegory, however. What is “The Real Matrix”? Not artificial intelligence – not yet, anyway! – but the encirclement of the ordinary person, family, community, etc., from their earliest school days up through adulthood within a fantasy world created by four kinds of institutions: mainstream media, other corporations (especially the private Federal Reserve which has owned the economics profession for over a century now), the federal government obviously (which hasn’t been truly *federal* since 1865), and academia. The primary purpose of this fantasy world is the same as that of the film: to keep the general population under control and ignorant of the fact.

Let’s look at specifics. Within the fantasy world, there’s very little inflation (less than 2%; never mind the rising cost of nearly everything relative to stagnant wages); real unemployment isn’t much over 4% (never mind the additional 18% or so of the working-age population that isn’t working and isn’t counted); the U.S. and other Western powers really are democracies and not plutocratic oligarchies; globalization has been a “free market” process which, given time, will make us all prosperous; and Donald Trump won the election because members of his campaign staff colluded with agents of a hostile foreign power.

Within this fantasy world, there may be political and economic elites – “one percenters” (it is more like point-zero-one-percenters) – who everyone agrees have been the main beneficiaries of the globalized New Economy, but there are no “conspiracies.” If you believe in “[conspiracy theories](#),” or that modern history has been [directed](#), you are irrational and paranoid. Never mind the obvious contradiction between this denial and the claims embodied after the final semicolon in the previous paragraph, or the [conspiracies that turned out to be real](#).

Within the fantasy world, the economy recovered under Obama’s and the Federal Reserve’s guiding hands, and is now strong – look at how the Dow rose steadily and now sets new highs every few days, with 6.2 million unfilled job openings (although we aren’t told how many of these jobs – assuming they exist – are part-time, and what percentage pays under \$25K/year). In the fantasy, the U.S. is not spending itself into oblivion, drowning in debt, and on the verge of bankruptcy. It is militarily powerful, although it hasn’t won a war decisively in over half a century (I am, of course, not counting assaults where there was no enemy worth speaking of, such as Grenada in 1983, or no one able to fight back at all, as in Panama City in 1989; and then there’s Afghanistan 2001 and Iraq 2003 which turned into unwinnable quagmires).

Within the fantasy world, both major parties’ mainstreams are knowledgeable, level-headed, and pragmatic – not hopelessly corrupted by money, intellectually bankrupt, and borderline incompetent – even if the widespread perception of these latter helps explain how Trump, never having held political office, was able to defeat 16 other Republicans handily despite furious opposition by the GOP mainstream; and how Hillary Clinton received her party’s nomination only by colluding with the DNC, as the leaked Podesta emails demonstrated.

Within the fantasy world, affirmative action and the

intellectual cult of diversity are legitimate policy responses to a systemically racist, sexist, and homophobic America. All white males have privilege, and dislike diversity engineering because they are racist, sexist, homophobic, etc. Open borders and free migration do not just help the economy but put us all on a path to a multicultural Utopia where all races and religions blend smoothly with one another. The sexes are interchangeable not merely because “whatever a man can do, a woman can do,” but because we’ve learned from academic feminists that gender is a *social construct*. Biology, which posits two sexes based on one’s chromosomes, is infected with “androcentric” bias and “misogyny,” and so is inherently biased and not to be believed.

Corporations support such views. A 28-year-old Harvard-educated Google engineer with *classical* liberal leanings named James Damore penned a [10-page critique](#) of the cult of diversity which millennials brought from academia to the tech world. He opined that the absence of politically correct female-to-male ratios at Google is not explained by sexist bias or other cultural factors, and that critics of the obsession with percentages should not be “shamed” for it. He argued that lack of parity results from men and women having different psychologies and biologically rooted inclinations, identifiable in a general sense because they range across cultures even if there are exceptions worth seeking out (some women are very good coders or computer scientists). Damore’s doubts about diversity were lukewarm at best. He didn’t deny that sexism exists. What he contended is that efforts to recruit more women to work at Google or in the tech industry generally had to take psychology and biology into account, and “If we can’t have an honest discussion about this, then we can never truly solve the problem.”

A quite reasonable and even-toned perspective. Damore’s statement was attacked in left-leaning tech media, however, as an “[anti-diversity screed](#).” Google summarily fired him.

A search for a new job and sometimes a new line of work may be the price of exercising free speech regarding the cult of diversity, especially out on the Left Coast. It is not just leftists who are in the grip of fantasies, though. I've encountered libertarians online who defended Damore's firing, saying he'd become toxic, and bad for business. Besides, corporations can fire whoever they want, for whatever reason, can they not? Employment is voluntary, after all; if you don't like the policies where you work, get a job somewhere else; and it's Google's property in any event, etc., etc. If all that is true, and employees are to be loyal flunkies, seen but not heard from, never criticizing corporate policy (i.e., policy made within vast and quite real power asymmetries), then ironically, were libertarians in charge we could still forget about living in a free society in any sense I'd recognize, which surely includes free speech.

In the Real Matrix, the Internet is a highly decentralized medium. Anyone with minimal know-how can put up a functional website, right? And blogs are now so easy to create that grade-school kids have them.

As with the other cases, the Internet's decentralization is appearance. It is one thing to put up a site or blog, and quite another for it to be visible on the Web. In the Desert of the Real, a handful of corporate actors control the Internet which was originally conceived within the bowels of DARPA, deep inside the Deep State. These corporate actors essentially control the Internet: to some extent how information flows on the Web, and for that matter, the software and hardware itself. (*) Google is the most obvious. Others include Microsoft, Apple, Yahoo, Amazon, Facebook, Twitter, and a few others. Google's is the most popular search engine. Recently, Paul Craig Roberts [reports](#), Google revised its search algorithms, ostensibly to combat "fake news." This has resulted in diminished web traffic to "alternative" sites, i.e., news and commentary sites ("left" as well as "right")

not affiliated with, or connected to, mainstream media corporations. Facebook has initiated related policies.

“The Real Matrix” – the original seven installments – was visible in my sense. It garnered hundreds of emails. My email count had been falling off, but has recently dropped precipitously. An article I publish now is doing very well if it garners a *dozen* emails. It is true that the Internet is much larger and more cluttered, and that there is far more competition for busy readers’ attention. As with publishing during the final decades of the last century, the Internet saw a shift to celebrity garbage and an increased focus on bottom-line considerations. Mainstream news sites, moreover, began making it easier for users not to have to think by simply presenting videos. With rare exceptions (like the video above) my stuff tends to require readers to engage written English.

What could be called the dumbing down of the Web does not really explain the relatively sudden diminished traffic that *large numbers of “alternative” sites* have recently experienced, however.

Google, which is basically a monopoly, indirectly controls web traffic, as its algorithms determine what rises to the top in searches. There’s more to this than selecting keywords. Leaving the technicalities aside, a search engine can ensure that sites dealing with disapproved topics (e.g., “conspiracy theories”) will not appear near the top of web searches. With busy people usually not looking past the first page or so that comes up in a search, links to unwanted information are simply never seen. I would go so far as to say that Google should be broken up, although with its usefulness as an information aggregator for the Deep State, I am not holding my breath. The tech leviathans I named are all in bed with the Deep State, as are the media corporations that preceded them. Anyone who thinks otherwise is kidding himself. (**)

And then there are “Prop-Or-Not” type ploys. In that case, the

Jeff Bezos (Amazon) owned *Washington Post* published the [article](#) that triggered the “fake news” meme as well as spotlighted the Russians-hacked-the-election hoax. The former backfired badly. Trump, his own command of media being what it is, turned the meme to his advantage.

The “Prop-Or-Not” article displayed the subtle authoritarianism necessary to maintain the fantasy world. It cited an organization no one had ever heard of, and offered no names or credentials or anything else to establish its credibility. We were clearly to take its authority on faith. If it wasn’t credible, it wouldn’t have appeared in the *Washington Post*, right?

The “Prop-Or-Not” site is [here](#). Study it for yourself. Do you see any identifiers there, any indication of who these people are or why we trust them? All I see is, “The Prop-Or-Not Team,” which doesn’t exactly clarify matters. The site links to bylined articles of which they approve: also unhelpful. One of the things I discovered is that it features a downloadable app that works – are you sitting down? – with the Google Chrome browser, to identify putative “fake news” sites by tagging them during searches. Nothing like a little well-poisoning!

There is, of course, bogus stuff on the Web, and no one ever said otherwise. Tech PTBs have no control over who puts up websites or posts on them – yet! But they *can* seed the Internet with disinformation designed to throw researchers and readers off track – or sometimes perhaps just to plant the suggestion in casual viewers’ minds that “alternative” media is by nature low quality and unreliable. This may be why we’ve seen – again just over the past couple of years – a surge of online “flat earthism,” especially on sites like YouTube (also owned by Google) where anyone can create a channel anonymously and upload gosh-gee-whiz videos. *Anyone* includes CIA, NSA, and other outfits not exactly in the truth-telling business, *posing* as neo-flat-earththers. Stuff about the Clintons being

disguised reptilian space beings belongs in the same category.

These are the most important features of the fantasy world that is the Real Matrix, a product of as much control over information by globalist corporations as they can muster. Result: the majority, including those who identify with, work for, or are sufficiently influenced by dominant institutions, remain “plugged in”; the minority of us who have “taken the red pill” and awakened in the Desert of the Real can be depicted as kooks, cranks, quacks, tinfoil hatters, conspiracy theorists, racists, sexists, homophobes, transphobes, xenophobes, Islamophobes, white supremacists, anti-Semites, pro-Russia progagandists, or whatever weaponized word or phrase best fits the moment. The point is to ensure that as many people as possible believe the fantasy world is the real world, so that the globalist / superelite route to a technocratic, corporate-controlled world state can continue with minimal disruptions.

For decades the U.S. has been the major obstacle to this goal, with its Constitutional republican form of government and a significant fraction of its population suspicious of concentrations of wealth and power. Arguably, we have seen a brand of economic warfare against this population, manifesting as stagnant wages and increasing amounts of contingent and precarious employment, as well as with the combination of open borders policies, financialization, and redistribution of wealth *upwards*. The Trump administration has concretized doubts that had been gathering for years about globalism, doubts shared by supporters of, e.g., Brexit, and about the motives of many so-called “experts” especially in economics but hardly limited to that. Trump ran for president on promises to *Drain the Swamp* and put forth an alternative that would halt the economic warfare and reverse the nation’s economic and cultural decline.

I am not, as I’ve repeatedly noted, privy to what occurs behind the scenes. So I do not know, but only suspect, that

Trump is being set up by Swamp denizens whose resources and capabilities he greatly underestimated – or believed he could play. David Stockman – author, contrarian, past Office of Management and Budget Director under Reagan, and one of those who foresaw the likelihood of a Trump presidency – now [predicts](#) that the Trump administration will be destroyed by its enemies, that Trump himself will be increasingly isolated, and finally forced from office within the next calendar year: possibly as soon as next February, he recently told a Vancouver audience. This will amount to a Deep State coup. Stockman worries over Trump's recklessness. He wonders whether his constant use of Twitter like a stick poking the Swamp critters is a good idea, comparing it to "waving a red cape in the face of the already enraged establishment bull." Stockman indicts Trump for being "so undisciplined, naïve, out-of-touch, thin-skinned, unfocused and megalomaniacal that he is making it far easier for the Swamp critters than they deserve. To a very considerable extent, in fact, he is filling out his own bill of indictment. Moreover, he is totally clueless about how to manage his presidency or cope with the circling long knives of the Deep State which are hellbent on removing him from office."

That is to say, media savvy alone won't save Trump's presidency. It might be worth noting, in closing, that a potentially calamitous debate over raising the debt ceiling is now just weeks away. If this Congress proves as incompetent at that as they've proven to be at "repealing and replacing" Obamacare which mainstream Republicans have prattled about for seven years now, the Dow bubble will likely pop and end the party on Wall Street with stunning abruptness, as it did in 2008, but with economic fundamentals considerably worse today than they were then (the Desert of the Real economy never truly "recovered," after all). Many of us would have preferred someone else at the helm just now, with things coming to a head and much at stake, but circumstances did not allow us to pick and choose. I surmise that if Trump goes down, whatever

the circumstances (impeachment over the Russia hoax, possibly following the economic debacle Brandon Smith is [predicting](#) which will be blamed on Trump, or by invoking the 25th Amendment and declaring the president “unfit to serve,” which has never been tried), the ensuing chaos may well ensure a Swamp victory and a return to the path towards a corporate-controlled world state if the masses remain within the fantasy world of the Real Matrix until it is too late.

Author's Note: if you believe this article and others like it were worth your time, please consider making a \$5/mo. pledge on [my Patreon site](#). If the first 100 people who read this all donate, my goal of just \$500/mo. would be reached in no time! And if we're honest about it, we all waste that much money each day.

Telling the truth can have negative consequences. Around this time last year my computer was hacked – it wasn't the Russians, either! Repeated attempted repairs of the OS failed, and the device gradually became unusable. I had to replace it off-budget.

This is also an attempt to raise money to publish and promote a novel, Reality 101 (a globalist technocrat speaks in a voice filled with irony and dripping with cynicism). Promoting a book means, in my case, the necessity of international travel which is not cheap.

I do not write for an audience of one. I write for you, readers of this site. If you believe this work makes a worthwhile contribution, please consider supporting it financially. I am not a wealthy person, and unlike the leftist groups I criticize, I do not have a George Soros funneling a bottomless well of cash my way.

If I reach the above goal of \$500/mo., I may be able to speak at an event in your area (contact info below). On the other hand, if this effort fails, I am considering taking an

indefinite “leave of absence” beginning later this year to pursue other goals. To sum up, these are your articles (and books). I don’t write to please myself. No one is forcing me to do it, as sometimes it brings me grief instead of satisfaction. So if others do not value the results enough to support them, I might as well go into retirement while I am still able to enjoy it.

(*). I invite those who see technological change generally as a response to “market forces” to ask themselves two questions. (1) Do they really believe Microsoft releases a new edition of Windows every two years or so, along with the other upgrades this requires, because of “market forces”? (2) If by some chance they are using an old and venerable computer running, say, Windows 98 because they happen to like the earlier editions of Windows (and because computers lasted much longer back then), but for some reason need to have it serviced, I invite them to contact Microsoft and see what happens. (Obviously I agree that *some* technological development responds to actual created market demand, as people do respond to incentives and promises of convenience.)

(**). While researching this section I learned that in 2015 Google quietly created a subsidiary for itself called [Alphabet Inc.](#), then the two “reversed roles” when Alphabet’s key players (who were, of course, Google’s key players) created a second subsidiary, a dummy corporation, and merged it with Google. What this means is that now an even larger and more shadowy concern *technically* owns Google along with 11 other corporations whose activities range across venture capital, energy, so-called smart cities (“urban innovation”), smart homes, health care, research into self-driving cars, and – interestingly – artificial intelligence.

© 2017 Steven Yates – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Steven Yates: freeyourmindinasc@yahoo.com

The Russian-Hackers False Narrative Exploded

Since the start of the year we've been regaled by mainstream media repetition of the [official narrative](#) that Donald Trump "might have" won last year's election with illicit help from Russia. We're told that "17 intelligence agencies all agree" that Russia at least tried to interfere with the 2016 election, with Congressional committees now on fishing expeditions trying to uncover evidence of Trump campaign members' or cabinet members' (or family members') involvement with Russians last year.

The whole thing now stands exposed as a hoax.

The only remaining question is whether this exposure will penetrate the official wall of silence, especially as one thing is becoming abundantly clear: the Trump administration and Special Counsel Robert Mueller, spearheading the investigation into allegations that members of Trump's campaign team colluded with Russia to tip the election in their favor, are on collision course. Mueller, also a former FBI Director (2001 – 13) and a close friend of James Comey who succeeded him, and has a reputation as a bulldog. He's the perfect soldier for Trump's enemies in the Deep State and on the left.

Paul Craig Roberts, one-time Assistant Treasury Secretary and former Wall Street Journal editor who was blackballed by mainstream media after coauthoring [an infamous article](#) criticizing the economic mythology surrounding "free trade," [has drawn our attention](#) to the information that exposes the hoax, supplied by a group known as Veteran Intelligence

Professionals for Sanity (VIPS).

VIPS was formed in 2003 by former intelligence officials to protest the use of faulty intelligence information on which then-President George W. Bush was about to base his disastrous decision to lead his “coalition of the willing” into Iraq. The group sent their first Memorandum (February 7, 2003) to Bush criticizing Colin Powell’s speech before the United Nations claiming sufficient grounds for the invasion. It is possible that one of their memoranda sent to President Obama circumvented a planned attack on Iran by Israel in 2010.

VIPS includes such authorities as William Binney, a former Technical Director at the National Security Agency, and Skip Folden, retired IBM Program Manager for Information Technology. There are numerous former or retired NSA, CIA, and USAF folks in VIPS. There is little doubt these people know what they are talking about.

They’ve now written President Trump a letter. You can read the letter and the information for yourself [here](#). One hopes it actually reaches the president’s desk and that he takes it seriously. If he is going to tweet anything, he should tweet that link and reach his millions of online followers immediately. And they should retweet it, and keep retweeting it, until ignoring it is impossible.

Someone compromised DNC computers last summer. That we know. While the mainstream narrative is that DNC computers were hacked, VIPS has shown conclusively that what happened was not a hack but a leak, the work of a person on the inside with physical access to those computers. This claim isn’t new, but has been routinely dismissed by the usual suspects in the mainstream as a [conspiracy theory](#). Now we can be more certain of the truth.

Unlike the “official” intelligence agencies, VIPS did original forensics research. What they discovered:

On July 5, 2016, information from DNC computers (the infamous Clinton-Podesta emails) was copied physically onto another device. On July 12, Julian Assange announced his intent to publish “emails related to Hillary Clinton” on WikiLeaks. Then on July 15, CrowdStrike, a DNC contractor, claimed to have discovered malware on the DNC server and claimed to have evidence linking it to a Russian hacker. That same day, “Guccifer 2.0” confirmed CrowdStrike’s statement, claimed credit for the “hack,” claimed to be a WikiLeaks source, and posted a document VIPS forensics showed was purposefully doctored to suggest Russian involvement.

I will quote the VIPS letter’s most important paragraph in full:

“Key among the findings of the independent forensic investigations is the conclusion that the DNC data was copied onto a storage device **at a speed that far exceeds an Internet capability for a remote hack**. Of equal importance, the forensics show that the copying and doctoring were performed on the East coast of the U.S. Thus far, mainstream media have ignored the findings of these independent studies [see [here](#) and [here](#)].”

Assange has denied from the get-go that his source was Russian.

This blows the infamous “Intelligence Community Assessment” released jointly on January 6, 2017 by the CIA, the FBI, and the NSA out of the water, as well as explains why they’ve refused to produce any hard evidence that “Russian hackers” were responsible for what happened to DNC computers. They have none!

Russian President Vladimir Putin told Trump the truth at the G20 Summit when he denied that his country had any involvement with last year’s election. Because “Russian hackers” had nothing to do with the release of the emails that found their

way to WikiLeaks.

It is almost certain that the timed release of putative evidence tying the compromising of DNC computers to Russia was purposeful, to distract from what those emails contained and focus ensuing media attention on Russia, where it has remained. All else is “conspiracy” talk (as if this claim that Russia interfered with the election could be classified as anything else).

The long and the short of it: we now *know* – *absolutely, period!* – that Trump did not win because anyone in or from Russia helped him. Most visibly, he won because the Democrats screwed up. They ran a candidate almost no one with a functioning brain thinks is honest or trustworthy *period*. A candidate, moreover, clearly tied to elitism and unearned privilege.

The deeper explanation for Trump’s victory was that the mainstreams of *both* major parties had collapsed. They lost credibility, at least among the 63 million who voted for Trump and probably among others who either voted for a third-party candidate or stayed home.

The GOP mainstream has championed “free trade” and open borders at least since the Reagan years, and since 9/11, war and police-statism, while ignoring the slow descent of a significant portion of the middle class into an economy abyss of rising living costs and stagnant wages. The Democratic Party mainstream, meanwhile, has promoted identity politics at the expense of the white working class (and former middle class), abortion, homosexuality, Islamism, the war machine, and again, open borders. (Democrats want open borders to get votes; Republicans want them so corporate billionaires can get cheap labor.)

Both parties have ignored the growing debacle in higher education, the cost of which goes up, up, up, alongside

bloating administrations, while the quality goes down, down, down, as institutions were transformed into arenas for hard left political agitation which burst forth in living color in 2015 – 16.

Mainstream media has also lost a great deal of credibility, just from having made predictions that Hillary Clinton would win in a landslide. As have their pollsters and their talking heads who have come to look like they followed the Peter Principle long ago and rose to their level of incompetence.

The mainstreamers aren't going to get their credibility back by pushing this Russia narrative.

Those talking about how we've entered a "post-fact world" or something equally silly because Trump exaggerated the number of people present on Inauguration Day, or possibly the number of people who voted illegally, need to look in the mirror. *There are simply no facts in support of what has dominated the airwaves for the past six months*, distracting Trump from the work he is trying to do on the economy and on protecting U.S. borders. The Russians-hacked-the-election narrative at this point clearly represents an elite-sponsored effort to discredit this president and render him ineffective, because his enemies among the elites and in the Deep State do not want a recovering middle class or border security. Above all, they do not want a rapprochement with Russia and cooperation between the two powers sufficient to resolve the crisis in Syria peacefully (in which Assad would remain in charge), contain ISIS, and halt the expansion of Anglo-Zionist power in the region.

Author's Note: if you believe this article and others like it were worth your time, please consider making a \$5/mo. pledge on [my Patreon site](#). If the first 100 people who read this all donate, my goal of just \$500/mo. would be reached in no time! And if we're honest about it, we all waste that much money each day.

Telling the truth can have negative consequences. Around this time last year my computer was hacked – it wasn't the Russians, either! Repeated attempted repairs of the OS failed, the device gradually became unusable, and I had to replace it off-budget.

This is also an attempt to raise money to publish and promote a novel, Reality 101 (a globalist speaks in a voice filled with irony and dripping with cynicism). Promoting a book means, in my case, the necessity of international travel which is not cheap.

I do not write for an audience of one. I write for you, readers of this site. If you believe this work makes a worthwhile contribution, please consider supporting it financially. I am not a wealthy person, and unlike the leftist groups I criticize, I do not have a George Soros funneling a bottomless well of cash my way.

If I reach the above goal of \$500/mo., I may be able to speak at an event in your area (contact info below). On the other hand, if this effort fails, I am considering taking an indefinite "leave of absence" beginning later this year to pursue other goals. To sum up, these are your articles (and books). I don't write to please myself. No one is forcing me to do it, as sometimes it brings me grief instead of satisfaction. So if others do not value the results enough to support them, I might as well go into retirement while I am still able to enjoy it.

© 2017 Steven Yates All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Steven Yates: freeyourmindinsc@yahoo.com

Meet The LGBTQ Movement's Biggest Sugar Daddy

In the wake of its fake news story about the University of Virginia fraternity house “gang rape” that in all probability never happened, I wondered whether to trust *Rolling Stone* ever again. It's clearly an Establishment publication, well-oiled by moneyed interests, that for years has posed as a voice of the so-called counterculture. But just recently *Rolling Stone* [ran a story](#) that appears to check out. Unintentionally, *Rolling Stone* writer Andy Kroll may have blown the whistle on one of the reasons the LGBTQ movement has become so well-organized and powerful.

As with many things, just follow the money ... much of which, in this case, can be traced to one person.

His name is Tim Gill, 63, a software developer, one of many who rode the wave of the 1990s tech explosion to a spot near the top. Born in 1953 in Indiana, he moved to the Denver, Colorado area with his parents when he was a child, and has resided there ever since. He attended the University of Colorado at Boulder where he majored in computer science. Initially he cut his teeth with Hewlett-Packard. Then, in 1981, he used a \$2,000 loan from his parents to start his own company, Quark, Inc., based in Denver.

Quark began producing quality desktop publishing software. The company's flagship product was QuarkXPress, the first version of which was introduced in 1987. QuarkXPress quickly earned an industry-wide reputation as the best software package able to handle complex, graphics-intensive page layouts, and by the mid-1990s subsequent versions had been adopted by major newspapers and other print publications across the country. Tim Gill became a multimillionaire, whose name appeared on *Forbes Magazine's* well-known 400 list.

A gay man, Gill had already begun involving himself in gay rights issues. The convergence of political and popular cultures of the 1990s were already tilting sharply leftward. In 1994, Gill created the tax-exempt Gill Foundation and, ten years later, the Gill Action Fund, the former in response to a 1992 ordinance, Colorado Amendment 2, which blocked the application of antidiscrimination laws to gays and lesbians. Thanks to the massive success of QuarkXPress, Gill was able to sink more and more money into gay rights causes, which included founding the Gay & Lesbian Fund of Colorado in 1996.

In 2000, Gill sold his 50% holdings in Quark for around \$500 million, exiting the company to devote nearly all his time (and money) to the gay-lesbian agenda via his foundation. This included creating Connexion.org in 2003 to serve as a vehicle for engaging gays and lesbians in political activity. Connexion.org closed in 2011; by then much of its mission and that of other “transformative” organizations was accomplished. Popular culture now viewed homosexuality with fascination, and the political universe was coming around. Gill would “marry” his partner in Massachusetts in 2009 after “gay marriage” was legally recognized there. Shortly thereafter, we began seeing the letters LGBT – now LGBTQ. (I have never been sure if the Q meant *queer* or *questioning*; the former seems redundant, as the word, once a slur, has been largely reclaimed, at least within that corner of the academic world devoted to “queer theory” and other such politically correct forms of life.)

Gill had created a donor club, OutGiving, which involved fellow multimillionaires who were either themselves gay or sympathetic to LGBTQ causes, coaching them in strategy, and in the most effective ways to distribute their vast resources. OutGiving thus enabled others to pour still more money into LGBTQ projects, especially those involving electing pro-LGBTQ legislators while targeting opponents for defeat. More recently in 2015, in the wake of the Trump-Pence insurgency, Gill and two other corporate multimillionaires created Freedom

For All Americans to promote their issues across the U.S.

According to *Rolling Stone*, Gill has poured approximately \$422 million into LGBTQ causes over a period of three decades – more than any other one person including George Soros. This money has been used to create an extensive network of state-level organizations. The Gill Foundation has bankrolled academic studies, and has doubtless been a force behind the rise of “queer theory” in academia. It has also bankrolled litigation, field organizing, candidates for state and local offices, and supported outfits often with tame-sounding names like the Coalition for a Better Colorado that, to an outside observer, would seem to have come out of nowhere, full-blown, and with plenty of money.

Via his network, Gill contributed more than \$1.3 million to Media Matters, \$733,000 to the leftist Citizens for Ethics and Reform based in D.C., \$175,000 to the leftist Center for American Progress and \$519,000 to ProgressNow. Moreover: “Gill’s fingerprints are on nearly every major victory in the march to marriage,” writes Kroll in *Rolling Stone*, “from the 2003 *Goodridge v. Dept. of Public Health* case, which made Massachusetts the first state to allow gay marriage, to the Supreme Court’s *Obergefell v. Hodges* decision two decades later that legalized it in all 50.”

His Colorado Democracy Alliance, a collection of outfits founded in 2003 with three other leftist multimillionaires and structured to avoid campaign finance laws, flipped the Colorado state legislature from Republican to Democrat in 2004; a CDA-affiliated outfit with the Orwellian name Colorado Freedom Fund spent \$500,000 to defeat a Republican gubernatorial candidate, Scott McInnes, primarily through negative ads. Gill’s activities have not been limited to his home state, obviously. He has flooded states such as Iowa and Pennsylvania with money [“to stop the Rick Santorums of tomorrow before they get started.”](#) In the former, his efforts led to the defeat of Danny Carroll, the Republican Speaker Pro

Tem of the House; the latter, a much bigger target, cost him over \$20 million, but in 2006 Santorum, whom Gill despises passionately because of past anti-gay remarks, went down to defeat.

Gill, who began as a shy, introverted, stereotypical tech nerd who shunned publicity, clearly became a master organizer promoting the LGBTQ agenda and targeting its enemies for defeat, which typically meant promoting Democrats over Republicans. His methods employed three basic principles.

First, instead of going national, focus on the state and local level. Writes Kroll again, "Congressional elections cost millions, but a smart investment of \$50,000 in a handful of state races could flip an entire legislative chamber from anti-LGBTQ to pro-LGBTQ." Kroll quotes Gill: "You go down to the states and all of a sudden you have those options... They're better laboratories, they're more diverse and they're a cheaper date."

He learned this from a testy lawyer and former tobacco lobbyist named Ted Trimpa, a sort of leftist Karl Rove, also based in Colorado. Trimpa urged him to pay attention to less visible races at the state level where the majority anti-LGBTQ measures were originating. Their ideas, as they evolved, included identifying and neutralizing vulnerable candidates through direct action instead of working through larger and possibly more risk-averse organizations. This revolutionized his strategy.

Second, operate in stealth – that is, conspiratorially, using what has been called *dark money*. "Gill also knew," Kroll continues, "his political efforts would never succeed if opponents connected him directly to the money. Stealth was key. The words *Gill Action* rarely appeared in a candidate's campaign filings; instead, anyone who bothered to look would find an oddly large number of donations from Malibu, Denver, and New York, for a state senate race in Iowa. Gill's team

operated under such secrecy – avoiding the media and guarding its playbook ...”

Rolling Stone goes on to note that in 2006, Gill Action helped defeat 50 of the 70 candidates it targeted. Four of 13 states where Gill Action operated “saw at least one legislative chamber flip from Republican to Democratic control.” Doubtless this trend was aided by gathering doubts about President George W. Bush’s disastrous war of choice in Iraq as well as an economy that remained sluggish outside of certain bubble-inflated sectors like housing – but Gill Action took the wins any way it could obtain them.

A third part of Gill’s personal strategy: be tenacious. Gill has been that. He does not give up. After being texted that New York State had rejected a gay marriage bill, Gill reportedly texted back, “That’s sad. What’s next?” What was next was Gill’s team creating a campaign they called Fight Back New York which successfully unseated three state senators who had voted against gay marriage. He set out, that is, to “punish the wicked.”

Finally, do not eschew bipartisanship – given that there are Republican corporate donors on board with the LGBTQ agenda. Gill has supported groups such as the Log Cabin Republicans. He teamed up with two Republican donors, hedge-fund investors Paul Singer and Daniel Loeb, to create the above-mentioned Freedom For All Americans in 2015.

This, though, is just more evidence that both dominant political parties have been thoroughly compromised: by lack of any moral compass but especially by the Almighty Dollar.

Now, Gill and his foundation are targeting the religious freedom movement, intended to protect Christians from business-destroying lawsuits by LGBTQ activists. For example, Republican legislators in Georgia introduced a religious freedom bill three years in a row. In response, the Gill

Foundation launched the far-left Georgia Prospers. Its strategy has been to reach out to the business community. This is perhaps unsurprising: statistically, as natural denizens of “blue” culture many homosexuals are now better off financially than many heterosexuals. They tend to be tech savvy, the richest having business smarts that lead them away from too-visible “pride” marches and into efforts like we see here.

Thus big business now has numerous people who are either gay or lesbian themselves or highly supportive of LGBTQ causes because gays and lesbians have money to spend, because the cultural left has convinced them that “equality” demands their support – or because as part of “blue” culture they tilt to the left themselves. Georgia Prospers has thus gained support from Google, Marriott, Coca-Cola, and Delta Airlines, among other leviathan corporations.

Obviously Gill supported Hillary Clinton last year and believed she would win. He and his team regarded the Trump victory as a major setback, because even if Trump himself didn’t express interest in opposing the LGBTQ agenda (he even once referred to *Obergefell* as “settled law”), his VP Mike Pence was its most outspoken opponent in Indiana when he was governor there, and a number of Trump’s appointees are noted for anti-LGBTQ views (e.g., new Education Secretary Betsy de Vos, a multimillionaire in her own right who has donated to anti-LGBTQ groups and candidates).

Gill is taking the long view, however, with he and his network of groups continuing to work at the state level, e.g., to oppose such measures as North Carolina’s HB2. “We are going to fight this law in North Carolina,” he said, “and keep fighting everywhere until LGBTQ people are fully protected in every single state.”

Protected from what?

According to them, from discrimination – although

increasingly, if a business does anything that can be interpreted as discriminatory on the basis of sexual preference and gets called out, it can face a massive lawsuit. It can also be given such a black eye in the now LGBTQ-sympathetic mainstream media that I am surprised anyone still dares.

Academia, of course, is eagerly seeking out LGBTQ people for faculty and staff positions!

Clearly, “equality” in practice means special favors – as I argued back in 1994 in my book *Civil Wrongs* which warned of the gathering dangers of not having opposed political correctness when it was still mostly limited to law schools and humanities departments but expanding rapidly. That same year I predicted that PC and Christianity were on collision course. Today, Christians trying to operate businesses choosing who to deal with, and not deal with, based on Christian principles, learn the hard way that they no longer have religious liberty in the U.S. Christian denominations are under stealth attack from the Gill agenda, continuing the road the U.S. is presently on towards a fully secular, de-Christianized, materialist society.

But mounting defenses of secularism is not part of the Gill methodology, which is about pursuing Fabian socialist style “penetration and permeation” to change Christian denominations from the inside. Consider this, from the Gill Foundation’s [website](#) regarding a donation to a leftist “faith” organization, one of a growing number:

“It’s no longer ‘God vs. gay,’ thanks in part to the work of Faith in Public Life, a national organization that’s changing the narrative about faith and LGBT equality. Focusing on the pulpit, not the pews, they educate and engage faith leaders to use their voices to advance equal treatment for LGBT Americans. And their national and state-based faith coalitions are sending a powerful message. Treat others as you’d want to

be treated.”

Treat others as you'd want to be treated.

That sounds like a good idea to me. On such a basis, those who know me know I do not promote bullying or otherwise harassing gays and lesbians. We Christians have an obligation to preach the Gospel, however; and for all we know, kindness rather than acrimony might lead some LGBTQ people to Christ. So let's turn this the other way. Would LGBTQ activists want to face massive lawsuits when they try to do business with people of their choosing? In the guise of “antidiscrimination” and “bullying prevention,” LGBTQ activists have become bullies themselves – typically with vastly more money than most Christians have!

Given these realities, I suggest that instead of Christian pastors doing what they have been doing (which is often nothing), they should study Gill's career trajectory and methods, and employ them in forging a viable strategy of opposition to the LGBTQ agenda, to the extent it is still possible. Gill has been effective, and one cannot argue with effectiveness. It should be clear: Christians have a lot of catching up to do. I wouldn't recommend relying on Republican politicians who can be voted out of office courtesy of one of these targeted campaigns if they haven't already been compromised.

The most realistic political strategy is to fight fire with fire – or dollars with dollars. Christians who happen to be multimillionaires (surely there are a few out there!) need to wake up, smell the coffee, figure out why they've increasingly lost on such issues as “gay marriage,” and realize that unless they begin to use their money as effectively as Gill's foundation and network of organizations have done, they will someday stand accused of a latter-day version of fiddling while Rome burns.

Author's Note: if you believe this article and others like it

were worth your time, please consider making a \$5/mo. pledge on [my Patreon site](#). If the first 100 people who read this all donate, my goal of just \$500/mo. would be reached in no time! And if we're honest about it, we all waste that much money each day.

Telling the truth can have negative consequences. Around this time last year my computer was hacked – it wasn't the Russians, either! Repeated attempted repairs of the OS failed, and the device gradually became unusable – a reason I haven't been around much lately – and I've had to replace it off-budget.

This is also an attempt to raise money to publish and promote a novel, Reality 101 (a globalist speaks in a voice filled with irony and dripping with cynicism). Promoting a book means, in my case, the necessity of international travel which is not cheap.

I do not write for an audience of one. I write for you, readers of this site. If you believe this work makes a worthwhile contribution, please consider supporting it financially. I am not a wealthy person, and unlike the leftist groups I criticize, I do not have a George Soros funneling a bottomless well of cash my way.

If I reach the above goal of \$500/mo., I may be able to speak at an event in your area (contact info below). On the other hand, if this effort fails, I am considering taking an indefinite "leave of absence" beginning later this year to pursue other goals. To sum up, these are your articles (and books). I don't write to please myself. No one is forcing me to do it, as sometimes it brings me grief instead of satisfaction. So if others do not value the results enough to support them, I might as well go into retirement while I am still able to enjoy it.

Globalists Can Use A Nation Divided And On The Edge Of Violence

We read incessantly how the U.S. is more divided and polarized than at any time in our lifetimes. Articles saying this are too numerous to cite individually. It's obvious in any event: leftists despise conservatives, and are despised by them in return. I've argued [elsewhere](#): there are basically two cultures in the U.S.: that of the "blue culture" of the crowded urban areas which embrace "progressive" values, and that of the "red culture" of rural states which reject them. Increasingly, neither side sees the other as legitimate or worth talking to.

The racial dimension here is obvious: blacks hate whites like never before, to the point of calls for violence. Whites are almost as fed up with blacks. Even those who supported the civil rights movement of the 1960s are fed up. There are exceptions, of course, but the general stance of the two races toward one another is increasing hostility. A point often made in why-people-voted-for-Trump commentary is that Donald Trump's support didn't come just from the white working class. Many middle class and even upper-class whites voted for him. They are tired of affirmative action and other preferences, black-on-white crime which mainstream media won't report, anti-white racism, and political correctness.

Into this fray walked Trump. He was the only candidate many of them had ever seen who openly said things like, "We can no

longer afford to be politically correct!”

Some of the images cultural leftists have foisted on the public in retaliation suggest derangement, as when the hopelessly untalented Kathy Griffin draws attention to herself holding a ketchup-covered mannequin’s severed head made to look like Trump’s.

How sick does someone have to be to come up with something like that?

The other side of the coin, though, is that the woman is practically in hiding because of death threats. Her career as a pampered, fawned-over celebrity is probably over.

This is a product of conservative pushback. The grassroots has had enough!

Colleges and universities are in trouble, most of it of their own making. Again I cannot count the number of disruptions of conservative speakers by leftists – many of the latter bussed in from off-campus, George Soros their sugar daddy. Violent leftists did millions of dollars worth of damage at Berkeley back in January.

Last month at Evergreen State College, a white professor [had to hold classes off campus](#) because of threats following his criticism of a leftist-proposed day-without-whites at his school.

This past week as I write, [a black sociology professor at Trinity College](#) wrote approvingly on his Facebook page of a vile article on Medium (one of the *worst* places on the Internet for this sort of thing, and no I won’t link to it) recommending, “let whites f***** die.” Point of departure: the potentially deadly assault by a Bernie supporter on several Republican Congressmen in Alexandria, Va., which put Steve Scalise, majority whip in the House, in critical condition.

The sociology professor went on to call whites “inhuman a**holes.”

It’s no secret that leftists have grown increasingly vile and violent since the Age of Trump began. Their grip on the national narrative has slipped, and they’ve upped the ante. Conservatives tend not to respond in kind, which is fortunate for leftists since conservatives (especially in rural regions) don’t share most leftists’ fear of guns. But everyone has his breaking point. As with the Griffin woman, the sociology professor in the above case has reported death threats. His home address and phone numbers were posted in a comments section.

Trump supporters have struck back in places like Berkeley. There is now blood between “red” and “blue” types. This may be just the start. I have a distinct impression that violence between, e.g., a Black Lives Matter campus group and conservative whites who decide they’ve had enough could erupt at any time. The former will have been on one of their usual rampages against “white supremacy,” bullying white students minding their own business. The latter may decide they’ve gone too far into debt via student loans to continue putting up with more of BLM’s crap. Having received no support from cowardly administrators, they may threaten to take matters into their own hands, next go round. In this way, a campus becomes a powder-keg.

Globalists are surely enjoying the unfolding spectacle – because they’ve fomented and orchestrated it. Soros has bankrolled BLM from the start, just like he’s financed other left-wing groups from MoveOn.org to Occupy Wall Street. His goal has been to destroy traditional American culture, since it’s been a longstanding bulwark against the sort of world he and his minions want.

What do they want? Economically, they see the world as a borderless marketplace where everything and everyone is for

sale for the right price, where they can get richer by financial manipulation at others' expense without consequence. Politically, they have been working toward a single global-governance structure, or world government, that answers to their leviathan corporations. They wish to set up a global currency that can be monitored, which entails ending cash transactions and destroying the dollar. Multiculturalism is a weapon against "WASP" culture. It breeds division and distrust. Globalists have no sincere interest in indigenous cultures, as should be clear if we survey the history of how their corporations have destroyed indigenous peoples on every continent except Antarctica.

I've used the term [technofeudalism](#) for the kind of political economy towards which globalists have been taking the world. Think *socialism for the elites and those favored by them, and cutthroat "capitalism with the gloves off" for everyone else.*

At the moment, I think globalists want conservatives to believe they scored a major triumph with the Trump presidency, and a few additional victories with local special elections that have favored Republicans such as the one in Georgia last week. Globalists are willing to sacrifice Democrats, since they are willing to sacrifice anyone if it helps them achieve their goals. It is useful to remember, their only loyalties are to themselves and to money and power.

Globalists view their strategy as akin to that of a chess master. Chess masters do not see just the board in front of them. They are always thinking several moves ahead. Globalists are master strategists. I envision them studying every economic boom and bust, every downturn and recovery, especially the financial crisis that actually began with the subprime lending fiasco in 2007 and its aftermath, learning all they could from it and how to become even better manipulators of world and national events. Underestimating them would be a *huge* mistake.

Do globalists in my sense, directing history, really exist?

Back in 1970, Zbigniew Brzezinski wrote (*Between Two Ages: America's Role in the Technetronic Era*, pp. 56-62):

The nation-state as a fundamental unit of man's organized life has ceased to be the principal creative force: International banks and multinational corporations are acting and planning in terms that are far in advance of the political concepts of the nation-state...

A global human conscience is for the first time beginning to manifest itself... Today we are ... witnessing the emergence of transnational elites ... composed of international businessmen, scholars, professional men, and public officials. The ties of these new elites cut across national boundaries, their perspectives are not confined by national traditions, and their interests are more functional than national. These global communities are gaining in strength and ... it is likely that before long the social elites of most of the more advanced countries will be highly internationalist or globalist in spirit and outlook...

The new global consciousness, however, is only beginning to become an influential force. It still lacks identity, cohesion, and focus. Much of humanity—indeed, the majority of humanity—still neither shares nor is prepared to support it. Science and technology are still used to buttress ideological claims, to fortify national aspirations, and to reward narrowly national interests... The new global unity has yet to find its own structure, consensus, and harmony...

David Rockefeller Sr. read this, especially the third paragraph, and the result was the globalist Trilateral Commission (TC), intended to internationalize the globalism of the American-only Council on Foreign Relations (CFR). Rockefeller and Brzezinski both went to meet their Maker earlier this year, but their progeny is still around.

How does Trump fit into all this? Is he truly the “populist” rebel his supporters voted for, or are matters (shall we say) a bit more complicated? Among the things bothering me is that Trump [filled his cabinet](#) with more CFR members than Barack Obama had, including denizens of the swamp he was elected to drain. Last year a friend drew my attention to [a briefing](#) Trump held with arch-globalist and former CFR president Richard N. Haass, of whom Donald spoke approvingly. What was up with this? she wanted to know. Trump has also met with the third TC founding kingpin [Henry Kissinger](#), over China. Unlike Trump’s tweets, none of these meetings received mainstream press coverage.

I have encountered authors who believe Trump was the candidate globalists wanted in the White House all along. Their reasoning is not hard to fathom in retrospect.

First, globalists knew there was opposition to their goals, and if they couldn’t gain control over it, it would grow until it stymied them. Creating a controlled opposition is a common strategy of theirs. Second, we know another economic calamity is coming. The question is not *if*, but *when*. Who will be blamed for it? Globalists may have decided they prefer someone highly visible and disruptive, a self-described foe, who openly defends unpopular stances like economic nationalism and keeps a few such folks like Steve Bannon around, to take the fall when the Dow loses at least two thirds of its value and things go to pieces.

Third, it is unlikely that *any* candidate would rise to the top and get nominated for national office on a major party in the largest economy in the world without the silent approval of those with real power. I recall [pondering last year](#) whether obvious efforts to derail Trump’s candidacy would materialize. They didn’t.

Globalists both own and control major media, via six well-known corporate leviathans. They could have shut Trump down.

They could have mandated a blackout on his rallies, as they did those of Ron Paul in 2008 and 2012. They did not. Yes, Trump was ratings. But we are talking about billionaires many times over. It isn't as if they or their corporations needed the dough. The bottom line: they were not *forced* to give Donald Trump 24/7 wall-to-wall coverage.

But they did. They obsessed over his every move, every public statement, every tweet. They talked his debate performances to death. They didn't need to cover the fact that his supporters were relishing every minute, that his level of support went up every time he said something politically incorrect. Nor did they need to cover the physical attacks on Trump supporters by unhinged leftists.

They could count on alternative media to do that.

I think Brandon Smith, the most visible defender of the globalists-wanted-Trump-to-win theory, might be right.

Smith [believes](#) that the official conspiracy theory of members of the Trump campaign colluding with Russian agents, or Russian hackers compromising the DNC and influencing the outcome of the election, or both, is serving a purpose: this being to give leftists in government, who are less unhinged and less likely to attack a Trump supporter with a bike lock something concrete to focus on: the idea, now also promoted relentlessly in all major media outlets, that someone they despise passionately may have stolen a national election with help from agents of a hostile foreign power. Such a narrative would delegitimize Trump's presidency and make his removal from office an acceptable option. Never mind that there is zilch evidence that the conspiracy theory is true. Not even James Comey's two and a half hours of testimony produced anything new: not a single concrete "smoking gun" or line of evidence. Do Comey's "memos" even exist? Has anyone outside the corridors of government and media power seen them?

So poor is the case that the Russians hacked the election that [an actual Russian hacker was offered a bribe to confess!](#)

In other words, the Russia conspiracy theory is a psy-op aimed primarily at the slightly less foaming-at-the-mouth left, from whom the nation expects at least some leadership.

Smith believes that if this morphs into an open effort to impeach the president and remove him from office, the effort will fail. The most visible reason it will fail is that the GOP-controlled Congress will not disrupt the nation with a vote to remove one of their own even if they dislike him personally.

A less visible reason is that the globalists want The Donald [right where he is](#).

The failure of an impeachment effort will enflame the rabid left even more. These people, driven by emotion and not being very bright, are easy to manipulate. The second psy-op, therefore, will target conservatives.

Go back to those campuses, which were closed temporarily due to safety considerations. Scenarios such as I envisioned above could happen. The fallout could quickly spread elsewhere via social media, just as BLM itself spread nationwide (given the generosity of its globalist sugar daddy).

Anything of this sort could provoke a dangerously authoritarian reaction from the Trump administration, one which would have loud support from conservatives nationwide who are fed up with black and leftist militancy and would applaud an iron-fisted, baton-wielding, police-state response. Conservatives, moreover, are already positioned to blame the left if Trump's stated agenda for the country, to reverse globalism and create jobs for Americans, is derailed. If efforts to secure the borders against ISIS-sponsored terror come to naught, conservatives will say – rightly – that leftists in government and corporate media distracted him with

the Russia conspiracy theory, while leftists both in and out of government fought his every other effort tooth and nail.

“Leftists,” Smith writes, “will be labeled economic and political saboteurs, and this accusation will work to a point, because it is partly true.”

All these efforts are in motion. including the globalist-caused economic decline outside point-zero-one-percenter enclaves and the leftist-caused cultural decline of the U.S. If Smith is right, the globalists in their banking/financial/media corporations will have deflected blame for decline onto others. But if decline, via an Age of Decadence (which I discuss beginning [here](#)) is the fate of empires which are inherently unsustainable, then reversing America’s decline is beyond Trump’s or anyone else’s abilities regardless of who is blamed.

Author’s Note: if you believe this article and others like it were worth your time, please consider making a \$5/mo. pledge on [my Patreon site](#). If the first 100 people who read this all donate, my goal of just \$500/mo. would be reached in no time! And if we’re honest about it, we all waste that much money each day.

Telling the truth can have negative consequences. Around this time last year my computer was hacked – it wasn’t the Russians, either! Repeated attempted repairs of the OS failed, and the device gradually became unusable – a reason I haven’t been around much lately – and I’ve had to replace it off-budget.

This is also an attempt to raise money to publish and promote a novel, Reality 101 (a globalist speaks in a voice filled with irony and dripping with cynicism). Promoting a book means, in my case, the necessity of international travel which is not cheap.

I do not write for an audience of one. I write for you,

readers of this site. If you believe this work makes a worthwhile contribution, please consider supporting it financially. I am not a wealthy person, and unlike the leftist groups I criticize, I do not have a George Soros funneling a bottomless well of cash my way.

If I reach the above goal of \$500/mo., I may be able to speak at an event in your area (contact info below). On the other hand, if this effort fails, I am considering taking an indefinite "leave of absence" beginning later this year to pursue other goals. To sum up, these are your articles (and books). I don't write to please myself. No one is forcing me to do it, as sometimes it brings me grief instead of satisfaction. So if others do not value the results enough to support them, I might as well go into retirement while I am still able to enjoy it.

E-Mail Steven Yates: freeyourmindinsc@yahoo.com

© 2017 Steven Yeates – All Rights Reserved

Far-Left Academic Crazies Strike Again: The Strange Case Of Rebecca Tuvel And Hypatia

[*Author's Note:* a somewhat different version of this material is available on my [Lost Generation Philosopher blog](#).]

Academics and academia-watchers were recently treated to the latest three-ring circus, and if this one doesn't make some

key players in today's pseudo-intellectual games look like certifiable head cases, nothing will. The matter would be the stuff of comedy, were these people not teaching impressionable students, many of whom are going massively into debt to get an education at their institutions.

I refer to what might be called the Tuvel-*Hypatia* affair.

This is what happened: a young woman named Rebecca Tuvel, a recent philosophy Ph.D., untenured at Rhodes College (a small liberal arts school in Memphis, Tenn.), submitted an article entitled "In Defense of Transracialism" to a journal called *Hypatia: A Journal of Feminist Philosophy* (the name is for a 4th century woman scholar in ancient Greece and Egypt who was murdered as a pagan during a religious-political feud). For over 30 years now *Hypatia* has been one of the leading, or perhaps just the loudest, mouthpieces for radical academic feminism in the humanities. If a newly minted Ph.D. publishes an article there, she has instant credibility (among her peers, at least).

Tuvel's article was accepted for publication and appeared in the most recent (March 2017) issue. I haven't read it and have no plans to do so (I have far better uses for my limited time). I am assuming the account to be found [here](#) is reliable.

If so, the article relies on a standard philosophical method: arguing from analogy. Because two items have certain features in common, they can be compared in at least one more interesting respect. In this case, I gather Tuvel was arguing that "transgendering," or whatever we want to call the presently-obsessive focus on sex change, is sufficiently comparable to "transracialism," the changing of one's race, that the public case against someone such as Rachel Dolezal who, though born white, spent years posing as being black, fails. If we accept the former (as does Tuvel), we are compelled to accept the legitimacy of the latter. Tuvel does not appear to have actually asserted that Rachel Dolezal was

“transracial.” Her argument was hypothetical. This, too, is in line with most thought experiments in academic philosophy. Thus for all I know, despite its ridiculous subject matter, the article is competently argued. It is also a given in philosophy that the validity or strength of someone’s argument is a matter of form, not content. It is possible, that is, to construct a structurally valid argument concluding that the moon is made of green cheese.

What happened next was that within weeks of the article’s appearing, an “[open letter](#)” condemning the article began to circulate online, soliciting and receiving signatures (since discontinued). It was unclear who had initially authored the letter, which did not sketch, or examine, or attempt to evaluate, Tuvel’s argument. Instead it demanded that the article be retracted as having “caused ... harm ...” whatever this means, as there was no evidence presented that harm had been done, or an attempt to analyze the concept of *harm* being used, as you’d find in serious philosophy. It went to denounce the hapless author for supposed sins such as “deadnaming.” Are you sitting down? “Deadnaming” – which I’d never heard of before prior to this fiasco – is using the former name of a “transgendered” person, e.g., using the name “Bruce Jenner” alongside that of “Caitlyn Jenner.” Well, gasp!

Anyway, this was just one of the articles methodological heresies. I won’t bore or torture readers with an account of the others. I will only note that *Hypatia*’s editorial board instantly caved Putting their collective tails between their legs, the journal’s board issued a pathetic [statement](#) on its public Facebook page which stands as an exhibition of how American academia has gone off the deep end into utter absurdity. They retracted the article, despite the obvious fact that the only “harm” done had been to its hapless author who had been too naïve not to realize that any straight (may I presume?) white woman writing on any of these topics is walking into a minefield.

Apparently, among the signees of the “open letter” were two people on Tuvel’s dissertation committee. What’s said to be true in Washington, D.C., is definitely true in academia: if you want a friend, get a dog. Also made clear by this case is how easily the academic hard-left will turn on its own with a burn-the-heretic mentality reminiscent of the Spanish Inquisition.

At least one observer, fairly prominent in academic philosophy and with legal training, [sees the possibility of a defamation lawsuit](#). Suffice it to say, the “open letter” took academic-left self-righteous arrogance to levels I’ve not before seen, demanding that *Hypatia* revise its refereeing procedures and publishing policies to ensure that an article like this one never again gets through its process and reaches print – based on who has the exclusive right to publish on such subjects to avoid this impossibly vague notion of “harm”!

What should we take away from episodes like this?

First, it is worth noting that incidences of bullying and career-threatening personal attack are more common in academia than anyone who has spent no time in its groves realizes (yes, I did over 15 years of time there)? I could name several white males whose names have been tarnished, their careers ruined, by possibly bogus sexual misconduct allegations and in some cases much less (it can be as little as a post on a private blog that expresses a politically incorrect opinion that gets picked up and circulated in social media).

Let’s make the question more basic: *how on Earth did fields like philosophy get in this kind of mess?*

The answer to this goes back just over 45 years. They got in this mess through academia’s mindless acceptance of affirmative action, which started us down this troubled road, having expanded until it has literally overwhelmed the humanities! Initially aimed to increase the number of black

professors (at which it has failed miserably), it expanded immediately to include women (read: feminists), and has more recently expanded still further to include sexual minorities including those almost never seen, much less publicly celebrated, before our present sordid era.

As the saying goes, policies that redistribute wealth and jobs from Peter to Paul can always count on the support of Paul—and Paula! And they will generate more Pauls, Paulas, and Paul-to-Paula “transing” (or whatever we’re supposed to call it)!

Around 1970, the “argument” had emerged (it was always more an exercise in propagandizing and bullying, at which the left has always excelled) that minorities and women are “underrepresented” in academia, and that all departments should make efforts not just at outreach but to establish specific goals and timetables for hiring more women and minorities – for after all, “diversity is our strength,” is it not?

The legal impetus began with the Supreme Court’s disastrous *Griggs v. Duke Power* decision in 1971. This decision changed the meaning of *discrimination* from an action taken by individuals to a lack of politically acceptable outcomes. Affirmative action, the meaning of which was also ambiguous from the get-go, changed from that of well-intentioned outreach based on calls for an end to racial and sexual discrimination to an insistence on bureaucratically measurable results as a test of “nondiscrimination.” Bureaucratic realignment because the goal; the gold standard become proportional representation. Hence the creation of the category of the “underrepresented group” in all official policy recommendations relevant to student admissions, faculty hiring, and promotions.

I described this process in some detail, along with its assumptions and its effects on occupations ranging from the construction industry to academia, in my book *Civil Wrongs*:

What Went Wrong With Affirmative Action (1994), a work not once discussed or argued with but instead blacklisted in academia. I learned in 1996 from a sociology professor at Bowling Green State University that the book had been placed on an actual “index of banned books” there – an “index” of how medieval academia had become even then! And yes, I was (figuratively speaking) lynched a handful of times, although we did not have social media in those days.

I’d committed one of the ultimate heresies, providing a political dissection of the rise of the “new scholarship”: so-called “critical theory” which borrowed freely from French philosophy (e.g., Foucault, Derrida, etc.), radical feminism, critical race theory, and rising homosexuality which at the time was barely on the radar but growing rapidly. Without affirmative action and the perceived need to protect it from intellectual criticism, very little of this stuff would even exist! The “new scholarship” method was political correctness, rooted in Frankfurt School educated Marxist philosopher Herbert Marcuse’s “Repressive Tolerance”: allowing the same free speech standards for “nonrepressed” as for “repressed” groups maintains systemic repression!

In other words: free speech for me but not for thee!

What began decades ago, in a then-obscure philosophical essay, bears fruit today in the threats of violence against conservative speakers on campuses!

By the end of the 1980s affirmative action had clearly evolved into race and gender preferences never called for in original civil rights legislation, and the idea had become to protect preferences both from legitimate criticism (in many cases from scholars far better situated than I was), while cowardly Republican politicians such as the first George Bush caved and signed a Civil Rights Act of 1991. That law reversed court decisions such as *Croson* (1989), upheld by the Supreme Court, which were threatening to drain the affirmative action swamp.

I opined further in my book that the particular attacks on such notions as rationality and objectivity coming from “new scholarship” quarters, though originating independently, had been pulled into and used by this effort: a rational and objective approach to race and gender in American public education policy did not yield results the activists wanted. There was no reason whatsoever why nondiscrimination should yield proportional representation of all ethnicities and both genders. Nowhere in the world did such a state of affairs exist. Experience seemed to show that efforts to force it into existence were counterproductive. Government policies designed to benefit some groups at the expense of others always caused trouble, and this was not just true in the U.S., it was true all over the world (Thomas Sowell did some of the definitive detective work on this). Such policies benefitted those in the “preferred” groups situated politically to take advantage of them, and they quickly incurred resentment of those in nonpreferred “untouchable” groups.

Rather than check their premises the “new scholars” grew still more radical. Anything based on logical reasoning had to go. *Logic*, they said, is a white, male, Euro-centric, heterosexual, social construct. Today they’d add “cisgendered,” the present decade’s chief contribution to the growing list of bizarre neologisms.

As Thomas Hobbes says somewhere, “When reason goeth against a man, a man goeth against reason.” A woman, too. Or any other gender you like!

In fact, any possibility of rational discussion of such subjects in academia was dead in the water by the turn of the millennium. Feelings reigned supreme! And they got increasingly unpredictable: I am sure Rebecca Tuvel never dreamed this kind of fracas would erupt over her attempt to add something new to the conversation, trendy and sordid though the conversation is.

So where does this end?

A fake concept, that of *marginalization* applied to anyone seen as “underrepresented,” is out of control in academia. As a friend of mine put it (I am paraphrasing): “2017 might be the year humanities faculty finally wake up and realize that a certain percentage of their number is certifiably bat****-insane!”

I argued to anyone who would listen over a quarter of a century ago that unless affirmative action for women and minorities was curtailed, with hiring based on accomplishment and perceived promise, we would have increasing numbers of groups claiming the mantles of marginalization and victimhood, and these group would get progressively more extreme.

Everything I predicted back then has happened!

Now I’ll say that unless the trans-crazies and their backers are called out for their particular brand of insanity, the situation will get worse – unless, of course, a rapid shift towards exclusive online learning or an economic collapse forces the bulk of these institutions to close.

Barring that, if nothing changes, then what’s next? Defenses of pedophilia, with pedophiles the next “marginalized group”? Will we then see unhinged outpourings of scorn and rage against “pedophobia”?

Will it then be necrophilia? Cannibalism?

Only college and university administrations, with the backing of boards of trustees and endowment committees, can stop this long-term trend. They will have to stand together, show some backbone (for a change!), refuse to sign off on the hiring of any more far-left crazies pursuing “research” on trans-whatever, and then agree to weather the public hate blasts likely to ensue from outraged left-wing faculty, well-placed off-campus political groups, celebrities, etc.

This will be ten times harder today than it would have been a quarter century ago because of how far the madness has progressed. Back then one might be lynched on talk radio. Today opponents of these trends might have to deal with threats; they might even be risking flash-mob type violence, easily orchestrated via social media. Removing the existing crazies is probably not an option unless said crazies do something criminal (I wouldn't put this past them, but doubt the mere suppression of academic freedom qualifies). But no one can *force* a really determined administration to permit the hiring of more and progressively crazier leftists in the name of bogus concepts of victimization and marginalization.

CREDITS:

Steven Yates is an independent scholar and author with a doctorate in philosophy. He is the author of the books *Civil Wrongs: What Went Wrong With Affirmative Action* (1994), *Four Cardinal Errors: Reasons for the Decline of the American Republic* (2011), and the ebook *Philosophy Is Not Dead* (2014). He is an expatriated American living in Santiago, Chile, with his wife (a chilena) and their two cats, Bo and Princesa. He owns Final Draft Editing Service, which caters to Chilean academics needing editorial oversight with their English (although he accepts U.S. clients as well as clients from elsewhere around the world). He is currently completing his first novel, to be entitled *Reality 101*, to be published later this year, while continuing with nonfiction projects such as *The Fifth Stage of Civilization* and others. Dr. Yates occasionally blogs about philosophy and related matters at <https://lostgenerationphilosopher.wordpress.com>, and has just joined Patreon.com: if you find his writing valuable and important enough to be worth your financial support, please consider visiting the site and making a contribution (free books and possibly more are in the offing). He might also be building his own house soon.

Please consider supporting my writing on [Patreon.com](https://www.patreon.com)

Questions About Syria: False Flag? And Was Trump Baited?

As everyone not in a cave since the start of the month knows, on April 4 the Syrian town of Khan Sheikhoun, in the northern province of Idlib, suffered a chemical weapons attack. Over 80 people were killed, at least 25 of them children, with dozens more incapacitated by deadly sarin gas.

Syrian president Bashar al-Assad drew immediate blame for the attack, which would have violated international agreements. Assad's denial of responsibility went unbelieved in Western media. Also dismissed out of hand was Russia's suggestion that a conventional air strike hit a warehouse containing chemical weapons possessed by the insurgents the Assad regime has been fighting. This was all prior to any significant investigation into what really happened, something admittedly difficult under the present circumstances.

Early Friday morning Syrian time, April 7, [President Trump ordered an assault](#) during which 59 Tomahawk Cruise Missiles launched from the USS Ross and the USS Porter took out the larger portion of the Shayrat air field and nearby military infrastructure at Homs, destroying more than two dozen Syrian aircraft (over 20 percent of Syria's air force). [Here](#) is Trump's defense of the action. There are accounts of how Trump was moved to reverse his hands-off-Syria policy by such scenes as a distraught father holding his two dead children, twins, and Syrian children struggling to breathe.

Such scenes have great emotional power but do not tell us what really happened, or who was responsible. This should be common horse sense. It is a telling sign of the times that Trump received more praise for this action than anything else he's done to date.

Many of us have questions, however.

The first thought that went through my mind when I read about the attack and Assad's being blamed for it was: *why on Earth would he do something so stupid?*

Assad has struggled since 2011, the year the Syrian civil war began. He was blamed for a major chemical weapons attack in a major Damascus suburb on August, 2013, one which killed over a thousand Syrians. He denied involvement, blaming rebels who also had chemical weapons. No decisive proof was ever presented of Assad's responsibility. He was ordered to turn over his stockpile of chemical weapons to the UN and claimed to have done just that. Some of us were open to the idea that that Damascus attack was a false flag, carried out with tacit U.S. approval if not actual assistance, designed to discredit the Assad regime as a prelude to his being ousted from power via a U.S.-led invasion. Donald Trump was among those who criticized Obama administration overtures against the Assad regime following that incident.

The U.S. has been involved in [covertly arming and training Syrian rebels at least since 2012](#). Russia has been bombing strategic rebel strongholds since 2015.

The intelligence community blames Assad for the April 4 incident. Do I need to remind readers, this is the same intelligence community that claimed to have evidence, undisclosed and traceable only to anonymous sources, that some in Trump's campaign staff were involved with and might have been colluding with the Russians last year, and that it was the Russians who hacked the DNC. The intelligence community

appears to have been playing its assigned role, trying to undercut the new administration's legitimacy. Trump's trusting them now thus also makes little sense, unless someone powerful – maybe more than one someone – had a private “chat” with him. I have no proof of this either, of course, but we are talking about people unlikely to leave paper trails, even electronic ones.

Just recently after all, Trump administration officials had [declared](#) that Assad was not a priority. This was consistent with the America First stance Trump took during his candidacy last year and in his inauguration speech, but was not what powerful people wanted to hear.

Could the latter have orchestrated the April 4 attack to lure a Donald Trump they know who goes off experience, not ideology, into changing his priorities (which have now flip-flopped on more other things than I can count)? A sarin gas attack did occur; others in Syria besides Assad's government have access to such weapons; those others have received covert assistance from the U.S. They may not be able to make chemical weapons, as some will respond; but it hardly follows that they don't know how to use them.

Add up two and two and get four. Part of the original role of ISIS was to overthrow Assad, who had been making slow progress against the insurgency.

There can only be speculation on many of the specifics, but the fact remains: *Assad had no motive for gassing his own people.* None whatsoever. Not only that, it is unclear he was in a position to do so. Khan Sheikhoun is in an area under al Qaeda control (a fact mostly neglected in Western media). Which means that whoever was directly responsible for the attack acted with al Qaeda's approval, not Assad's.

The strongest evidence against Assad turns out to be [a flight map](#) released by the Pentagon the day of Trump's assault. The

flight map shows a trajectory a Syrian flight might have taken – emphasis on the *might have*, in the sense that it was physically possible. But a careful reading of anti-Assad articles in places like [Bloomberg](#) shows reliance on the same kinds of “anonymous sources” we’ve come to expect – a four-page government document about which we learn next to nothing – ultimately failing to disclose any real evidence tying the Assad government to these attacks.

Calls for real evidence seem to mean little in today’s world, however.

Ron Paul (who may yet turn out to be the last actual statesman the U.S. had) believes the April 4 attack to have been a false flag. He stated on his weekly [Liberty Report](#) the following day that Assad’s doing this made no sense: “Before this episode of possible gas exposure ... things were going along reasonably well for the conditions... Trump said let the Syrians decide who should run their country, and peace talks were breaking out, and al Qaeda and ISIS were on the run. It looks like, maybe, somebody didn’t like that so there ance had to be an episode, and the blame now is we can’t let that happen because it looks like it might benefit Assad. So Assad releases gas to kill a bunch of people.”

Dr. Paul is not alone. More recently, weapons expert Theodor Postol, professor emeritus at MIT and past scientific advisor to the Department of Defense, [issued three reports](#) evaluating claims of Assad’s responsibility. He stated unequivocally, “I have reviewed the [White House] document carefully, and I believe it can be shown without doubt that the document does not provide any evidence whatsoever that the U.S. government has concrete knowledge that the government of Syria was the source of the chemical attack in Khan Sheikkoun, Syria, at roughly 6 am to 7 am on 4 April 2017.”

He argued that the attack probably resulted from actors on the ground.

“In fact,” he continued, “a main piece of evidence that is cited in the document point to an attack that was executed by individuals on the ground, not from an aircraft ... This conclusion is based on an assumption made by the White House when it cited the source of the sarin release and the photographs of that source. My own assessment was that the source was very likely tampered with or staged, so no serious conclusion could be made from the photographs cited by the White House.”

The photograph he refers to is that of a crater with a shell inside, which allegedly contained sarin gas. His analysis of the shell casing concludes that the damage to the casing is inconsistent with the effects of an aerial explosion. More likely, the explosive charge was laid on the shell containing sarin before the latter was detonated.



<- Khan Sheikkoun crater

He explained: “The explosive acted on the pipe as a blunt crushing mallet. It drove the pipe into the ground while at the same time creating the crater. Since the pipe was filled with sarin, which is an incompressible fluid, as the pipe was flattened, the sarin acted on the walls and ends of the pipe causing a crack along the length of the pipe and also the failure of the cap on the back end.”

He went on to criticize what he called the “politicization” of intelligence findings: “No competent analyst would miss the

fact that the alleged sarin canister was forcefully crushed from above, rather than exploded by a munition within it. All of these highly amateurish mistakes indicate that this White House report, like the earlier Obama White House Report [from 2013], was not properly vetted by the intelligence community as claimed. I have worked with the intelligence community in the past, and I have grave concerns about the politicisation of intelligence that seems to be occurring with more frequency in recent times ...”

Postol had used similar arguments back in 2013 based on a close inspection of what documented physical evidence he was able to study. Getting at the truth about what is really going on in Syria is difficult, however, and made worse by the likelihood that no one in U.S. government or media really wants the truth.

What should be clear: powerful people would like to see Assad gone. They have plans of their own for Syria (surprise, surprise: they involve oil, and a pipeline, can't you guess?). Some of these people are in Saudi Arabia. Some are in Washington.

We also know that the neocons who appear to be overwhelming the America Firsters in the Trump administration continue to promote limited war and chronic instability in the region, and one wonders if they will be satisfied when the entire Middle East (except for Israel, of course) is reduced to piles of ash and burned out rubble.

Or when unassimilable refugees have overwhelmed the West. Even Hillary Clinton weighed in expressing approval of Trump's action and stating that it should continue more broadly. Then she added, “I ... hope they will recognize that we cannot in one breath speak of protecting Syrian babies and in the next close America's borders to them.” This, from someone who has no problem with the deaths of millions of unborn babies at the hands of American abortionists.

If, under clear and obvious pressure from all quarters, Trump weakens and then reverses his initial determination to vet those seeking to enter the U.S., he will lose the support of many who voted for him. One result could be a 2018 disaster for Republicans. But that is not the worst danger. Many of us rejected another Clinton presidency because, in addition to her support for abortion on demand, her raving-lunatic multiculturalism, and her belief in open borders, another Clinton presidency clearly meant collision with Russia – very possibly in Syria.

So again, was Trump lured, whether through his lack of a consistent worldview or just inexperience at dealing with the power politics of Washington and the Deep State? Was he compelled to go against his best instincts, which went against wars of choice and regime change? True, he once said he would “bomb the hell out of ISIS.” He called the foreign policy of the Bush II-Obama-Clinton axis a “complete and total disaster,” however, and he was right. I had hopes that he and Russian president Vladimir Putin could work together on a strategy to contain ISIS, presently the most murderous force in the Middle East – or, conceivably, the entire world, as not even Kim Jung Un’s barbarous regime puts Christians to death by hacking off their heads. (Syria’s Christian minority, incidentally, is grateful to Assad. His government has been the only thing preventing their suffering a likely brutal fate at the hands of ISIS militants.)

Such a strategy might begin by cutting off supplies of money and arms clearly coming from, shall we say, outside the region.

It won’t happen if Trump been lured, possibly as a survival strategy, into continuing the “complete and total disaster” of the Bush-Clinton-Obama axis. Their version of “America First” is not a government that goes where it is invited and otherwise minds its own business, but of a global empire ruled by the Exceptional Nation, imposing “liberal democracy” and

the mass consumption culture on the world – by force, if necessary.

Meanwhile, relations between the U.S. and Russia have deteriorated once again. They are now what they were when Obama was president and Hillary was rattling her saber.

As of this writing there has been no escalation in Syria – nor any sense that regime change in that troubled land could be in the offing. Could this, perchance, be due to Russia's having moved one of its state-of-the-art frigates into easy striking distance in the eastern Mediterranean where, to the best of my knowledge, it remains, watching quietly? While the present strategy seems to be to drive a wedge between Putin and Assad, trying to persuade Putin that support for Assad is “not in Russia's best interests,” the bottom line is, the two remain allies (again, as of this writing).

Assad is not, therefore, Saddam Hussein, who was a U.S.-instilled puppet from the get-go. Nor is Syria Iraq.

Putin does not appear to want war, especially with the U.S. He has tolerated being lied about and demonized in Western media (and no doubt, self-anointed guardians of the sacredness of mainstream thought about whom I [wrote previously](#) will cite such remarks as these as “evidence” *I* must be working for the Russians!). Surely if Putin wanted war, with the kinds of provocations we've seen in Ukraine where neocon-backed forces assisted in overthrowing a democratically elected government in 2014, as well as this latest incident in Syria, we would know it by now!

In fact, Putin has kept his head and acted with remarkable restraint against a steady stream of Washington-originating provocations. He doubtless sees the alternative as unacceptable.

I am sure, however, that like anyone needing to operate from a perception of strength, there is a point beyond which he will

not allow himself to be pushed.

A U.S.-led invasion of Syria would do it, inviting an extremely dangerous escalation that could lead to World War III!

© 2017 Steven Yates – All Rights Reserved

Guess What? We're "Fake News"

I just ran across this Harvard University Library based [site](#), the latest broadside against so-called "fake news," i.e., independent and alternative news and commentary sites online. While there are links to several related articles, I found only one name, that of a Melissa Zimdars who, it turns out, is not at Harvard but at a place called Merrimack College, where she is an assistant professor of communications and media (Ph.D., 2015).

So what's this doing on a Harvard site? Apparently she relied on the idea that if you've launched such a project and can affiliate it with Harvard, you have instant credibility. I do not know if she authored the main page or not. No other names are listed.

Zimdars's page contains a lengthy list of "alternative" news and commentary sites of all sorts on the Internet, along with a classification guide of categories, or tags, apparently borrowed from [elsewhere](#). The list itself, one learns from the main page, was "compiled by students for a class taught by Melissa Zimdars at Merrimack College." Great. A list compiled by members of Generation Snowflake.

As for the tags: by the "fake" tag is meant, for example,

“Sources that entirely fabricate information, disseminate deceptive content, or grossly distort actual news reports.”

Then there is “bias”: “Sources that come from a particular point of view and may rely on propaganda, decontextualized information, and opinions distorted as facts.” Seriously now: how many people out there aren’t reporting from a “particular point of view”?

There is that old standby: “conspiracy”: “Sources that are well-known promoters of kooky conspiracy theories.” Take that.

NewsWithViews.com is on that list, cited as “fake” and “conspiracy.”

I wonder who, on NewsWithViews.com, stands accused of “fabricating information” or “grossly distorting actual news reports.” To my mind this is potentially libelous. But as long as we have no specifics (which would require naming names) or any real analysis, who knows?

That is exactly the problem with broadsides like this, the best known of which occurred in [The Washington Post](#) last year, in which a completely anonymous outfit calling itself PropOrNot.com launched a general attack on independent and alternative media that was given instant credibility because of where it appeared, associating independent and alternative media with the then-still-growing Russians-influenced-the-election meme, put forth to insinuate that Donald Trump owed his shock victory in the presidential election to “Russian propaganda.”

I learned of this latest list because I subscribe to Tom Woods’s daily e-letter. His site TomWoods.com is listed. He was noting, with bemusement, that its tag is “unknown.” What’s up with that? I checked and found: “All websites tagged as “unknown” still need to be analyzed ...” And: “many of these were suggested by readers/users or are found on other lists and resources ...”

In other words, Professor Zimdars has yet to look at many of these sites to see what it says or how it qualifies for such a list. There are dozens of sites with the “unknown” tag. A lot of them I’ve never heard of.

As for those I *am* familiar with, we’re in good company: Drudge Report is listed. Also LewRockwell.com, AntiWar.com, Breitbart.com, WND.com, PaulCraigRoberts.org, Alt-Market.com, zero hedge.com, GlobalResearch.ca, ShadowStats.com, NaturalNews.com; even WikiLeaks is there (and given – are you sitting down? – an “unknown” tag)!

In fairness, there are left-leaning sites listed as well: CommonDreams.com, Counterpunch.org, Dailykos.com, – all somewhat “populist” to one degree or another, and have posted articles outside standard academic-left identity political box. (Professor Zimdars missed Salon.com, the most hysterical hard left site to be found anywhere.)

In an era that has led to the rise of President Donald Trump, this sort of thing was probably inevitable. Mainstream media and academia have suffered “huge” losses of credibility. They want it back.

I haven’t been secretive about my view that empowering Trump’s rise – and quite independent of any evaluation of the man or whatever he does in office – was the long-term collapse of mainstream credibility. *Mainstream* here includes mainstream media, mainstream business, mainstream science, mainstream academia more broadly.

Mainstream media relied all last year on pollsters who told us in unison Hillary Clinton would win. Some said she would win in a landslide. Trump hammered the idea that these polls were faked, or at least unreliable. Only his supporters believed him.

Mainstream media also repeated, back during 2001-03, the Bush II administration’s allegations that Saddam Hussein had

weapons of mass destruction and was a threat to the U.S. No weapons of mass destruction were found in Iraq, and the idea that Hussein had ever been a threat to legitimate U.S. interests turned out to be preposterous.

Was this or was this not “fake news”?

Mainstream corporations had sold out the country and its workers to globalist interests in the name of the Almighty Dollar. There can be little doubt global corporate leviathans have placed profitability ahead of everything else via “free trade” deals, and this has pushed some independent researchers “leftward,” towards a reexamination of people like Karl Marx whose analysis of capitalism, they now believe, had more going for it than anyone suspected (cf. [this](#)). The white working class might have moved to the left had it not run headlong into identity politics which ludicrously brands it “racist” and “privileged.”

Politically homeless until 2015-16, they voted for Donald Trump.

Mainstream science (i.e., scientific institutions) embraced materialism, a metaphysical worldview, eons ago. Ideas like, e.g., Intelligent Design, are branded “pseudoscience.” More urgently, is the climate really changing due to industrial activity (decades of burning fossil fuels for energy)? Determining this should be fairly straightforward, even for one such as myself who is not a scientist, but one thing becomes clear to anyone who spends much time wading through the wide range of material on this topic: many people out there do not trust academic science (and is there really any other kind of science these days?). They see science departments in universities as embedded in the pursuit of government grant money when they don’t see it as furthering a worldview. In fairness, it is easy to see those who proclaim man-made climate change to be a hoax as on the take from global corporations who stand to lose billions of Almighty

Dollars if the economy moves away from extractive enterprises.

Lack of capacity to trust science is not a good thing! If the climate is indeed changing because of human industrial activity, *we absolutely need to know about it, and we need to know that the evidence backing up this claim has not been sullied by partisan or other interests!!!*

Mainstream academia outside the sciences and broad fields like engineering was hijacked by political correctness and above-mentioned identity politics tribalism. The purveyors of this stuff apply it to everyone except straight white Christian men, then wonder why an "alt-right" develops out here in the conceptual hinterlands.

I would add that mainstream "movement conservatism" and the mainstream "liberalism" of both the Republican and the Democratic Parties have also collapsed.

"Movement conservatism," originally designed to flourish during the cold war years, became "neoconservatism" after the collapse of the Soviet Union. Its advocates assumed an End of History stance (cf. Francis Fukuyama's celebrated book published in 1992) with the global triumph of "liberal democracy" and "market capitalism."

Besides these abstractions, they had no idea what they wanted to conserve.

The ensuing years thus unleashed a globalism that had been there all along, waiting: a globalism that outsourced America's manufacturing base, drove down American wages, replaced jobs with technology, fostered economic inequality including the growth of the "Davosie" as some writers have begun calling them, fought wars of choice that precipitated mass migrations, worsened cultural divisions aggravated by obnoxious Social Justice Warriors, and systematically lied about it all with "jobs reports" produced through questionable methodology or allegations of "white privilege" against men

and women who were just barely surviving.

The political mainstream proved unable or unwilling to face and address these issues.

Hence the loss of credibility that gave rise to Donald Trump among the hapless corporate-donor controlled GOP, and would have given rise to Bernie Sanders across the aisle had the DNC not cheated – so openly you had to be blind to miss it – and which has put independent and alternative media sources on the map.

We are rising in influence, and the mainstream is having a collective myocardial infarction over it! Hence the “fake news” meme. To the Melissa Zimdars of the academic world, we are “fake news” if we point all this out, and follow up by suggesting that a new direction is needed for our civilization if we hope to sustain it.

Do we independents make mistakes? Of course we do! Few of us have the resources available to ABC or CBS or the Clinton News Network (CNN), or Fox News, or to print publications like *The Washington Post*, *The Wall Street Journal* and *Forbes*. As an unaffiliated writer speaking only for myself, I’ve gone down blind alleys a few times, and reinvented the wheel once or thrice. I’ve been called out a couple of times on having used a quotation I thought was real but turned out to be bogus. When it happened, I issued a disclaimer in the next article. This almost never happens now.

The method I recommend is the one I adopted when writing my book *Four Cardinal Errors*. I either tracked a quotation to the original source – the author’s book or article, or a statement in the Congressional Record or other government document – or I didn’t use it. There were a couple of bogus quotes I put in there anyway to discuss what made them interesting even if they weren’t valid. The point is, there are no bogus quotes in *Four Cardinal Errors* that are not clearly identified as such!

Do mainstream media outlets never misspeak or get facts mixed up or confused? I cited an example above, one that got over 4,000 Americans killed, thousands more maimed for life, and killed tens of thousands of Iraqis while rendering hundreds of thousands homeless! I thought it common knowledge that six leviathan corporations now own and control roughly 95% of Western mainstream media, which include big city newspapers (all of which look alike and run essentially the same mainstream pundits on their editorial pages), television networks, cable networks, major book publishers, magazines, websites getting far more traffic than this one ever will, and much more besides. Their systems are hierarchical, authoritarian, and exclusive: if you don't comply, or if you question directives, you're out the door and in search of a new career.

Independent and alternative media are *free* media – the only places left where there are free flows of information. Very few of us earn any Almighty Dollars for this! It's done from a sense of obligation – to the truth and to the future – when it's not a sheer labor of love!

Arguing my case, however, the phrase that keeps recurring in my mind these days is that of bringing a knife to a gunfight. Fundamental beliefs of worldview and in political economy are based on habit, parentage, familiarity, interestedness, partisanship, who is signing your paycheck, and some personal experience in light of one's own sense of "rightness" ... not abstract reason. They can also be based on the fear that one is losing one's protected dominance. This last appears to be the case with mainstream media moguls and their footsoldiers, including those in academia who may believe they've stumbled onto a major career-builder.

I've no hope, therefore, of convincing people who put up websites denouncing alternative media sites they've clearly barely glanced at.

Perhaps the best thing to do about the Melissa Zimdars's of the world is to ignore them. With them, we are guilty until proven innocent. The "unknown" tag appended to dozens of independent news and commentary websites on Professor Zimdars's list demonstrates this. This is how authoritarianism works, including its more subtle epistemic varieties, which [poison the wells](#) by labeling us "fake news," in advance of allowing readers to decide for themselves if we've made a credible case for our claims or not.

The irony is that it is Donald Trump who is frequently accused of authoritarianism. If he's authoritarian, he has no monopoly on that trait.

© 2017 – Steven Yates – All Rights Reserved

The Fate Of Health Care Coverage In America

According to the Congressional Budget Office, 24 million people could lose their health care coverage over the next ten years (14 million of them in 2018) if the GOP's current strategy to "repeal and replace" Obamacare results in a bill that gets through Congress and which President Trump signs. The prospective bill may be dead in the water, at least as of this writing. The GOP has caught pushback from both sides: at town hall meetings from those who have acclimated to Obamacare and don't want it changed, versus conservatives who claim the GOP plan is too similar to Obamacare and hasn't been changed enough.

This is what happens when an entitlement mentality dominates entire sectors of a society, and a critical mass of citizens

expects government to take care of them.

In a series of articles done almost three years ago (first installment [here](#)), I reviewed a past investigation into the trajectories major civilizations tend to follow, from their inception based on a set of ideals, their rapid growth, and their maturing into developed governance units with a single language, legal and administrative structure, trade routes, respect for genuine learning, and a solid work ethic. Then something goes wrong. Wealth and comfort become ends in themselves. Generations rise who reap the benefits of wealth and comfort without any sense of the work that went into them. Their intellectuals embrace a relativism that rejects their founding ideals as having no special standing. This relativism encourages the resentment felt against those who built the civilization by those who did not.

The civilization falls into successively more destructive waves of decadence. It furthers policies whereby some can live at the expense of others, and since it's all legal, if you are one of those others, you cooperate or eventually the government sends men with guns pointed at your head. Corruption sets in, financial as well as political. Wealth is generated increasingly by speculation and borrowing against the future, not productive work. An entertainment/celebrity culture rises, marked by hedonism, ostentatious displays of wealth, and a fascination with endless varieties of sexual debauchery. Substance abuse becomes a problem. So do two social phenomena once on their way to being conquered: economic inequality and poverty (a bogus "equality" of all lifestyles having been fostered as a surrogate for the real thing, which must be earned and cannot result from government freebies.)

The society, once relying successfully on rules for successful immigration and expecting immigrants to assimilate (most did), opens its borders to unassimilable outsiders who flood its cities with a dozen different languages. Its legal system

increasingly supports the outsiders over its own. To the political class, the outsiders are potential votes. To the corporate class, they're cheap labor. Many of these outsiders mean no harm, and have been caught in bad situations. Some, however, are actively hostile and begin to tear at the society's fabric. The problem is that there is no reliable way of determining in advance who is who. One terrorist with a rifle or a truck bomb can destroy a lot of lives!

As those who remember the "old ways" gradually die off and are not replaced, the civilization itself begins to die. It dies further when small handfuls of dissident writers and intellectuals warn of danger from these various forces and are demonized as racists, xenophobes, homophobes, nationalists, supremacists, tinfoil-hat wearers, or deplorables. It dies the rest of the way if enough of its remaining productive citizens simply pack up their affairs and flee to less repressive jurisdictions on other continents.

Does this sound at all familiar? I could be speaking of almost anywhere in the Anglo-European West right now, with variations from country to country, where a sense of entitlement is the mindset of the day, whether it is an entitlement to cross open borders or to have one's health care paid for at someone else's expense.

In areas like public health, attempts to satisfy this sense of entitlement require centralization and bureaucracy. Eventually, as all professionals are pulled into the Weberian [iron cage](#), the efforts become unsustainable. Prices go up. Quality drops. We are at that point with health care in America, as [I've argued previously](#): the national conversation is not about human health but how health care is to be paid for. This preoccupation is not crazy, moreover, because prices have indeed escalated uncontrollably, and one lengthy hospital stay can bankrupt a person.

The idea that promoting better health education and better

health practices would lower the price by reducing the supposed need for centralized bureaucracy occurs only to a few of us, out here in the conceptual equivalent of flyover country, as it were. Those locked into the entitlement mentality with all four claws see calls just for eliminating Obamacare as morally equivalent to allowing people to die. Just the other day, on the mainstream [Bloomberg site](#): “America has already decided, as a society, that people should not to die in the street for lack of health care.” *We* decided, collectively. “We” don’t make these things up.

A friend of mine wrote an account of what has gone wrong with health insurance in America that nails the problems so clearly that I was tempted just to copy and paste. Unfortunately his account is a bit long, so I must summarize. He argues as follows:

One buys insurance of any sort to protect oneself from events that have a low probability of happening to any of us, but if they do happen, the results are potentially catastrophic. Thus we try to protect ourselves against criminal break-ins, fires, floods, earthquakes, and so on. The idea is to “insure” millions of people against losses that are probably not going to happen to most of them, but with a risk that is sufficient that they are willing to pay the right premium for protection against it, just in case it *does* happen.

My friend identified three factors at work here. (1) The probability of the undesirable event happening to any one person must be low. (2) If it *did* happen, its effects on that person would be disastrous. (3) Millions of people must be willing to pay into a single pool of resources made available to minimize the effects for those few for whom it *does* happen. I would add a fourth: (4) the organization managing this pool of resources and administering claims must be able to make a profit. These are businesses, after all, not charities.

In a nutshell, this is how insurance works. Something very bad

happens perhaps one time in a million, but its costs are so high that millions of people are willing to pay to be protected financially should it happen to them.

Now for the \$50,000 question. Do health and sickness really fall into this insurable category?

First, illnesses, even serious ones, are much more common than the other catastrophic events we listed. And the older you get, the greater the probability of serious and possibly debilitating illness. Eventually it happens to the majority of us.

Second, over the past century we've seen a major shift from acute to chronic conditions. Acute conditions were either cured or the patient died. Chronic conditions, on the other hand, are not cured but *managed*. Their management is often quite profitable to doctors, hospitals, and Big Pharma. In a sense, managing millions of people's chronic conditions is what enables us to say we no longer have a *health* care system but a *sick* care system.

Third, as a population ages, these conditions grow in number – eventually those with chronic conditions threaten to outnumber the healthy! And their conditions get increasingly expensive to manage!

Because of these factors, universal health insurance for a population of over 325 million people (not counting those living in the U.S. illegally) was always a Utopian dream! An insurable risk, by its nature, has to be something that rarely happens, not something that eventually happens to the majority of the population! Attempting to insure expanding groups of elderly people whose chronic conditions are only going to get worse is a recipe for a financial black hole!

That is to say, the math doesn't work. The only way to make it work is to force young people who don't need as much insurance to pay the costs of those who do – the individual mandate in

Obamacare. This accords with the entitlement mentality: some are entitled to live at the expense of others. Force the young to pay into that resource pool, even though they receive few or no benefits.

This is not true insurance, it is wealth redistribution. It is moving money from the pockets and bank accounts of the young and relatively healthy to pay for the health care costs of the elderly. Welfare for the old, that is, paid for by the young. All Obamacare did was point the metaphorical *de jure* gun at their heads. Buy health insurance or pay a penalty to the IRS for noncompliance.

The fact that the penalty was sometimes less than one's premiums, taken on a yearly basis, which were skyrocketing under Obamacare, was a sign of the latter's fundamental dysfunction.

This is *not* a system that can be amended, reformed, repaired, or "repealed and replaced." It should be scrapped, lock, stock and barrel. It is time to recognize that in the long run, it does not work. It cannot be made to work.

If Paul Ryan and Donald Trump try to make "GOP-care" work without the individual mandate, however, the resulting system will soon run out of money and indeed, people who thought they could depend on it will be left high and dry.

The idea should be to get *free* of dependency.

Replace "GOP-care" with [health education for primary prevention](#), which includes, and requires, freedom and responsibility – personal, familial, and local.

This sort of thing needs to be incorporated into every school system in the land: public, private, or homeschool curriculum. Education for primary prevention should include information on proper nutrition, the importance of exercise, stress reduction, and the avoidance of unnecessarily risky behaviors.

The biggest thing presently in the way: the entitlement mentality.

Few people are old enough to remember when anything resembling freedom was the norm: that is, when your treatment was between you and your doctor or other specialist; Medicare was not involved; insurance companies were not involved; your doctor was not under pressure to sell you Big Pharma's latest expensive drugs.

Thus the resistance currently facing the attempt to replace Obamacare which was, after all, designed to make money for Big Pharma and Big Insurance.

This belief that health care is an entitlement, not the result of systems of preventive actions persons take as individuals or as family members, is one product of our present Age of Decadence.

In the past, an Age of Decadence has directly preceded a civilization's implosion, usually resulting in a lower standard of living. If that happens in the U.S., its masses will realize – too late! – that entitlements were an illusion.

This is not to say that those *unable* to care for themselves should not be cared for. But when people are not forced against their will to pay the medical costs of strangers, they are more likely to be generous; and when their families and their communities are autonomous, their capacity to care for the totally infirm is likely to be greater. Incidentally, the number of people requiring tertiary care due to long-term chronic conditions will drop dramatically when everybody or at least the vast majority of citizens are practicing primary prevention as a way of life. This incidentally includes *minimizing* the distance between food's origin (farms) and one's dinner table. Believe it or not, there was a time when today's most serious life-ending illnesses – cancers and heart disease – and most common chronic conditions such as diabetes

and, for the elderly, dementias such as Alzheimer's disease – were almost unheard of. The problem is the garbage in our food: high fructose corn syrup and other sweeteners, additives such as flavor enhancers, preservatives, and environmental contaminants.

The point is, functional universal health insurance is and will remain a Utopian dream. We will not force the numbers to add up any more than we can force water to run uphill.

Sadly, you cannot explain this to people mentally locked into the entitlement mindset. I know; I've tried. What I've realized is that there is a great danger that increasing chronic illnesses coupled with an inability to pay for treatment will be one factor in Western civilization's downfall. One can only hope the GOP-controlled Congress figures this out. If not, it will be up to us as individuals and families to use the knowledge we have, take care of our health and that of our families outside whatever dysfunctional systems prevail, and minimize our contact with them.

Are the globalists out to get Donald Trump?

The Michael Flynn resignation has changed the equation. Donald Trump's enemies are now playing this Russian connection gambit for all the mileage they can get out of it. Flynn appears to have misled Vice President Pence and others about his communication with Russian ambassador Sergey Kislyak. Trust was killed. The Deep State's collective antennae shot up higher than that wall will ever be!

Trump has had enemies before, but the Deep State is an

entirely different animal. I think he and Steve Bannon, lacking experience with the real centers of power in the Western world, quite underestimated what they would be up against. Paul Craig Roberts reports that former NSA spy John Schindler sent out a tweet immediately following Flynn's departure indicating that the Deep State was "going nuclear" against Trump, and that "he will die in jail."

These are not folks The Donald is accustomed to making deals with. These are people who, along with the globalists they serve, have controlled every White House for at least the past 70 years. The last president who tried to stand up to them was shot to death in a motorcade: JFK. Then Bobby Kennedy, the immensely popular Democrat who would have been a shoo-in for the presidency in the 1968 election and would very likely have reopened the investigation into his brother's murder, was also gunned down. To this day a man rots in prison who maintains he has no memory of the shooting.

In other words, Trump is up against folks who would kill him outright if they thought they could get away with it. In today's connected environment of alternative and social media, Deep State denizens doubtless know that millions of people would react instantly if anything bad happened to Trump. I would not be surprised if pitchforks came out and there was blood in the streets of the Asylum on the Potomac. I do not think the Deep State wants that. Its minions and its masters would much prefer a slower route to technofeudalism.

Trump is a target because the platform he ran on, and has furthered since Inauguration Day, opposes everything the globalists want: open borders and free migration, "free trade" which makes global corporations richer, and a reversal of the de-industrialization of the U.S. that began with NAFTA and went into overdrive after the Meltdown of 2008.

He's also a target because he's doesn't play political games. He's not a Harvard-bred over-intellectualized ideologue, and

says what he thinks. (Actually, he attended the more down-to-Earth Wharton School of Business.) He calls out the controlled mainstream media on its fake news. This might play in the rough-and-ready “red” culture of Peoria but is totally out of place in the antiseptic “blue” culture of the above-mentioned Asylum.

And now, his administration is in danger! We can’t pretend otherwise!

A new official narrative is being laid into place even as I write.

Please allow me to digress. I have been studying official narratives for over 20 years now, ever since I realized (mid-1990s) that the civil rights movement had been hijacked, and its replacement’s call for racial realignment instead of nondiscrimination was being defended by less-than-honest means. My first book grew out of that. Then it dawned on me that there were other official narratives besides the one on race and gender. Many.

Here is my working definition of an official narrative: a government-approved and media-sanitized account of some dramatic event, such as an assassination or terrorist attack or mass shooting. It can often be identified by having appeared in near-complete form very quickly after the event that prompted it, then being repeated endlessly in all major media outlets, along with powerful supporting images, its essentials never again questioned by “responsible” commentators – this despite a lack of actual evidence (witnesses, “smoking gun” physical evidence, etc.) and sometimes despite physical evidence to the contrary. A convenient enemy is named whose motivations explain the event. Patriotism may be invoked, or its opposite, as the situation requires: whatever manufactures consent around the narrative by leading the viewing audience to suspend independent judgment and trust the authorities. The final stage is to

demonize anyone who questions the narrative as a “conspiracy theorist,” a meme the CIA invented out of whole cloth in 1967 to circumvent critics of the Warren Commission Report. Other weaponized words are now available, such as “truther.” All to cement the narrative in the masses’ minds and make it almost impossible for them to think it false.

Examples of official narratives: Oswald shot JFK and acted alone. Sirhan Sirhan shot his brother five years later and acted alone. James Earl Ray shot Dr. Martin Luther King that same year and acted alone. The Gulf of Tonkin attack actually happened. Timothy McVeigh’s truck bomb destroyed the Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City; he and Terry Nichols acted together with no involvement by “unknown others.” Osama bin Laden was behind the 9/11 attacks, in which 19 Saudis commandeered planes and flew them into the Twin Towers and the Pentagon. Two Chechen terrorists, acting on their own, were behind the Boston Marathon Bombing. There are others, but those will do for now.

Logic and evidence have nothing to do with the process of cementing an official narrative in place. This was the hardest thing to wrap my brain around, given my philosophical training and the value it places on critical thinking skills, which by definition do not yield to mere authority.

Combatting an official narrative is extremely difficult. Since it isn’t a product of logic or evidence, using logic and evidence against it is like bringing a knife to a gunfight. Done from within institutions, taking on an official narrative can be career suicide. Ask former faculty members of universities who questioned the official 9/11 narrative. Or ask James Tracy, fired from his tenured position at a Florida university following his questioning the Sandy Hook official narrative on his private blog.

Returning to Donald Trump, I fear we are watching another official narrative fall into place, especially since the end

of Flynn's brief tenure in the administration. It goes something like this: Trump and his associates had numerous nefarious contacts with Russian agents going back through last year's campaign and before. In the end, Russian influence helped turn the tide in his favor and against Hillary Clinton ... perhaps in exchange for lifting the sanctions put in place in response to yet another official narrative: Russia's "invasion" of Crimea in 2014 (it was an annexation following an overwhelming popular vote, as most of the inhabitants of Crimea are ethnic Russians).

Were this true, and Trump knew about it (corporate media has revived the meme of "What did the president know, and when did he know it?" from the Nixon years), it would be grounds for impeachment.

The problem is, as with all official narratives, there is no evidence it is true. Trump-haters have been circulating the "35-page dossier" that was leaked to the media, one of many such illegal leaks. It contains nothing decisive, nothing that would stand up in a court of law. Moreover, "the Russians" can hardly be given credit for the record turnout at GOP primaries that led to Trump's nomination; nor did "Russian hackers" tell millions of people who to vote for on November 8.

But: "there you go again, Yates, thinking logic and evidence matter"! There is truth to the claim that in today's power-structured and media-saturated political economy, truth doesn't matter. There is a sense in which we inhabit a truth-free world. We have for years.

The upshot is that Trump and Steve Bannon are dangerously close to being in over their heads. I don't mean this in the usual sense, which deems them incompetent. I mean it in the sense that they've underestimated their enemies. Not the aggrieved Left, who still believe themselves entitled to a Hillary Clinton presidency. I mean the Deep State, an essential component of the globalist military-security-

surveillance complex. I don't think Trump had any idea what he was going up against, how powerful the CIA and other elements of the Deep State really are, or of their capacity to destroy his presidency possibly with plants on the inside.

Sometimes Trump has been his own enemy. He's gotten careless. He's easily distracted and gets off message (e.g., about his daughter Ivanka losing a Nordstrom contract – or whatever it was). He's assumed he could run the government from the White House like it was one of his business empires. Frankly, I was afraid this would happen. Nomi Prins recently took note of the alarming number of former Goldman Sachs people now working in this administration. This is especially troubling given Trump's (correct) campaign allegation that Hillary Clinton was owned, lock, stock, and barrel, by Goldman Sachs. He comes off looking hypocritical. Just the other day, Chuck Baldwin took note of the number of CFR members Trump has (hopefully unknowingly) taken on board.

It's a fair question: can you "drain the swamp," presumably of globalists, when your organization is full of people with present and not just past affiliations with globalist organizations like Goldman Sachs and the CFR?

Be all this as it may, Donald Trump is still doing his part!

Last Thursday, Trump gave a press conference. Having read an article in my (mainstream) Yahoo newsfeed calling it "crazy" and implying that it had been a disaster, I gave it a close listening. Trump made a few trivial errors, such as getting his electoral vote count wrong and claiming he'd gotten the most electoral votes since Reagan. During the Q&A session he seemed (to me) more rattled than usual. But under present circumstances who wouldn't be? He's never been a great speaker. He got important things spot on, however, such as the obvious media bias against him, a bias amounting to sheer hatred. If anything, he put corporate media in its place. They hate that. But as Commander in Chief with access to a great deal of classified information that could be dangerous to the

country if it got out, he's under no obligation to broadcast specific plans regarding Russia or North Korea to a mostly hostile audience.

Trump had to repeat himself more times than I could count, that these claims of Russian interference are an official narrative (my term obviously, not his). He noted, also correctly – this should be a no-brainer! – that given their status as “powerful nuclear countries,” peaceful relations between the U.S. and Russia would be better for everyone than the collision course the two nations were on during the Obama years and would have continued under another warmongering Clinton presidency.

Sadly, the Deep State does not want peaceful relations with Russia. That doesn't fit their agenda, which may not be eventual war (one hopes not!) but a mere continuation of tensions that justify a continued flow of taxpayer dollars into the war machine and the covert Intel apparatus, filled with bureaucrats who pass reports around all day.

And the Deep State serves Trump's real enemies, the globalists. Which is the main reason the Trump administration is in trouble.

I can't know the immediate specifics of the globalist plan. I am sure there is one. I had been assuming that Brandon Smith had the right idea in that the globalists will allow what the controlled media call the “populist” insurgency to continue for a while, prick the global debt bubble (which would remove trillions from the global economy practically overnight), and blame the “populists.” It would be the biggest and most destructive official narrative ever: “populism” (i.e., national sovereignty, local economics, border controls, and all that other “deplorable” stuff) can lead nowhere except to economic devastation!

But maybe that's not the plan! Aside from George Soros

organizations bankrolling a few agents of disruption at places like Berkeley, I see little evidence of globalists themselves doing anything beyond overseeing publications on how terrible the “populist” insurgency will be for the global economy (i.e., how it threatens their moneyed interests), and how it is steeped in ignorance and a rejection of “expertise” (i.e., their agenda for the world). All they need do is wait, while Trump and his administration flounder helplessly against relentless media attacks driven by illegal leaks until it is rendered dysfunctional. Trump’s enemies are salivating at the prospect of his being impeached or forced to resign, as was Nixon, or possibly far worse – for if the charges of his having won an election due to covert Russian intervention he knew about could be made to stick, he could be tried for treason.

That would be the worst punishment the Deep State could inflict on someone who opposed them! Never again would we see an outsider attempt what Donald Trump has attempted, which is to oppose the Deep State and the globalists on their own territory, that of corporate-bought governance and controlled corporate media.

I don’t know that this will happen, of course. I pray that I am wrong, and that Trump will be able to ride this out.

For though I may not know the immediate specifics, I am reasonably sure of globalist goals. I have shelves of books and articles that spell many of them out, sometimes in their own words, and allow us to reasonably infer much more.

Globalism’s primary goal is corporate-controlled world government: a consolidation of wealth and power begun decades ago through the network of central banks anchored at the Bank for International Settlements, which in turn answers to the vast corporate leviathans in the City of London (home of N.M. Rothschild & Sons and the de facto seat, therefore, of the Rothschild-Rockefeller axis of evil; also the Fabian Society,

the Bank of England, the London School of Economics where Soros and David Rockefeller Sr. both earned advanced degrees); furthered through semi-secret “think tanks” such as the CFR and the Trilateral Commission; continued today via “free trade” deals that free corporations to do as they please; and broadcast almost openly via Davos confabs (which Trump has not once attended, by the way).

Once in place, this power structure of power structures would be immune to attack from the outside, as it would control the resources necessary for mounting any sustainable opposition, especially finances and technology.

If the globalists win, no one alive today will ever again see a financially independent middle class, anywhere. There will be limited social mobility, carefully vetted and confined to globalist loyalists like the Mark Zuckerbergs of the world or other tech-obsessed geeks who invent all sorts of cool gadgets and apps but never question the dominant political economy. Those people will be allowed to get rich, as Zuckerberg has, and be praised in controlled media for their “entrepreneurship.” (Yes, Virginia, Zuckerberg is a globalist.)

If the globalists win, there will be no meaningful education; the focus will be on vocation. The potential power of subjects like mine has already been reduced to almost zero, after all. The twentieth century philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein once described our subject as a “battle against the bewitchment of our intelligence by means of language.” Indeed! But where do we see that happening? Almost nowhere!

If the globalists win, there would be little or no work stability outside those tech circles just mentioned. Precarity, it is now called, will be the fate of the masses: labor that is part-time, temporary, consisting of “independent contractors” instead of real employees able to organize and bargain for better wages, work conditions, etc. Saving for

retirement will be a thing of the past. For most millennials as it turns out, this is already true.

If the globalists win, there will eventually be total surveillance of all work and consumer activity – which will be child's play once cash is eliminated in favor of electronic transactions, the use of cash eventually criminalized (only drug dealers, gun runners, and terrorists use cash will be that official narrative).

Needless to say, under corporate-controlled world government there will be no national borders of more than ceremonial significance. Mass migration will still be used to destroy the last remnants of the once-dominant culture in the U.S., a culture that will continue to be demonized as too white and too masculine, but was really too enamored of independence and self-reliance, with its guns and its God.

Speaking of Whom, if globalism wins, mass secularism will be the order of the day, not theism. No politically meaningful Christian activity will be allowed. You may see a contentless "spirituality" or perhaps the prosperity pseudo-gospel of the Jim Osteens or the "purpose-driven" message of Rick Warren (CFR). This is allowable in a culture whose real gods are money and power, and in which you "monetize yourself" or starve.

If the globalists win, there will still be abundant bread and circuses – mass consumption of unhealthy fast food, sports, celebrities, scandals, violent movies out of Hollywood, drugs (legal and illegal), etc., all to pacify the masses, in some cases damage their health, and ensure continued manufactured consent.

There will likely be continued theatrical wars, especially in the Middle East. Possibly the globalists will decide that Muslims have served its purpose and can be safely "terminated with extreme prejudice," as it were. (Islamophobia was never

more than another of those fake phobias, after all.)

For whatever it is worth, the Donald Trumps of our world are all that stand between the present and the rapid development of that world, technofeudalism, the specific political economy of corporate-controlled world government.

If Trump is taken out by the Deep State, that's the future, which we can expect probably within ten years and possibly sooner, depending on how much chaos ensues. I wonder how many of Trump's enemies, whether in the media, on the Left, or wherever, have any idea.

© 2017 Steven Yates – All Rights Reserved

The left's continued self-destruction

Recently I published "Why the Left Has No Credibility." Sadly, things have gotten worse just in the short time since that appeared. There's truth to the adage that just when you think things can't get worse, they do.

Presumably all have heard about the riot at University of California at Berkeley, in response to a planned appearance by Breitbart.com writer Milo Yiannopoulos. A peaceful demonstration, which by itself fell within what the First Amendment protects and wouldn't have led to the cancellation of the speech, turned violent when around 150 people showed up wearing masks. They started breaking windows, setting fires, and physically attacking anyone within reach. Naturally the University had to cancel the event out of legitimate public safety concerns.

The First Amendment, it should go without saying, doesn't protect violence!

These people, who were very well organized, were clearly not students. Robert Reich, formerly Bill Clinton's labor secretary and now a professor out there, suggested (without producing any substantive evidence) that Yiannopoulos and Breitbart.com orchestrated the riots themselves, to lend support to an idea Donald Trump tweeted the next day, that federal funds should be pulled from universities where conservative speakers get shut down by violent protests.

Reich was alleging that the "alt-right" had perpetuated a false flag, in other words.

This is what passes for serious punditry by Established (i.e., paid) columnists these days.

I could have spent 50 years and not come up with a whopper like that! Small wonder these folks have lost control of the national narrative and have to draw on silly memes like "alternative facts."

Later, we learned of the usual George Soros connection. This group was the recipient of a \$50,000 grant from a Soros-funded organization.

Has anyone kept track of how much trouble this one globalist billionaire has caused in his life?

A similar occurrence took place the next night at New York University. The speaker was British-born Canadian author Gavin McInnes, whose commentary routinely appears here. Invited by the College Republicans, he lasted something like 20 minutes in the face of constant heckling and disruptions. Outside, police had to intervene as a near-riot broke out. You can watch the spectacle here – if you've a strong stomach. How interesting that so few people involved in these protests can speak a single sentence without torrents of obscenities pouring out. Note, too, the arrangement of balloons into a

stuffed animal shape mounted on one guy's head as he meanders about lecturing anyone who will listen about "white supremacy."

I'd like someone to tell me how many rights "white supremacists" have taken from anyone this year.

The real fun begins at around 10:15, with a leftie meltdown of volcanic proportions. It makes the one I linked to last week look tame by comparison. She's screaming at the top of her lungs at police, and then, at 11:06, she drops the real bombshell.

She says she's a professor. The way she introduces it, is supposed to give her a badge of credibility.

Her name is Rebecca Goyette, and she portrays herself elsewhere as some kind of artist – look at her public Facebook page.

She's not a real professor, as it turns out (age restricted: again, strong stomachs only!). Maybe, in her delusional leftie-pervert universe, she thinks she's a professor. Who knows?

Some of the onlookers, having heard her say she's a professor and taking her at her word (how interesting, that they would do that), are clearly as bemused as I am ("she's a professor," says someone, presumably scratching his head).

What she is, is a complete nutjob!

What seems clear is that an increasingly violent and deranged Left appears more determined than ever to shut down all conservative presence on campuses – completely. Their favorite words are now fascist, Nazi, neo-Nazi, and white supremacist.

I guess racism, sexism and homophobia are losing their force. Too many people now see through those.

Richard Spencer, credited with coining the phrase alt-right, was doing an interview in Washington on Inauguration weekend when someone lurched out of the crowd and sucker-punched him in the face – on video, no less!

And again, a loudmouthed celebrity, covered by mainstream media, calls for what would amount to a military coup against the Trump administration – not exclusively in response to Donald Trump's attempt to protect America's borders. One need only reflect on the irony: the Left went ballistic when, late in the final Presidential Debate, Trump hesitated to say he would automatically accept the results of a Hillary Clinton victory.

The Left is refusing to accept the Trump victory, and its militancy is getting increasingly dangerous. A journalist and writer I once respected, Chris Hedges, author of the very good *War Is a Force That Gives Us Meaning* (2002), now goes into a weekly torrent of hysterics. In his latest, he calls for resistance to make America ungovernable. He calls for nonviolence, as if not realizing either that the Left already crossed that bridge, or that protesters don't have to engage in open violence to endanger innocent people's lives when, e.g., they are obstructing highways as they've done for the past year now.

Now I'd be the first to admit that Trump's executive order of Friday, January 27, could have been planned better, e.g., written to exempt green card holders, employees of the U.S. government traveling with passports from the affected nations, and others with permanent residency in the U.S. whom, one can presume, have gone through a rigorous vetting process. Had I been Trump, I would have issued a preliminary statement that the order was coming and given as many people as possible it would likely affect sufficient time to get their ducks in a row. But that's just me. I think executive orders are, at best, blunt instruments. Trump hardly invented the executive order as a means of governing. I'm not sure a more nuanced and

careful approach would have made the slightest difference to the angry, violent Left, though.

I've mentioned survivalist writer Brandon Smith's view that Left and Right are being orchestrated into a head-on violent confrontation. He writes, "Instead of admitting that their ideology is a failure in every respect, [the Left is] doubling down. When this evolution is complete, the Left WILL resort to direct violent action on a larger scale, and they will do so with a clear conscience because, in their minds, they are fighting fascism. Ironically, it will be this behavior by leftists that may actually push conservatives towards a fascist model. Conservatives may decide to fight crazy with more crazy." As if to confirm Smith's fears, some idiot Social Justice Warrior threatened this. If he or his buddies actually went through with it, President Trump might see little choice except to send in Homeland Security to deal with the problem. I doubt they would hesitate to use deadly force.

Trump would then be playing into the hands of the globalists just as the Left has been doing. Smith continues, "If under Trump conservatives fall to temptation and exploit the 'ring of power' that is government to exert dominance in the name of stopping the Left, then they will ultimately be destroyed as well. In this case history will not remember conservatives as freedom fighters rebelling against globalist machinations, but as evil 'populists' that caused global economic collapse and the re-establishment of the institution of fascism. The globalists can swoop in after the dust has settled and use the American collapse fable as a story to tell children for the next century. A reminder that nationalism and sovereignty are harbingers of war and death."

You see, not all of us are sure about all that Trump is doing. Smith believes he was the globalists' choice all along. His reasoning is not implausible. Is he "draining the swamp"? Nomi Prins, former banking analyst and strategist turned author of *It Takes a Pillage: Behind the Bonuses, Bailouts, and Backroom*

Deals from Washington to Wall Street (2009) and All the President's Bankers (2014), believes the number of Goldman Sachs people in Trump's administration is more than a mere cause for concern. Prins advocates something Trump has not to my knowledge mentioned: reinstating Glass-Steagall, which would restore the separation between commercial and investment banking. Others on Trump's cabinet such as billionaire Rex Tillerson (former Exxon/Mobil CEO) are accustomed to getting what they want through top-down decrees. Someone better tell him, what might have kept his employees in line won't work with the Chinese, and that he needs to not treat them like adolescent school boys needing to be told how to behave.

There may be the need, that is, for a credible critical stance – a credible “Trumpism” other than Donald Trump and his administration: critical of globalism, favorable towards sensible border security, but better thought-out and articulated, and taking note of the things Trump is ignoring or deeming unimportant. I attempted a possible beginning for such a project here (though I must credit the writer who called himself Publius Decius Mus and essays such as this for inspiration).

I stated in my earlier article that Trump's number one enemies are the globalists, not the Left. The present-day Left, in the U.S. at least, couldn't tie its collective shoelaces without Soros money or cushy academic positions.

The U.S. national debt, as I write, is \$19.97 trillion. Total U.S. indebtedness including unfunded liabilities is, according to some estimates, over ten times that. To the best of my knowledge, Trump has said nothing about this looming debt bomb. He can't possibly not know about it. I am sure Steve Bannon knows about it. He strikes me as a bright guy. If you factor in the even larger derivatives bubble (larger still; its the exact size appears to depend on whom you consult), we are literally sitting atop the largest set of asset bubbles in world history. Much of what even Trump is planning presupposes

that the bubble will last. The problem is, they never do. They always pop sooner or later. Or are popped, when the truly powerful prick them. Something they are quite capable of, as soon as more “populists” are elected (Brandon Smith again).

Marine Le Pen in France who has launched her campaign for the Presidency there as an attack on globalization, radical Islamism, and on calling for a referendum on France’s remaining in the EU. I think she will win. So, I believe, will Geert Wilder, her counterpart in the Netherlands.

The real question: are “populists” being set up to take the fall when the superelite pops the bubble they created?

There is more than a ghost of a chance that we will know before the end of this year! That we will know within four years is probably a given!

The Left is completely unaware of this, of course. Like five-year-olds having temper tantrums when their parents won’t let them play in the street, they have no sense of the real danger. What they have is visibility, due to money, popularity, and the sort of sensationalism that wins visibility these days.

Those of us who are aware of the danger are consigned to Facebook (where we are at the mercy of “algorithms” that weed out unwanted information, so that it simply never appears in newsfeeds), blogs, and sites like this one that may get some Web traffic but ultimately not enough to make a difference. Sad. Truly sad.

© 2017 Steven Yates – All Rights Reserved

The best replacement for Obamacare

“No problem can be solved from the same level of consciousness that created it.” –Albert Einstein

“You never change something by fighting the existing reality. To change something, build a new model that makes the existing model obsolete.” –Buckminster Fuller

The (Un)Affordable Care Act, Barack Obama’s signature legislation, has been a disaster. I probably don’t to argue this before most readers of this site. With the start of the “Trump years,” the GOP-controlled Congress looked to have its best opportunity ever to get rid of this disaster.

Some have gotten cold feet, however. In a sense, this is understandable. As they look at the details and see that since the law went into effect, its fine-print complexities have insinuated themselves deeply into the insurance, health care and Medicare bureaucracies, changing them from the inside to fit its requirements. The idea of striking Obamacare down all at once has its appeal, but to those on the inside, doing so looks like it might risk a situation where, in a very short period of time, not just millions of people are uninsured again, but hundreds of thousands of employees in these industries are left high and dry: needing to make decisions, some medical and some financial, with no idea what the rules now are.

This is the problem when industries are placed under the thumb of massive bureaucracies. The latter make themselves “indispensable.” They expand into new areas, which become the scene of still more constantly-changing laws and regulations. This is also the problem when much of the population hasn’t been educated to think independently. Toss out the rule book,

and they are at sea!

Be this last as it may, we need is to wake up and realize we are kidding ourselves if we think the present mess has a centralized "fix." I sincerely hope "repeal and replace" doesn't mean what it sounds like, because if it does, the GOP will replace one mess with an even bigger mess, and the GOP will own it. I am led to believe Donald Trump is working on a "fix." I hope he doesn't replace one form of centralization for another form of centralization. For the same reason, it won't work, and he will end up owning the resulting mess.

Get rid of this kind of system we must! Its price tag is too high, and many of its "benefits" are illusory. The other day Simon Black (of Sovereign Man) wrote why his elderly stepfather, a Medicare patient, was dropped by his doctor. There is no summing this up:

"... [P]hysicians across the country have been firing Medicare patients; and according to a late 2015 study from the Kaiser Family Foundation, 21% of physicians are not taking new Medicare patients.

"Much of this trend is based on stiff penalties and financial disincentives from the Affordable Care Act (Obamacare), and 2015's Medicare Access and CHIP Reauthorization (MACRA) Act.

"MACRA in particular is completely mystifying.

"The law created a whopping 2,400 pages of regulations that Medicare physicians are expected to know and follow.

"Many of the rules are debilitating.

"For instance, MACRA changed how physicians can be reimbursed for their Medicare patients by establishing a bizarre set of standards to determine if a physician is providing "value."

"As an example, if a patient ends up in the emergency room, his or her physician can incur a steep penalty.

“This explains why my stepdad was dropped by his doctor.

“The healthcare system has been broken to the point that physicians now have a greater incentive to fire their Medicare patients than to treat them.

“One Florida-based physician summed up the situation like this:

“I have decided to opt-out of Medicare, acknowledging that I can no longer play a game that is rigged against me; one that I can never win because of constantly changing rules, and one where the stakes include fines and even potential jail time.”

“The irony is that all these new laws and regulations were designed to “save” Medicare.”

Most people do not know it, but the medical profession has one of the highest rates of mental health disorders such as depression, substance abuse as a form of coping, and suicide. There is abundant malfeasance: absurdly long hours causing sleep-deprivation; there is bullying and abuses of power; etc. Medicine and health care have become extremely high-stress occupations. Burnout is common. A young MD suffering from depression or who has become hooked on “uppers” to stay awake during a 24-hour shift knows he needs help but fears seeking it because doing so could cost him his medical license and end his career.

Moreover, the third leading cause of preventable death is the medical profession itself (exceeded only by heart disease and cancer). Illnesses, injuries and deaths do occur in hospitals due to physician and surgeon error.

A major factor here is drowning medical professionals in thousands upon thousands of regulations they are expected to understand and comply with; penalties for not doing so range from debilitating fines to prison time.

Thus what Americans have is the world’s most expensive, most

bureaucratic, and arguably least functional health care system. This system cannot be “reformed.” It can only be escaped from, until its dysfunction in the face of superior alternatives collapses it. This article is about escaping this system. It will require a paradigm shift of major proportions, especially in this age of entitlements, dependences, and a population that can’t think without a book of rules to follow. We cannot simply “repeal and replace” Obamacare. We need a different way of thinking about public health.

Two preliminaries. (1) We have to realize what disasters like Obamacare and MACRA are intended to do. Obamacare’s primary purpose was not just to insure the uninsured, although doing so, for as many as possible, did make it look good on paper. What Obamacare was intended to do was Make Money for Big Pharma and Big Insurance. Money lost from insuring preexisting conditions was more than made up for via skyrocketing premiums, and deductibles high enough to make the system unaffordable for those of modest means. It and MACRA were designed to increase the level of control over the public as well as over the medical profession. When the federal government can unconstitutionally force you to buy health insurance, and unconstitutionally sic the IRS on you with whopping \$600-plus penalties if you don’t, your aren’t free. As George Carlin put it in one of his best routines (warning: language!), “You have owners! They own you!”

Obamacare may have been designed to fail, to pave the way for a single-payer system. Why is single-payer bad? It works in, say, Denmark, does it not? Perhaps. Denmark’s population is a little over 5 and a half million. Over 324 million people live in the U.S. (more, if you count illegal aliens). It is insane to think a system workable in small countries can be just as effective in a country with a population almost 60 times higher!

So what’s the answer?

Some years ago (late 1990s, to be exact), I took a series of courses in health promotion and education. It was, by most standards, an unusual program. There wasn't a lot about health; leaving aside what I thought even then was an unhealthy obsession with sex, there was far more psychology, directed towards behavior change. I'd been thinking of a new career. I saw useful ideas in the program. But it became clear: what was good here was incompatible with top-down enforcements typical of bureaucracy. What I learned about myself (surprise, surprise): I don't have the patience or temperament necessary to fit into a public health bureaucracy. For one thing, I tend to ask questions instead of following a book of rules blindly. After a couple of stints writing reports for a consulting group (and one collaboration journal article with one of the leaders) I abandoned the career option. But not the ideas, which I've used myself with some effectiveness.

They are the key to the best replacement for Obamacare.

The program called them the Three Levels of Prevention. That, as it turns out, is a misnomer. A far better phrase: the Three Levels of Health Care.

The first level is that of Primary Prevention. The second, Secondary Treatment (my term). The third, Tertiary Care (my term).

I've seen all three in action. The first is by far the most important if Americans, as a society, want to get control over their health care. So I'll spend the most time on it.

Primary Prevention is everything you do to avoid getting sick, injured, etc. It draws on the adage that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. Primary Prevention involves learning about nutrition, including how to read food labels in stores. People who do not do this, are setting themselves up for trouble later in life. I have no special

diets to offer here. I know people who have gotten results with, say, the Paleo Diet. I've not studied specific diets such as this, though, so I cannot be either for them or against them. Since our body systems are all slightly different, as are our habits and levels of motivation, what "works" for one person may not be as effective as what "works" for another. What matters is, you absolutely need to know what you are putting in your body, and be sure it really belongs there. Remember: food corporations and grocery chains don't care. They just want to sell you products and Make Money. It's a buyer-beware world. It is up to us—we, the people—to educate ourselves and each other about what's in our food, and eat the right things. Much of this is common horse sense. You cannot get enough fresh vegetables and fresh fruits. Nuts are also good. Meat is optional; it contains an abundance of protein, but you can live without meat. It is harder to digest than fruits and vegetables. What counts is getting vitamins and other necessary nutrients. I try to eat at least one orange and at least one apple per day. I also feast on broccoli. It was an acquired taste, but I can now eat it cold, with a salad. Cooking it actually robs it of some of its nutritional value.

Primary Prevention may involve learning to grow your own food. When you do, you know exactly what is in it. It involves knowledge about food preparation – what happens to food when ingredients are mixed, cooked, and so on. Primary Prevention has some don'ts. Minimize your alcohol intake. Shrink your caffeine intake. Do without if you can (the latter, alas, is a hurdle I've not cleared – but as a coffee drinker I rarely have more than two cups per morning). By all means reduce your intakes of white bread and sugar. Stay away from high fructose corn syrup laden soft drinks! It is common knowledge that these lead to obesity, and obesity comes with its own set of health risks. But don't do so-called diet drinks, either, as artificial sweeteners come with additional problems. Eat less salt. Steer clear of fast food, unless it's a salad, and other

junk food. And above all, don't smoke!

Never forget, where food is concerned you're invariably dealing with people who have their grubby paws out, waiting for your hard-earned cash. They don't care about your health. They care about Making Money. It is up to you to assume full ownership of your health! That's what Primary Prevention is all about!

Primary Prevention also involves exercise, whether for weight control or other purposes. Joining a health club or gym is optional but not required. Taking long walks is a form of exercise. Primary Prevention involves stress reduction (walking on back streets or roads is again very good for this; so are deep breathing exercises), getting enough sleep at night, establishing a routine for maximum productivity, and other things that, at first glance, might not seem to have much to do with health, but in fact do if your aim is a life that is all it can be: a life of wellness, or well-being that is more than a mere absence of illness.

Lest the preceding sound "new-agish" to some readers, getting right with God and maintaining a prayerful relationship with Him is, in my humble opinion, the ultimate stress reducer and potential maximizer of personal wellness.

Primary Preventive actions strengthens your body's systems. We all learned about the 'germ theory of disease' as children, but "germs" are all around us. The point is for our systems to be able to resist the ones that make us sick. That's called building up our immune systems. Proper nutrition, including sufficient quantities of vitamins, etc., helps accomplish this. As does avoiding risky behaviors of all kinds.

Little if any of this can be had in classrooms. Never forget, too: public education is not designed to truly educate but to socialize, to transform children and adolescents into mindless consumers and obedient sheeple. You must take charge of your

health education.

Ask yourself: which is easier to control: an alert and healthy populace that practices all the above? Or a sickly, overweight, lethargic sheeple who have no idea about nutrition or how to read food labels and no incentive to learn? Which group Makes more Money for corporations, e.g., those which comprise Big Food (Monsanto, Tyson) and Big Pharma (Merck, etc.)?

A healthy population, moreover, does not need as many services from doctors, clinics, hospitals, and so on. A healthy population has fewer worries over who is insured and who isn't.

All reasons why there is little real incentive for serious health education in a society based on mass consumption and control, where Money has become a surrogate for God.

To learn Primary Prevention is to begin to secede from the present-day health care system. To communicate Primary Prevention to one's loved ones is to inspire them to say this, and to educate others in the benefits of health self-reliance.

In that case, what about the other two Levels of Health Care. At the risk of sounding anticlimactic:

Secondary Treatment is medical care in the familiar sense of going to the doctor and getting a diagnosis you hope is correct, prescription medicine you hope will work and not have nasty side effects, etc. Its purpose is to restore your body system to its previous state (health). Always remember: most likely your doctor has been taught only which drugs are most likely to "cure" what, and may know little or nothing about nutrition and Primary Prevention for the reason already stated: they don't Make Money! Your best bet is to minimize your need for Secondary Treatment, and we're back to Primary Prevention. Never forget: these days, for all the reasons stated above, your doctor is under tremendous pressure,

including time constraints as he/she has to cram as many patients as possible into his workday.

I believe that if the present mess continues – if we do not scrap altogether the idea of a centralized health care payment system on the Obamacare model – we will see a shortage of doctors within the next ten years. That alone will make Secondary Treatment less of an option, and not an option at all if you're in the boonies and can't find a doctor to treat you!

Tertiary Care tries to establish new stability after a severe disruption – such as a stroke or a heart attack. My mother was a stroke recovery patient with partial paralysis on her right side, so I saw Tertiary Care first hand. I have encountered claims that strokes can be treated at the Secondary level and their damage reduced to almost nothing if it happens fast enough (within an hour or so). I have not investigated these claims, so I cannot vouch for their authenticity, but they are interesting. Since my parents lived in a rural area, this was not an option for my mom. Her Tertiary Care treatment involved blood-thinning drugs (again, there can be side effects), physical therapy, and speech therapy. Tertiary Care also involves family members: at the time, my father and myself: counseling, patience, fall prevention, how to maneuver a partially disabled elderly person into and out of bed, etc.

Tertiary Care is no fun. Hence it behooves us all to learn what might make it necessary, and we're back to sound nutrition and other best Primary Prevention practices, as these will reduce your risk of heart disease or stroke later in life. It is important to realize that in real health education, we are discussing processes that exact their worst effects after long period of time. Hence to appreciate the value of Primary Prevention is to become a Long Term Thinker. You cannot live exclusively in the present. Indulge today, and you'll pay the consequences tomorrow.

Educating the Three Levels of Health Care offers the only viable way out of our present morass. Has anyone noticed: there is not a word about actual health care in the (Un)Affordable Care Act? Of course not! Again: its purpose was not health care but about how it was to be paid for, and again who Makes Money! I've had economics-types tell me, The problem with Primary Prevention is, it doesn't sell. If that's the case, we can forget about ever again having a healthy population, and about stopping the advance toward a world government that answers to global corporations—including those which profit handsomely from people being sick!

The alternative to bureaucratic, centralized systems – including anything similar that ends up intended to “replace” Obamacare – is to withdraw from them, to refuse to participate in them beyond the minimal requirements of the law. What you withdraw into are systems whose fundamental principle is self-reliance: educating one's own and each other, as opposed to dependence on strangers with their hands out, or on the public education system.

Those who practice Primary Prevention will find their health care costs dropping to almost nothing. They won't need insurance. They won't need Medicare. The problems posed by our present health care nightmare can be made to go away only if the bureaucratic, centralized systems that created the nightmare are rendered obsolete!

© 2017 Steven Yates – All Rights Reserved

Why the left has no

credibility

The other day, information came my way about the fate of Yazidi girls and women at the hands of ISIS. The Yazidi are a Kurdish people indigenous to what was Mesopotamia. They live primarily in what is now the Nineveh Province in what is now northwestern Iraq, although there are Yazidi communities in both Syria and Turkey. Their religion is a blend of Zoroastrianism, Islam, Judaism and Christianity, with links to Sufiism.

They had already been caught between U.S. troops and Iraqi insurgents. Not being Muslims and being a peaceful people, they were sitting targets for the Islamic State.

ISIS militants came to the Yazidi region of Shingal on August 3, 2014. Thousands of Yazidis were killed, kidnapped, or sexually enslaved. The article I received spoke of Yazidi girls being "sold" for a few packs of cigarettes.

Mirza Ismael, who chairs the Yazidi Human Rights Organization-International, said, "Some of these women and girls have had to watch 7-, 8-, and 9-year-old children bleed to death before their eyes, after being raped by ISIS militia multiple times a day. ISIS militias have burned Yazidi girls alive for refusing to convert and marry ISIS men. Why? Because we are not Muslims and because our path is the path of peace. For this we are being burned alive: for living as men and women of peace."

There is, of course, a massive international slave and "sex worker" trade in that part of the world. Girls who have not yet entered puberty, some of them kidnapped, are repeatedly gang raped by ISIS militiamen many of whom are pedophiles. If the girls cry out in protest, they are beaten bloody, often to death. Those who try to escape and are caught can have their noses or ears or hands or feet cut off.

Radical Islam, of course, sees women as less than property. It

is illegal in countries controlled by Radical Islam for women to receive an education. Most can't read or write their native language. They are forbidden to leave their houses without male approval.

I present this live horror show as the perfect backdrop for these highly-touted (by Western corporate media, anyway) women's marches in Washington and other major Western cities following the Trump inauguration, protesting actions they seem to believe the Trump administration is about to undertake.

There were many speakers at these events. One of them, actress Ashley Judd, read a poem in which she asked why "tampons are taxed when Viagra and Rogaine are not."

In this one query, given all we reviewed above, you should see the reasons why the American Left has no credibility – none whatsoever. It had none before the Donald Trump era began on January 20. But now the fact (and it isn't an "alternative fact") is out in the open, or should be.

People like Ashley Judd, other celebrities including far wealthier and more famous ones like Madonna, live in a bubble of privilege – and I don't mean that leftist invention, "white privilege." I mean the privilege of being able to open their mouths and be heard by millions despite their utter cluelessness.

One of the criticisms I sometimes hear of U.S. citizens is that when all is said and done, we know little of what goes on outside our borders. I doubt most Americans have heard of the Yazidi, or know that ISIS overwhelmed them on August 3, 2014. After all, I'm sure Kim Kardashian did something that week!

It is unclear how many women participated in these grandiose marches. What is clear is that they have no idea how well off they are compared to their counterparts elsewhere in the world. As children they were taught to read and write. They went to school alongside boys. As adults they can come and go

as they please, without asking permission. They can go to college and pursue careers. They can gain visibility (with or without actual talent). Some of the world's wealthiest celebrities are American women.

Yes, yes, yes, I know there were women who struggled and fought for those rights. I saw a list on the Left-leaning Medium site just the other day. I also know that today's whiners aren't qualified to polish those women's shoes.

One of their biggest fears seems to be that under the Trump administration and the new GOP-controlled Congress they might lose the "right" to kill their unborn children and have the U.S. federal government pay for it if they can't pay for it themselves, which means taxpayers, some of whom are pro-life, will continue being coerced into helping fund the killing of unborn babies.

They are afraid Planned Parenthood might be defunded and shut down. I have the feeling, though, that the Madonnas and Ashley Judds of the world have enough money between them – that there is enough money in the community of celebrity women generally – that they could keep Planned Parenthood open, privately funded, and serving women's legitimate health needs. I wonder if this has occurred to any of them. Probably not. They would have to stop whining, get up off their celebrated duffs, and start doing something useful.

Why do I keep mentioning Madonna?

Because the other day she was quoted as having thought about "blowing up the White House." When I read that, what raced through my mind was, "Why isn't that a terroristic threat?"

Then Secret Service started looking into the matter. She did some of her fanciest backpedaling, saying her remark was taken out of context. I don't believe she meant it literally, of course. She was just doing what Left-leaning celebrities do best, which is shoot off their mouths. But with the thought

now out on the table, who knows what one of her fanatic followers might do?

The American Left has lost control of the public narrative. Other voices, including from alternative media with alternative narratives, are now being listened to. Leftists can't stand it, and are reacting as they typically do when they can't have their way: getting verbally abusive and violent.

Outside the now-infamous Deploraball [sic.] in Washington the night before the Inauguration, writer James Allsup, a Trump supporter from Seattle, was targeted outside the event by leftist protesters along with some of his fellow attendees. Pushing and shoving ensued. After hearing someone yell, "Die, Nazi!" Allsup was punched while others filmed it, then struck in the head with a metal flagpole. He had to go to the ER for stitches.

This was only one example, and it is hardly an outlier. We reported on the harassment of Trump supporters and attendees of his rallies as far back as last spring, when thousands of University of Illinois at Chicago students took to the streets, compelling Trump to cancel a scheduled appearance out of public safety concerns.

It was not Trump supporters, moreover, who began to shut down major thoroughfares and interstate highways trying to block attendees from reaching Hillary Clinton rallies.

Now there is abundant evidence that the Left is in total meltdown mode. A friend of mine who lives in Texas sent me this the other day.

I know that was painful. She either didn't know she was being filmed or didn't care.

Do these people have any idea how silly they look and sound?

Author and blogger Charles Hugh Smith has a brilliant essay about what happened to the Left. He goes further into the history of Marxism than we need to worry about here, but what it boils down to: their obsessions with political correctness and identity politics cost the Left the support of the American working class.

For all practical purposes, they threw this support away, because so many American workers are straight white Christian males, and straight white Christian males are history's biggest villains, didn't you know?

A lot of Democrats have yet to figure out that had they not throw this obviously important segment of the electorate under the bus, their candidate might have won!

That wouldn't have given the Left credibility. The Clintons sold out to the postmodern religions of money and power years ago; neither would know any other reality if it walked up and bit them. Hillary's arrogant refusal to campaign in certain states was a dead giveaway: she didn't think she'd need the white working class vote to defeat Donald Trump.

She lost each of those states to Trump. Reality always gets the last laugh.

Now, Bernie Sanders has offered to work with Trump on trade issues. Sanders just might be getting it (maybe, I hope).

The American Left's ignorance may be exceeded only by its volume and its capacity for violence, but leftists are not Donald Trump's most formidable enemies.

The globalists – or the superelite, the global elite, or the international financial cartel, call them what you will – are Trump's most formidable enemies. Those paying attention know they just held their annual World Economic Forum confab in Davos, Switzerland. The number one topic: "populist" insurgencies in Europe (think: Brexit, Geert Wilder in the

Netherlands, Marine Le Pen in France) as well as in the U.S., i.e., the growing resistance to their economic domination of the planet, with all its externalities which include the wanton destruction of advanced nations' middle classes and mass migrations caused by their incessant wars. Globalists, incidentally, like wars! Wars are very profitable! Ask those in the upper echelons of Halliburton!

The proximate cause of the European "populist" insurgency is Muslim mass migration which is tearing their countries apart. France, reeling from multiple terror attacks over the past couple of years, has a problem dwarfing anything the U.S. has to worry about.

I've long thought Trump misplayed his hand with Mexicans. He could have pointed out that Mexico's agricultural workers were hurt as badly by NAFTA as the U.S. manufacturing base. He would have had Hispanic communities on his side, as he moves to renegotiate or scrap superelite-driven "free trade" deals and enforce U.S. immigration laws just as Mexico enforces its immigration laws.

Muslims from places where ISIS is now established are far more dangerous. When a leftist whines about Islamophobia – among all the fake phobias the Left has invented over the years, that one has to be the stupidest! – I want to ask her how many more San Bernardino type workplace shootings or Orlando type nightclub massacres she would countenance, and what she would say to families of innocent people killed by newly transplanted Muslim immigrants who turned out to be ISIS sympathizers?

I'm sure the pseudo-intellectuals who championed Europe's open borders policies didn't think they'd be dealing with violent, unassimilable populations destroying neighborhoods in France, Germany, Hungary, Sweden, and elsewhere. So please don't somebody write me and tell me nothing like that could happen in the U.S.

Well, under Donald Trump's watch it won't happen. I think – I hope! – we can be assured of that!

The problem, though, remains the globalists, the superelite. They haven't gone away, and I don't believe for five seconds they are willing to allow one rogue "blue collar billionaire" to upend plans they've been working on longer than most of us have been alive without trying to do something about it – something possibly worse than anything Madonna might have thought up. Just keep in mind: Trump has inherited a mammoth stock market bubble; global debt has never been higher; the only thing standing between the present world and a massive depression is continued money printing by central banks. Were there a planned economic downturn – the Meltdown of 2008 on steroids! – given their control over corporate media, and given the gullibility the Left regularly displays, for globalists to get away with blaming Trump and other "populists" would be child's play!

These are the things that worry me the most right now! Plus the fact that everything the Left is saying and doing to try and weaken and delegitimize Donald Trump plays right into the hands of the globalists.

If the Left wanted to make itself useful, its members would forget their marches and start monitoring pro-globalist sites on the Internet. There are quite a few, actually, like The Economist, Foreign Affairs, Foreign Policy Magazine, Bloomberg, and Project Syndicate. Globalists, in their hubris, cannot keep their mouths shut, either. Across the aisle, survivalist author Brandon Smith has useful advice on how globalists think. My book *Four Cardinal Errors: Reasons for the Decline of the American Republic* (2011) is still in print, as is my "The Real Matrix" series. The latter is incomplete, but not terribly dated.

In other words, now that Donald Trump is President there is work to be done informing those who care about where the real

danger lies. And frankly – I hate to be blunt about it, but – leftists, you are in the way!

© 2017 Steven Yates – All Rights Reserved

The fake news – fake narrative epidemic Pt. 1

The CIA and FBI say Russian hackers influenced, or tried to influence, last November's election, with Vladimir Putin himself directing the covert cyber-attacks. These claims have been made without evidence to back them up. There have now been tens of thousands of references to "Russian hackers" in mainstream media over the past month. Most of these, as a lawyer would say, assume facts not in evidence. I guess repetition counts as evidence these days, however.

Fifteen years ago the CIA said Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction, and that there was a real and living threat he would use them against the U.S. This evidence-free claim led, back in 2003, to the worst foreign policy blunder of the new century, as Bush II launched the Iraq War. Saddam's regime was brought to its knees in less than a month. But then what? An insurgency began; over 4,000 Americans ended up losing their lives; tens of thousands of Iraqis were also killed, with tens of thousands more people displaced as war spread across the region, today's hotspot being Syria. Small wonder Donald Trump could call U.S. foreign policy "complete and total disaster."

No weapons of mass destruction were ever found in Iraq. This turned out to be the fake news story of the decade.

Fake news is the order of our times. In mid-2015, when Trump first announced, his candidacy was a joke. The “experts” said so. He would never be taken seriously. Then, of course, he was. The “experts” went on to say he had no chance at the nomination. Then, as one by one, his empty-suited competitors fell, he did. Trump, who was invoking issues the GOP base cared about such as outsourcing, immigration, globalism, and jobs, began racking up delegate votes, until Ted Cruz was his only opponent. Then he won the GOP nomination. He still had no chance against the Clinton machine. The pundits said so. The major polls all said so. Then Trump won the Presidency!

The rationalizations began. It was “whitelash” (said Van Jones). Then it was James Comey’s fault and Email-gate. Then it was fake news on Breitbart, Facebook, and Twitter. More recently it became Russian hackers. One could make a case for the first of these. Many white people are fed up with political correctness. They have had it with being told they have “privileges.” They are fed up with official narrative on race, gender, homosexuality, and so on. Trump actually said little about these, but what he did say appealed to the white working class. Ergo, he’s a racist, a sexist, and so on. This is Exhibit A in the decline of critical thinking skills amongst the “experts” of our era, and certainly among so-called progressives. At one point, Trump told black America, “Your schools are terrible.” This is the truth. Most public schools are terrible. Some are worse than others, though, and those of the inner cities border on dysfunctional.

We are awash in fake narratives, promulgated in universities and government as well as major media. Fake narratives form the backdrop that gives mainstream media fake news credibility. If the subject is race, the fake narrative begins with the premise that America is a structurally racist society, that what is harming blacks today is the legacy of slavery, not their own behavior; that they continue to face unjust discrimination; that their visceral hostility and

violence is to be blamed on the “white majority,” and that more “education for diversity” is the cure.

If you don't agree, then you're a “basket of deplorables” racist, “irredeemable” and possibly even a “white nationalist” or “white supremacist.”

Thus you will not read about black crime in any general way, even if a few dramatic incidents like the four blacks who kidnapped and tortured the autistic white kid in Chicago might be covered. You will read that Black Lives Matter, but you will be told that to respond, “all lives matter,” is to be racist. You will not read that blacks are 13% of the population but commit well over 50% of all violent crimes in the U.S., and in big cities, this number rises to over 90%, most of it against other blacks. There is far more violent crime by blacks against whites than by whites against blacks. There is far more hatred of whites by blacks than there is hatred of blacks by whites. These, too, do not fit the fake narrative, any more than does the occasional black conservative who has figured all this out. Thus if you assert them, you must again be a “deplorable” and possibly a “white.. Well, you get the idea.

Or take gender, that “social construct” (i.e., academic superstition) that is something other than biological sex. Women are held back by the “glass ceiling”; never mind that one just ran for president and would have won had it not been for the Electoral College. Women, it seems, face hostile environments, because everywhere they go, they face the “patriarchy.”

Universities have a “rape culture” where one in five (one in six? one in four?) girls can expect to be sexually assaulted at some point. Another fake narrative. Recall the “campus rape” story at the University of Virginia fraternity house that Rolling Stone reported? Completely discredited, this sordid tale owes its existence to the fake “rape culture”

narrative. The article has been taken down. I am not surprised. It is embarrassing. Read (I copied and saved portions of it):

“Jackie was sober but giddy with discovery as she looked around the room crammed with rowdy strangers guzzling beer and dancing to loud music. She smiled at her date, whom we’ll call Drew, a good-looking junior – or in UVA parlance, a third-year – and he smiled enticingly back.

“Want to go upstairs, where it’s quieter?” Drew shouted into her ear, and Jackie’s heart quickened. She took his hand as he threaded them out of the crowded room and up a staircase...

Drew ushered Jackie into a bedroom, shutting the door behind them. The room was pitch-black inside. Jackie blindly turned toward Drew, uttering his name. At that same moment, she says, she detected movement in the room – and felt someone bump into her. Jackie began to scream.

“Shut up,” she heard a man’s voice say as a body barreled into her, tripping her backward and sending them both crashing through a low glass table. There was a heavy person on top of her, spreading open her thighs, and another person kneeling on her hair, hands pinning down her arms, sharp shards digging into her back, and excited male voices rising all around her. When yet another hand clamped over her mouth, Jackie bit it, and the hand became a fist that punched her in the face. The men surrounding her began to laugh. For a hopeful moment Jackie wondered if this wasn’t some collegiate prank. Perhaps at any second someone would flick on the lights and they’d return to the party.

“Grab its [sic.] m***** leg,” she heard a voice say. And that’s when Jackie knew she was going to be raped.

She remembers every moment of the next three hours of agony, during which, she says, seven men took turns raping her, while two more – her date, Drew, and another man – gave instruction

and encouragement. She remembers how the spectators swigged beers, and how they called each other nicknames like Armpit and Blanket. She remembers the men's heft and their sour reek of alcohol mixed with the pungency of marijuana. Most of all, Jackie remembers the pain and the pounding that went on and on...

When Jackie came to, she was alone. It was after 3 a.m. She painfully rose from the floor and ran shoeless from the room. She emerged to discover the Phi Psi party still surreally under way, but if anyone noticed the barefoot, disheveled girl hurrying down a side staircase, face beaten, dress spattered with blood, they said nothing. Disoriented, Jackie burst out a side door, realized she was lost, and dialed a friend, screaming, "Something bad happened. I need you to come and find me!" Minutes later, her three best friends on campus – two boys and a girl (whose names are changed) – arrived to find Jackie on a nearby street corner, shaking. "What did they do to you? What did they make you do?" Jackie recalls her friend Randall demanding. Jackie shook her head and began to cry. The group looked at one another in a panic. They all knew about Jackie's date; the Phi Kappa Psi house loomed behind them. "We have to get her to the hospital," Randall said.

Their other two friends, however, weren't convinced. "Is that such a good idea?" she recalls Cindy asking. "Her reputation will be shot for the next four years." Andy seconded the opinion, adding that since he and Randall both planned to rush fraternities, they ought to think this through. The three friends launched into a heated discussion about the social price of reporting Jackie's rape, while Jackie stood beside them, mute in her bloody dress, wishing only to go back to her dorm room and fall into a deep, forgetful sleep. Detached, Jackie listened as Cindy prevailed over the group: "She's gonna be the girl who cried 'rape,' and we'll never be allowed into any frat party again."

This story began to unravel almost at once. Efforts were made

to identify “Drew,” something “Jackie” had refused to do from the start. There was no evidence he existed. And are we really supposed to believe that these people rolled around in broken glass for three hours? Or that following a brutal gang rape, she and her friends would be pondering the future of their social lives?

It turned out that when someone checked its calendar, the Phi Kappa Psi fraternity had not held an event the night of the alleged “gang rape.” As “Jackie’s” friends were located, they had different stories of what happened that night, leaving investigators with an incoherent mess. “Jackie” stopped cooperating. Surprise, surprise.

Had this “gang rape” actually happened as described, would there have been the slightest doubt? Ever knocked a drinking glass to your kitchen floor by accident? Of course you have; we all have. You locate the pieces and pick them up gingerly, unless you want to sustain a few painful cuts. For part two click below.

© 2017 Steven Yates – All Rights Reserved

The fake news – fake narrative epidemic Pt. 2

A girl on her back in broken glass being raped is going to end up with more than a few cuts. She would have been dripping blood and leaving an easily-followed trail as she left the house. The first passersby she encountered outside would probably have called for an ambulance, as obviously she would have needed immediate medical attention. The police would have gotten involved, and probably nailed the boys involved as

they'd also have a few gashes of their own. (It was pitch dark in there, remember? How would they have avoided all that broken glass?)

This was fake news. It didn't happen. But it fit the fake narrative (the campus "rape culture"). That it was published is more testimony to collapsing critical thinking skills at major publications. Rolling Stone used to be a good source for information I'd not see elsewhere. I don't know that I'd trust them now. They may have learned their lesson, given the lawsuits they've faced including from a university administrator contending that her career was badly damaged by "Jackie's" allegation that she didn't take the campus "rape culture" fake narrative seriously enough.

Fake narratives give rise to fake news about "hate crimes" (by, e.g., Trump supporters against minorities) that never happened. Fake narratives are frequently promulgated by intellectually dishonest means. Note how many "phobias" we have now. Homophobia, xenophobia, transphobia, Islamophobia ... did I miss any? A phobia is an irrational fear, of course. There are legitimate phobias, such as claustrophobia and agoraphobia. You don't argue with their sufferers, you try to cure them or manage their conditions if you can.

But try to challenge one of the fake phobias, or fake narratives more generally, and something quite interesting happens. Basket of deplorables type remarks allude to it.

Around the end of the 1980s, I tried on several occasions to reason with my fellow academics about "affirmative action." Silly me, thinking that arguments (in the sense of logic: presenting conclusions backed up with evidence) were what mattered. I once gave a carefully referenced, 30-plus slide presentation on the subject at a humanities conference, showing first how vague the concept and directives on affirmative action were from the outset, how this alone spelled trouble as no one could be sure what the law required,

and then how Supreme Court decisions such as Griggs v. Duke Power (1971) shifted policy from nondiscrimination to racial realignment, presuming an unstated ideal no one could certify was attainable. This, I observed, was the source of common words like underrepresented group, which logically and conceptually presuppose correct representation. Based on this I laid out the reasons why (1) it was not working, if the intent was to increase the representation of black faculty on campuses; (2) one reason it could not work was that government programs cannot "give" people motivation and skills; (3) the number of officially designated underrepresented groups would expand, because federal law had created a spoils system able to be taken advantage of; and finally (4) the results would drive groups apart instead of bring them together. It would breed hostility from white males when they realized their legal disadvantage, and it would breed hostility from blacks when the programs failed. Awarding freebies to some at the expense of others always does this. Always.

I might as well have been talking to the walls.

Afterwards – most of the audience having sat quietly with a constrained chill – I tried to open up a dialogue with a woman who had challenged my motives during the Q&A session. Without looking me in the eye she snapped, "I've heard it all before!"

Eventually I ceased talking to female academics.

Before long I was encountering reasons to believe that purposeful deafness to basic logic when it went up against a dominant narrative was the order of the day on topics other than that one. These included many features of history, where academic historians have a blind spot over what they brand as "conspiracy theories"; they include globalization, which we are assured by economic "experts" is a good thing; they include the origin of life and human origins (evolution), involving myriad claims about states of affairs that are scientifically untestable; they include man-made climate

change over claims which should be testable and rationally decidable, but where we now have scientists resigning their positions over the oppressive conditions this official narrative has created.

Challenge any of these narratives, and you won't be answered with reason. You'll get snarky, condescending responses. You'll be treated as uninformed, unintelligent (or "uneducated"), or worse. A decision to challenge a fake narrative can be career-ending.

A more interesting question is, How did all these fake narratives, the basis for the real fake news of mainstream media, government, and academia, get started? What purpose do they serve? In the case of dominant media, one has to go back a full century. One learns of Oscar Callaway, then a Senator from Texas, writing in 1917 on the controlled press following the loss of his Senate seat due to his opposition to U.S. entry into what became World War I. His observations were entered into the Congressional Record:

In March, 1915, the J.P. Morgan interests, the steel, shipbuilding, and powder interest, and their subsidiary organizations, got together 12 men high up in the newspaper world and employed them to select the most influential newspapers in the United States and sufficient number of them to control generally the policy of the daily press.... These 12 men worked the problems out by selecting 179 newspapers, and then began, by an elimination process, to retain only those necessary for the purpose of controlling the general policy of the daily press throughout the country.

They found it was only necessary to purchase the control of 25 of the greatest papers. An agreement was reached; the policy of the papers was bought, to be paid for by the month; an editor was furnished for each paper to properly supervise and edit information regarding the questions of preparedness, militarism, financial policies, and other things of national

and international nature considered vital to the interests of the purchasers.... This policy also included the suppression of everything in opposition to the wishes of the interests served.

The effectiveness of this scheme has been conclusively demonstrated by the character of the stuff carried in the daily press throughout the country since March, 1915. They have resorted to anything necessary to commercialize public sentiment and sandbag the National Congress into making extravagant and wasteful appropriations for the Army and Navy under false pretense that it was necessary. Their stock argument is that it is "patriotism." They are playing on every prejudice and passion of the American people.

Callaway, who had been attacked in the press for his lack of "patriotism" (rather like the critics of Bush II's war), wanted an official investigation. Nothing was done, and the whole thing fell down the memory hole. Media consolidation has continued ever since. It took a quantum leap when Bill Clinton signed the 1996 Telecommunications Act. This act eased restrictions on media cross-ownership, so that one conglomerate could own multiple concerns. It was part of neoliberal so-called deregulation. What it did was allow the dominant corporate actors to strengthen their control over information through buyouts and mergers. Today over 90% of mainstream media, which includes newspapers, television networks, cable stations, web concerns, magazines and their websites, Hollywood production companies, and much more, is owned by six megacorporations.

It's all about the attempt to control narratives as much as possible. The purpose of fake narratives is to create an artificial reality – often an economic reality where things are rosier than they really are, by, e.g., presenting an "unemployment rate" that excludes you from the labor force if you haven't looked for work in a month. Numbers can be made to look impressive even if they don't mean much. A fake narrative

now is how the Obama administration has overseen a “recovery” with massive job growth, etc.

Economics, however, is now mostly mass psychology. Its purpose is to make the visible national elites look good, just so long as they have the favor of the globalist elites, of course. Obama had that. Trump will not, so that even if his policies bring about a jobs renaissance, we will likely hear nothing except downsides. The fake news story about Russian hackers as well as repeated accounts of how Hillary Clinton “won the popular vote” have already done plenty to delegitimize the Trump presidency before it has even starts.

This isn't over, however. Until the Internet era, media corporations could rely on their narratives for a controlled public. Alternative media has changed the rules of the game. People can get their news from DrudgeReport.com or Breitbart.com or NewsWithViews.com instead of the Clinton News Network (CNN), or MSNBC, or ABC, or even FOX.

Mainstream media have lost control. They want it back! Hence their fake news about “fake news.” If nothing else, it is embarrassing to a multi-billion dollar operation like CNN to be proven wrong over and over, rendered almost irrelevant, by little outfits run on shoestring budgets out of home offices by guy with websites and a handful of researchers and writers most of whom work for free!

But that's what we've got!

Information has never been more widely available than it is today. It might be a good idea to make use of it, because I've got a hunch a crackdown of some kind is coming. That, however, is another article.

© 2017 Steven Yates – All Rights Reserved

Things that matter most

This year has been intense. Probably no one reading would argue with that. Perhaps, with the Christmas / New Year's Eve 2016 season having arrived, the time has come to step back from all the politics and reflect on what matters most in human life. I haven't written a whole lot about my Christian beliefs. This article will be an exception.

Exactly one year ago, I was spinning out an article series on materialism and how inadequate it is on all fronts as a worldview. What is the ultimate grounding of value? It isn't to be found in politics, or economics.

Recently I've been involved in a discussion group based here in Santiago.

We've met once a week, each Wednesday at noon, to have lunch and study Colossians. As time passed, we found ourselves with a larger project: communicating those things that matter most, and how to approach different audiences. While our theologies haven't meshed perfectly at every juncture, we agree on what follows.

The first thing to communicate is that man is a sinner. Do we not, every day, do things we shouldn't do, and think thoughts we shouldn't have? All of us, if we're honest. Human nature is sinful. "For all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God." Rom. 3:23.* Humanism, in whatever form, denies this. It implies we can build Utopia here on Earth, or create its conditions. But if Paul was right, we have an explanation why all attempts to do so, whether coming out of the individualistic and capitalistic economic philosophies that began with Adam Smith and Carl Menger or with the collectivist and Marxian ones that came later, have failed or become

corrupted.

Sin stands at the root of all personal and institutional failure, all corruption whether in politics or business, all war and violence, all casual cruelty, and many other sources of grief. The humanist believes we can conquer these ourselves: with better education, more economic growth, better political leadership, or still more advances in science and technique. Recent history suggests otherwise. Our educational institutions are a disaster. Our economy has been hijacked by a tiny, unaccountable power elite. We've just turned our political system over to Donald Trump and the cabinet he is assembling. We have little choice but to pray for the effectiveness of the new administration, but it would be a grave mistake to place too much hope in any one human being or in any team he assembles.

The consequences of sin are worse than earthly ills, however.

"The wages of sin is death ..." begins Rom. 6:23. Death in this context doesn't mean mere physical death of the human body. It means permanent separation from a perfectly holy God whose absolute holiness cannot accommodate the presence of sin.

But what is important here – and what we celebrate during Christmas season (or should) – is that this perfectly holy God made the ultimate provision for us. The above verse continues, " ... but the gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord."

We cannot save ourselves, but Jesus Christ can save us. "But God demonstrates His own love toward us, in that while we were still sinners, Christ died for us" (Rom. 5:8). This might seem a tall order. Unbelievers typically cannot get their brains around it. Christ took the punishment for our sins. Having been both God and man, and therefore the one man to walk the Earth sin free, He went willingly to His death on the Cross with our sins placed on Him – to be resurrected again sinless,

the “wages” of our sins paid for.

These were supernatural acts – theological mysteries our rational intellects were not designed to fathom. Those who place their trust in their intellects alone, therefore, usually turn away. But: “Trust in the Lord with all your heart, and lean not on your own understanding,” warns Proverbs (3:5). Our rational intellects may solve a lot of problems in this world (or not). They will never solve the problem of human sin and our eternal destiny, because they are themselves tainted by sin.

So what must you do to get around this? Your best bet is to become a Christian, if you have not done it already? As did the founders of Western science, early modern philosophy, and philosophical theology, who understood that in the absence of a God who is not just perfectly holy but perfectly “rational” in His creative powers, Western science had no basis, for there was no reason to assume the world is a place of discoverable order and not ultimate chaos. The trajectory of the postmodern academic intellect towards skepticism, nihilism and despair seems to confirm this.

The Psalmist says (19:1) “The heavens declare the glory of God ...” Paul told the Romans (1:20), “For since the creation of the world His invisible attributes are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and God head, so that [we] are without excuse” (1:20).

One of the most fascinating things about modern space exploration is the uniqueness of every celestial body our unmanned probes have approached and photographed. I expect this to continue as our technological capacity to peer into the depths of space and into other solar systems increases. Physicist Hugh Ross, moreover, once listed a concatenation of over 20 physical constants and other measurable phenomena of this universe and our Earth and observed that if any of them was only slightly different (sometimes by a billionth of a

percentage point!), life on Earth would be impossible!

Are we really supposed to believe with the materialists that all of this, and all we are, are collective cosmic accidents?

Returning to our personal, Earthly situations, Paul advises, again in Romans, "if you confess with your mouth the Lord Jesus and believe in your heart that God has raised Him from the dead, you will be saved" (Rom. 10:9-10). And most famously, from John's Gospel (3:16): "For God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believes in Him shall not perish but have everlasting life."

This alone, not honoring rituals such as going to church on Sundays and taking communion, or doing good deeds, or even devoting one's life to serving others, are sufficient. "For by grace you have been saved through faith, and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God, not of works, lest anyone should boast" (Ephesians 2:8-9).

So no, Christians do not have a monopoly on moral behavior. No honest Christian says he never sins; the most he can say is that his sins are forgiven. We are obligated to turn from sin and try to be more Christlike. We may not succeed. No, I take that back. We will not succeed. Christians remain sinners, but their sins have been forgiven, and they can be assured of living eternally with God in the Next Life, where there is no sin.

No other faith provides this assurance. With Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism, etc., at their best, one is never sure one has done enough, or has followed the "paths" sufficiently. This is because all other faiths offer whatever rewards they offer contingent on actions taken by us. Christianity alone sees this as futile. Christianity says, there is nothing you can do about your sinfulness except confess it to Jesus, ask Him to save you, and then sincerely and prayerfully turn from it. Perhaps this is why Christianity is so unpopular. It is

humbling in its unsparing account of human nature. But its plan of salvation is simplicity itself, defying all intellectualizing.

This surely applies to our political thinking as we begin a New Year – a year likely to be as troubled and unrestful as this one was, possibly more so.

I and others have argued passionately that a power elite – or superelite – has come to dominate world affairs from behind the scenes, typically operating through global finance but hardly limited to that. Superelite dominance did not begin yesterday. There is a sense in which this kind of outcome is virtually inevitable in a world that is developing economically and advancing technologically while remaining in sin: both because a minority of persons are fascinated with power and pursue it to the exclusion of all else (money having become a fast track to power in the West), and because the majority has unwittingly given them power, trading freedom for security and avoidance of toil. “Make us your slaves, but feed us,” Fyodor Dostoevsky’s cynical Ivan Karamazov mocks the masses in the classic “Grand Inquisitor” section in *The Brothers Karamazov* (1880).

The idea of a consolidation of secular power is perfectly compatible with Biblical Christianity: “Finally, my brethren,” writes Paul, again to the Ephesians, “be strong in the Lord and in the power of His might. Put on the whole armor of God, that you may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. For we do not wrestle against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this age, against spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places....” (6:10-12f.).

Paul was writing in the first century A.D. He could have been writing to us in the twenty-first. His words would be just as true. Check this out. (Warning before clicking that link: disturbing images! Under no circumstances should children view

it!)

Is that a Satanic ritual, or was someone with an incredible amount of money to burn, an amount sufficient to fund a performance like that, just incredibly bored that day?

We would be remiss to place our full confidence in any one human leader, or any one political party, or any one agenda. As an expat I've become acquainted with folks who urge a complete withdrawal from the "bread and circuses" of politicking, participating in elections by voting, etc. Their idea of liberation is to form small groups and even autonomous colonies "off the grid," as it were. I am sympathetic to such notions, which, if by some chance the Trump administration is sabotaged, may be inevitable. But if such groups are not organized along Christian principles, they, too, will fail and leave their supporters even more disillusioned and bitter.

One of the things non-Christians cannot wrap their brains around is the presence of evil in the world in the form of seemingly unrecompensed suffering? Why does God permit such things? Why do evil men often soar to the top in this world? That it made sense to ask such questions was evident to the earliest Christian philosophers. Augustine of Hippo (354 – 430 A.D.) wrote about it. "Where then is evil?" he pondered. "What is its origin? How did it steal into the world?... Where then does evil come from, if God made all things and, because he is good, made them good too?" His answer comes down to original sin and rebellion against God, which tainted creation itself (Gen. 3:17-19). The larger answer is that God "sees the big picture." We do not, and cannot.

It might be useful to remember that nowhere does Scripture promise Christians a life free of suffering, especially for their beliefs. If anything, Scripture promises it! "Blessed are you when they revile and persecute you, and say all kinds of evil against you falsely for My sake," says Jesus. He continues, "Rejoice and be exceedingly glad, for great is your

reward in heaven, for so they persecuted the prophets who were before you" (Matt. 5:11-12). Remember, too, whatever we suffer is trivial and minuscule compared to what Jesus Christ suffered, both prior to and during his crucifixion – easily one of the most brutal, prolonged, and torturous forms of execution sinful, sadistic humans have ever devised!

So our task, hard though it may sometimes be, is get things into perspective and "keep our eyes on the prize," as it were. We were not put here to fashion a Utopia on Earth. I keep hearing about some group called Dominionists. I think it is mostly critics and haters of Christianity using that term; I cannot find much evidence of such a group or ideology called that which has much influence over our secularized body politic.

There are people in what used to be called the New Right who fell into this kind of trap, however. And others advocate something just as misguided, the so-called prosperity gospel ("Jesus wants you to be rich!"). The Jesus of history instructed us, "No one can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one and love the other, or else he will be loyal to the one and despise the other. You cannot serve God and mammon" (Matt. 6:24).

Be all this as it may, it should be clear: Christians need to be very, very cautious in their political thinking, and not fall into thinking they have what it takes to build a Utopia, be it a Utopia of politics or a Utopia of money. We cannot build such a thing by our own efforts, any more than we can save ourselves by our own efforts.

What does Scripture say instead?

"These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them from afar off were assured of them, embraced them and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth. For those who say such things declare

plainly that they seek a homeland. And truly if they had called to mind that country from which they had come out, they would have had opportunity to return. But now they desire a better, that is, a heavenly country. Therefore God is not ashamed to be called their God, for He has prepared a City for them." (Hebrews 11:13-16).

Doesn't sound to me like a command to build a Dominion (or some such thing).

The truth: in this world, Christians are bound to be outsiders! And this is a good thing!

But "as it is written: 'Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor have entered into the heart of man, the things which God as prepared for those who love Him" (I Cor. 2:9).

And: "Fear not, for I am with you; be not dismayed, for I am your God. I will strengthen you, yes, I will help you, I will uphold you with my righteous right hand" (Isaiah 41:10).

To my faithful readers: Merry Christmas! And Happy New Year!

*All Biblical quotations are from the New King James Version (1982).

© 2016 Steven Yates – All Rights Reserved

The attempt to steal the presidency from Donald Trump

I'd hoped they would go away: the unsupported allegations that for all intents and purposes Russian hackers hijacked the November 8 election. Even though not even the FBI has endorsed

these allegations, and there is doubt within the ranks of the agencies themselves over “fuzzy” and “ambiguous” CIA conclusions, yet another official narrative is falling into place, trumpeted within the halls of government and from all mainstream media outlets – and an extremely dangerous one at that!

I am getting the impression, observing day by day, this is worse than I imagined it would be. I’d thought, following a federal judge’s declaration the other day, that the adults would prevail. Now, I am not so sure. For starters, Electoral College electors, especially in swing states, are being bullied and harassed 24/7! Some are reporting having received death threats! Their names and contact information have been made publicly available on websites put up by irresponsible left wingers! Some electors now fear for their safety and the safety of their families!

It should have been clear long ago: many leftists are basically unhinged. If you want to see how unhinged unhinged can get, check this out. I had enough confrontations in the old days to know this (exchanges of letters to the editor, later in online forums which I soon gave up, a few by email, a very few face-to-face). I am not sure how far leftists will go, how much mayhem they would risk, to prevent someone whom they hate with a passion from entering the White House next month, as he represents everything they scorn and despise.

Here is the situation: as Trump had 306 electoral votes when the dirt settled, 270 having been required to claim the presidency, if 37 electors can be persuaded to change their votes on Monday to someone else, they officially deny Trump the presidency and throw this election into the House of Representatives. A hard-left “Constitutional” law professor at Harvard (where else?), Larry Lessig, is offering legal counsel to the 20 electors (so far) who are contemplating changing their votes – in light of the allegations about the Russians, about which they are demanding more information. Democratic

Party insiders (e.g., John Podesta) are irresponsibly fanning these flames. (Here)

Should this happen, at least three possibilities ensue. (1) The GOP-controlled House could do the sensible thing and vote for Trump. (2) They could vote to install Hillary Clinton and defend their action by saying she won the popular vote, which would show that they no longer accept, or realize, that the U.S. is not a direct democracy. (3) They could throw their weight behind an Establishment Republican who wasn't even on the ballot, whom no one (except moneyed interests) would see as legitimate!

Team Trump will already have appealed to the Supreme Court for intervention (one hopes!). It is hard to know what the latter would do. What amounted to a soft coup would be technically legal. But the technically legal thing is not necessarily the sensible thing. Were either Congress or the Supreme Court to uphold a choice for anyone but Trump, given his Electoral College victory on November 8, they risk massive civil disobedience. The reason is not hard to see. One reason many people, especially middle class and rural working class whites, voted for Trump is their having gotten fed up with being discriminated against, bullied, ridiculed, and humiliated by what they increasingly see as an alien and hostile "blue" culture of the big urban areas. Now that they have made a difference in the voting booth, playing by the rules, if this election is stolen (this is how they will perceive it, and I doubt they will be much interested in legal niceties), I wouldn't be surprised if many refuse to sit still and just take it!

Even if the so-called Hamilton Electors get cold feet on the 19th, on January 6 their votes are counted. Trump could still be denied the presidency on January 6!

Trump won this election by rules that have governed elections for as long as I or anyone else reading this have lived! An

official decision for anyone else, whether it came from the House or from the Supreme Court, would be reasonably interpreted as a coup! Whoever made the final decision would own the consequences, which could be very serious!

Beginning on Monday, in other words, the U.S. enters a period of extreme danger! We know Trump has enemies. Trump's worst enemies, I submit, are not these unhinged lefties, much as they'd like to think so, but the far wealthier and more powerful globalist superelite whom Trump has stood in opposition from the get-go. He is the only Republican to have used the term globalism! This speaks volumes about the level of threat he represents, openly exposing their actions!

Trump's worst enemies won't try to assassinate him, as some fear. That would be too obvious. I wouldn't put it past some leftist loon to take a shot at him, especially if January gets here and all efforts to derail a Trump presidency have failed. Such a person would discredit the left even more completely than it has already been discredited by events of this past year, getting every poll and every prediction about Trump's chances of winning this election dead wrong. But I doubt the loon would be thinking in those terms.

What none of us peons can fully discern, of course, is the exact superelite strategy for undermining and destroying the freedom (i.e., "populist") rebellion that has been gaining ground all over the Western world against their brand of political-economic domination. Does it involving trying to destroy the Trump presidency with a massive economic downturn, as Brandon Smith believes (and has a very sensible argument)? The Federal Reserve, which just raised interest rates on the strength of the meaningless U-3 unemployment number, could create conditions for such an event with more rate hikes, or by turning down the money printing spigot which has been propping up the Obama-era house-of-cards economy.

Or could the plan be to allow leftists to destroy the Trump

presidency before he ever gets into office, empowering them to attack “populists” elsewhere, e.g., in France? Marine Le Pen’s National Front is making headway there, given the string of terrorist events as well as the transformation of entire neighborhoods in and around Paris into third world hellholes, attributable to Muslim immigrants that would not be there absent the EU’s open-borders policies. Antiglobalists understand that if you don’t have border protections you soon don’t have a country.

These latest threats to the Trump presidency, let us not forget, are based on allegations for which no evidence has been shown to exist: the claim that Russian hackers tilted the outcome of the November 8 election in Trump’s favor. All we have are anonymous claims and supposed evidence, at the time of this writing still behind closed doors, assuming it exists at all. This from the same organization that told us how Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction, the result being a destructive war-of-choice the consequences of which are still being played out. This is the same organization, incidentally, that created the “conspiracy theory” meme back in the 1960s, a meme that, for half a century now, has been highly successful in circumventing evidence-based criticisms of government-approved narratives.

We are supposed to accept these pronouncements about Russian hackers on faith? How stupid do they think we are, anyway???

Incidentally, no one appears to have a problem with George Soros or the Saudis having generously supported Hillary Clinton! If these do not constitute “foreign interference” with a U.S. election, then what does?!

Hypocrisy, thy name is the American Left!

First, it was “whitelash,” one-time Communist Van Jones’s term – given that white has become, all by itself, a term of disdain in far-left circles, racist in any logical sense of

that term. Then it was the FBI, accused of hurting Clinton's chances with its 11th-hour allegations which (I believe purposefully) went nowhere, on which Smith based his conclusion that Trump was the globalist superelite's desired victor, as they want someone they consider an ideological foe in the White House who can then take the fall when they pull the plug on the house-of-cards economy. Then it was this "fake news" stupidity (solidly smacked down here). Now it's the Russians. Anyone with a functioning brain knows that had Hillary won and Trump alleged Russian interference, he'd be dismissed as a "conspiracy theorist."

The Left, of course, gets a pass on such things!

What experience I have had (in the past as an academic, and then more recently) has only reinforced my conviction that most leftists are what Lenin called "useful idiots": people some of whom believe they are the movers and shakers of modern events but are actually as helpless as they are clueless, as without the money flows coming from the George Soros of the world, they would all be forced to get real jobs waiting tables or emptying hospital bedpans.

I cannot foresee clearly how the immediate future plays out. What is clear: Trump's real enemies are the globalists, the superelite, not American leftists most of whom cannot think their way out of wet paper sack. The globalist superelite cannot be properly described as either "left" or "right." Worship of money and unbridled power have no ideology. Globalists make nice with Communists, or for that matter, with Fascists, if doing so will advance their goals. They place no value on individual human lives, which they have used as cannon fodder for generations, bankrolling both sides of bloody wars which "cull the herds."

Make no mistake about it: these people are evil in any sense of the word one wants. Their goal is to establish a global state (world government) that will serve, and be served by,

the leviathan corporations they control, and which will be used to institute a monoculture based on mass-consumption, obedience, and systems of reinforcements and Orwellian persuasions intended to (as Chomsky once put it) “keep the rabble in line.”

One can only hope that the Electoral College electors will remain steadfast, and stand their ground against something unprecedented. They accepted this responsibility when they agreed to be electors, although I have a problem with the idea that having to deal with personal threats is what they signed on for. I am hereby praying, and am requesting prayers, for their safety and for the safety of their families, as they do the right thing on Monday. Should they fail in this task, caving into leftist demands, one can then hope and pray that the House of Representatives, or if it comes to it, the Supreme Court, will do the right thing, the sensible thing, and allow put Donald Trump in the White House according to the rules governing U.S. elections put in place over 200 years ago. Otherwise they will be responsible for whatever happens next, be it a “presidency” which will never be deemed legitimate even if it is tolerated in the interests of national peace, or be it massive civil unrest and possibly worse!

© 2016 Steven Yates – All Rights Reserved

Donald Trump and the fourth turning

In 1997, William Strauss and Neil Howe published their *The Fourth Turning: An American Prophecy* (Broadway Books). The

book triggered something of a national conversation which continues to this day. Their thesis was that U.S. history has passed through lengthy cycles, each lasting 70 – 75 years. Each cycle comes divided into smaller units called turnings. Each turning has its own cultural identity, preoccupations, and mood.

According to *The Fourth Turning*, the first turning in any cycle is called a High. The second, an Awakening. The third, an Unraveling. The fourth, a Crisis. Highs are characterized by strong institutions and institution-bound values, conformity, and a generalized spirit of optimism. An Awakening calls institutions and their values into question. Individualism appears, via demands for free expression; conformity is increasingly rejected, but not optimism which is into cultural idealism and a mass desire for transformation. Eventually the Awakening gives way to an Unraveling. The preceding values have lost their legitimacy, but it is increasingly unclear what replaces them. People decide this for themselves. A do-your-own-thing individualism thus reigns. Optimism gives way to cultural pessimism, especially among those still loyal to preceding valuations. Finally, a Crisis hits, often in the form of a severe shock to the body politic or the economy. Sometimes other transitions from turning to turning are marked by sudden jolts, although this is not always the case.

Different turnings give rise to generations with different mindsets based on how they are raised and what is happening around them when they come of age. A Prophet Generation is born during a High and comes of age during an Awakening. Their parents are often authoritarian, in tune with the spirit of the High, and their children rebel. Think of the Baby Boomers, who ranged across the hippies and “consciousness raising” gurus to the first high-tech whiz kids such as Steve Jobs. A Nomad Generation is born during an Awakening and comes of age during an Unraveling. Think of so-called Generation X: latch-

key kids, punk rockers, goths in black, etc. Their parents were busy "finding themselves," and the economy was also beginning to struggle, forcing both parents into the workforce. They were often on their own psychologically, and adapted.

A Hero Generation is born during an Unraveling and comes of age during a Crisis. Their parents were often just trying to survive. They learn resilience, and sacrifice for the future. I think of my parents' generation, who fought and won World War II and went on to build the real economic boom of the 1950s – 1960s. The Millennials fall into this category now, which means that whatever has been dumped on them (soaring college tuition and massive debt amidst a lousy job market), much may be required of them in the near future if the country is to survive intact. Finally, an Artist Generation is born during a Crisis and comes of age during a High. They often serve as foot soldiers for the Heroes but also, through their works, begin to inspire the next generation of Prophets. Read William Whyte's *The Organization Man* (1956) or Alan Harrington's *Life in the Crystal Palace* (1959). Or Jack Kerouac's *On the Road* (1957), one of the defining novels of the Beat Generation which preceded the hippies. The oldest of the upcoming generation of Artists are in their teens. They will come of age during the next High.

When Strauss and Howe wrote *The Fourth Turning*, the country was eyeball-deep in an Unraveling: NAFTA, the unending Clinton scandals, the credit-fueled tech bubble, the so-called culture wars, growing anxiety about international terrorism, etc. Strauss and Howe predicted that something nasty would end the Unraveling. Their timetable suggested it would happen within five years. On September 11, 2001, the Twin Towers fell. Media regaled us for days with images of the burning towers.

However one interprets those attacks, the mood of the country changed dramatically. A Crisis shakes national identity as events play out. The nation emerges changed, redefined, with

new goals and new values. The stage is set for the next High.

Are these cycles real? Begin with 9/11 and go back 72 years. What do you find? The Crash of '29, which ended the so-called Jazz Age portrayed in such classics as *The Great Gatsby* (1925) by F. Scott Fitzgerald, a Nomad born during the early Progressive era (an Awakening). Go back another 69 years. We encounter South Carolina's Ordinance of Secession (December 1860), the opening salvo that set conditions for the bloodiest war ever fought on U.S. soil: a Crisis in any sense of that term. By the time it was resolved, original federalism involving dual sovereignty and states' rights was dead. The cycle before that began following the battle over the Constitution's acceptability and eventual ratification (1791).

Thus the most recent High in the U.S. began with start of the post-war boom (1947-48) and ended with the Kennedy assassination (1963). My six-year-old mind knew something dreadful had happened to the country. The ensuing Awakening continued for perhaps 20 years, into the Reagan era. The country had been through a lot: the campus rebellion and aftermath, the disastrous conflict in Southeast Asia, Watergate, the Iranian revolution / hostage crisis, and more. But the idealism that took root during the 1960s was still around and had transformed a lot of minds and lives. This was true across the political spectrum. One saw a firmly entrenched academic left, but also the libertarian movement and resurgent conservatism.

In the early 1980s, that is, it was "morning in America." But what became clear with 20/20 hindsight was that we'd entered a period of national drift. Conservatism, Ronald Reagan notwithstanding, lost its identity; by the mid-1990s leaders of those who self-identified as conservative had few ideas what they wanted to conserve, aside from abstractions like "family values" and the U.S. as the "exceptional nation." An Unraveling is a period of great change.

Some of the changes may be good: the tech revolution and the

Internet.

Others are not so good: this era also gave rise to Clintonism and a war machine that rivaled anything the Soviet Union had come up with – willing to impose “liberal democracy” on the rest of the world by force so global corporations could make billions.

According to one account, the last Unraveling came to a screeching halt with 9/11. Other who conduct Fourth Turning discussions hold out for the Meltdown of 2008 as the beginning of the ensuing Crisis. I prefer the former, as we clearly crossed a threshold that day, but see no point in starting an internecine war over the matter.

Everyone who studies this agrees: we have been in a severe Crisis for a sufficiently long period of time that resolution, one way or another, is imminent!

Thus we come to the Donald Trump victory, and the Trumpist brand of economic and cultural rebellion against globalism, elitism generally, and political correctness.

It is important to note that the Strauss-and-Howe version of recent history is only partially deterministic. The cycles and patterns of turnings may be fixed, but not the specifics. A given turning might be similar economically to its ancestor 70-odd years before, but otherwise sharing little by way of mood.

The Crisis of the 1930s, the Great Depression, retained a sense of optimism because the people were still basically Christian. Some suffered terribly, but God was in charge. Anyone who doubts this need only listen to the upbeat big band music and swing that was popular during that era. The present Crisis has occurred in a country secularized and turned materialist during preceding turnings – and gone nihilistic. No one is “in charge.” We inhabit a violent world in a dead universe. Listen to our gangsta-rap, heavy metal, or Goth

rock, or note how many rock stars have either died young (often from drug overdoses) or committed suicide (Ian Curtis, Kurt Cobain).

Nothing guarantees that the cycles and turnings will continue indefinitely. A sufficiently destructive war would put an end to the whole shebang in one fell swoop. Still larger discernable civilizational cycles suggest that the pattern Strauss and Howe claim to have discovered is only temporary.

There are no guarantees, that is, that our present Crisis will end well. It depends on what Donald Trump does in office, who he surrounds himself with, whether or not the resulting administration is able to function amidst the hostility presently coming from the alliance of globalists, so-called progressives, and corporate media types, and how much it can accomplish.

I can envision two conceivable scenarios.

One: Trump continues to confound the "experts." He confounded them by winning the GOP nomination and then the presidency. Some who worked for Trump believe that his administration could lead an economic renaissance. A friend of mine wrote from my former home state of South Carolina:

"... I am of the opinion that our economy has been depressed, just barely above flatline for the past ten years, in spite of running the printing presses. I think the economic policies outlined by President-Elect Trump will create lots of good paying middle class jobs. Particularly if he follows through with deporting aliens, cutting the corporate tax rate, and renegotiating trade deals. Once the middle class has employment security again, there is a HUGE pent-up demand for consumer goods, including houses and cars, that people have been deferring because of ten years of economic hard times. I see a real boom. If the boom happens based on private sector money, and real demand, as opposed to government subsidies and printing presses, it will be an actual boom, not just an

artificial bubble. Allowing American energy production will turn much of the U.S. into a Williston, N.D. style boom town. Get rid of Obamacare mandates and employers will be ready to hire again.”

This, of course, is predicated both on Trump being able to govern and people’s being ready and able to go back to work. Is Trump truly independent or not? The relentless attacks by so-called progressives and via corporate media surely suggest so. So-called progressives on college and university campuses are increasingly embarrassing themselves with their “cry ins” and counseling sessions since the election. Academics were blindsided because with few exceptions they’ve been living in a leftist echo chamber, talking only to each other, as with elite media based in big cities.

The latter are launching a rearguard action against “fake news” sites (Breitbart.com, Infowars.com, Drudge, your host here, etc.), i.e., trying to reclaim their territory now that this election has seriously damaged their credibility – an effort hardly helped by their lunatic notion that “the Russians did it!” Think about it: despite the most blatant media bias we have ever seen, pollsters who consistently put Hillary Clinton in the lead, countless “experts” who said she would win in a landslide, and attacks from within his own party, Trump won! “Alternative,” Internet-based media promoted him, along the way debunking the nonsense about his “racism,” his “sexual assaults on women,” his “ties to the Russians,” etc. It has become increasingly clear that mainstream media, over 90% of which is controlled by six leviathan corporations all in bed with globalism, is filled with overpaid empty suits and is propped up by consumer habit, propaganda, celebrity titillation, the wealth of its owners, and very little else.

Should Trump bring about the desired business renaissance amidst a new spirit of nationalism and a repudiation of PC rubbish, the stage will be set for one kind of High.

The second scenario isn't as optimistic. Brandon Smith has argued at length (here, here, here, here, and here, with abundant other relevant analysis on the same site), that despite all this, those I call the superelite wanted, and planned for, a Trump victory. In this case, all of us including yours truly were fooled. We made the assumption that a Trump victory would damage the globalist cause and so would not be allowed; Hillary was their woman. But according to Smith, she was not their choice, he was. If this sounds crazy, consider: (1) Despite her connections and support, it is possible the globalists were never at ease with Hillary Clinton because of her obvious egotism and arrogance, the likelihood that she and her husband would use her presidency to pad their wealth and promote their foundation rather than serve superelite goals; her clear recklessness and dishonesty; ongoing scandals sure to mar her presidency and distract from what they wanted done; her explosive temper; and her predilection to provoke Russia for no good reason, a predilection clearly still in evidence.

Smith's argument: (2) globalists despise "populists" as loudmouthed, inferior rabble, and have seen at least two golden opportunities this year to set them up. The first was Brexit; the second was the Trump victory. Smith argues that they will allow "conservative populism" room to breathe across the northern hemisphere, perhaps for a year to a year and a half, and then pull the plug on Western house-of-cards economies, especially Great Britain and the U.S. propped up by money printing and creditors' blind faith. The British collapse, possibly spreading to the EU itself, will be blamed on Brexit, while the U.S. tailspin is blamed on Trump. Elite-controlled media and academia will contend that the reason the economic and financial worlds collapsed was that "populists" have no grasp of economics and hence no idea what they are doing. I have acquaintances in academia who are already sounding this conditioned response, calling Trump "incompetent," a "buffoon," when not reciting the usual litany

("racism, sexism," etc.). Trump cannot, after all, single-handedly, by sheer force of will, build his economic renaissance without the cooperation of many others who – in this scenario, anyway – are only feigning loyalty to his success.

The economic uptick of the two weeks following the election (the Dow's surge, a stronger dollar, etc.) might well lend support to this idea. These suggest that big business is happy with Trump. The idea here is that the superelite is taking a step back in preparation for a large leap forward, while supplying us plenty of bread and circuses in the form of campus protests and attempts to undercut the Electoral College. These will prove futile: the former, as we noted, are only embarrassing themselves; the latter would open an unprecedented legal and constitutional Pandora's Box.

The Crisis, in this case, will culminate when the plug gets pulled, the "global economy" tanks as hundreds of billions in fiat money simply disappear back into the nothingness from which they came, and controlled mainstream media blames Trump and other "populists" and "economic nationalists." The superelite doubtless hope this will utterly demoralize the "deplorables," Trump's white working class and former middle class supporters, as all they had hoped for will disintegrate in front of their eyes.

Then the superelites and their cadre of technocratic "experts" will ride to the rescue, which will come with powerful strings attached. Full recovery will require full-fledged, masks-off and gloves-off globalism: global economy via "free trade" deals such as a revived TPP; world government via the unaccountable organizations such deals create, likely to include a new global reserve currency replacing the dollar, and a global tax (something the UN has been pushing for years); national borders reduced to lines on maps, for the purposes of instigated mass migrations which will further demolish white, achievement-oriented, Western and Christian

culture; a global “spirituality,” perhaps, intended to end Christian predominance; control over information, which will mean control over the Internet and a forced shutting down of websites demonized as “fake news”; finally, unbridled media and academic demonizing of the “populism” / nationalism / sovereignty / Christian white male “supremacy” axes, all as “causes” of the preceding chaos.

The next High begins as corporation-controlled world government is installed and its central banks flood the world with investment money – the new global currency. Its institutions will demand – and receive – totalitarian surveillance and dominance over populations with no other live options.

Those of us writing for sites like this one will be forced to go underground. I imagine some of us will end up living out our lives and then dying in extreme poverty.

Goes without saying, I very much pray to God that Brandon Smith’s scenario is wrong. But every prediction he’s made for this year, he’s gotten right.

Once it begins in earnest (2020?), the next High may continue for a time comparable to the last one, which lasted from 1948 to 1963 (15 years), or until around 2035 (?).

The future depends on which of these scenarios ensues: a successful economic and cultural renaissance under a Trump administration, or globalism returning with hurricane force.

We must do our part now to bring about the former, by (among other things) exposing this nonsense about “fake news” on the Internet; continuing debunking bogus “hate speech” and “hate crimes” blamed on Trump or his supporters; and above all, refusing to be intimidated by robotic allegations of “racism, sexism, xenophobia, homophobia, transphobia, Islamophobia,” the whole litany of weaponized words used to demonize.

Trump wins! Now the real work begins

It's over. The country has spoken. Donald Trump won (as of this writing, 276 electoral votes to Hillary Clinton's 210; 270 required to win the Presidency)!

As much as Trump warned about the likelihood of this election being rigged, it didn't happen. There is no way of knowing for sure, of course, but perhaps the would-be vote riggers understood clearly how many people were watching. They didn't dare!

Trump's victory was no landslide. The country barely avoided a second Clinton Regime. But we take what we can get.

Now the real work begins. Trump took the first positive steps during his victory speech by reaching out to the country, including those who have opposed him from the get-go. He promised to be a president for all Americans, and to deal with foreign powers fairly, if firmly and from a pro-American stance. It is important that these gestures continue. They are necessary, and they are right.

But let's not gloat. That's what the Left would do. A Hillary Clinton victory would have been shoved in our faces.

We're better than that.

There are decent people who are genuinely worried, even scared. These are the people who bought all the mainstream media pap about Trump's being a racist, a fascist, a

xenophobe, a sexist who abused women (using the infamous p-word over ten years ago); never mind that these allegations came out of nowhere, with no evidence to back them up.

Global markets tanked overnight Nov 8 – 9 as it became clearer by the hour that Hillary Clinton, the globalist favorite, wasn't going to pull this out despite what all the polls and "experts" told us.

The "experts," as is often the case, were dead wrong. The Dow recovered within a matter of hours, by the way.

My interpretation all along has been that this election was a public referendum on Americanism versus globalism, free speech versus political correctness.

I am happy to report that Americanism won. Free speech won. But what did we win? A major battle, to be sure, fought against huge odds. But let's not rest on our laurels and think we've won the war.

All one has to do to see the crux of the matter is look at the electoral map. The states of the Northeast, heavily populated by those supportive of the globalist, power elite mindset, and those of the West Coast (same), all went to Hillary Clinton. So-called "flyover country" except for Illinois, all the Southeast, and the inland portion of the Northwest, all voted for Donald Trump. And if one looks at the breakdown county by county, the real divide is still clearer: the "blue" areas of Hillary supporters are all the big and larger medium-sized cities. They subsist in vast seas of "red" outside the cities, even in so-called "blue states."

The divide is as stark as I have ever seen it. We are indeed "two Americas."

We are talking about two incommensurable mindsets and ways of seeing the world that have been battling, and will continue to battle, for control over not just the U.S. but the entire

Western world, and more besides. In my last article I used the terms New America versus Old America. 'Incommensurable,' by the way, means approximately, 'unable to be brought under a single shared vocabulary or consensus, and/or a single set of legitimizing rules agreeable to all parties to a dispute.'

The word seems perfect for the two mindsets battling for control over the public consciousness in the U.S. right now, neither of which considers the other legitimate.

The mindset that voted for Hillary Clinton sees itself as well-educated, sophisticated, cosmopolitan, supportive of what it calls diversity (the diversity of faces), tolerant, etc., etc. Its basic premises, stated or not, are those of secular materialism and worldliness. It has little use for religion, and sees allegiance to tradition as a sign of backwardness. It disdains such things as private gun ownership; city-dwelling pseudo-sophisticates are basically afraid of guns. They make wonkish pronouncements on the issues of our times, on the strength of Ivy League degrees; or they working in or with the leviathan banks or other mega-corporations being paid more in a year than most people outside their enclaves will see in their lives; the elite mindset includes West Coast celebrities Hillary consistently drew on for support; it also includes, finally, the bulk of those who draw federal paychecks, who as cogs in the technocratic machinery of the Deep State have no fundamental problem with centralization, micro-management, or top-down policies as a means of getting things done.

We know what's best for you and we'll do it for you whether you like it or not perhaps summarizes the elitist outlook.

The mindset that voted for Donald Trump is the mindset on Main Street, not Wall Street. Many of them have spent lives working with their hands, living in small communities or rural settings. They intuitively distrust massive changes they never voted for and can't control. Guns don't bother them, since they grew up with guns. Handling guns safely is second nature

to them. They are skeptical of the economics-über-alles mindset of the city people. They do not trust anyone motivated solely by money and power, and are open to the idea that the wealthy and powerful have routinely conspired against them.

They adhere to one of any number of Christian denominations; questioning God's existence literally doesn't make sense to them. In terms of politics, when they are actually interested in politics, they are small government folks who trust representatives they know personally and can drop in on for a visit to express a concern. They prefer to live in a decentralized world, not a world of global economic forces dominated by city dwellers with soft hands, probably unable to change a tire or do simple household repairs, living in gated communities hundreds of miles away.

Leave us alone could well summarize what they want.

The latter have successfully expropriated and reclaimed the label deplorables. They took Hillary's snarky comment and tossed it back in her face. Some of the Deplorables are now wearing the label as a badge of honor!

Neither group sees the other as well-intentioned, or as having any monopoly on truth or "the facts." The elites have spent the past year tearing their hair out as their control over the national conversation slipped away. Their dominance of mainstream corporate media, emphasizing namecalling over substance, with its blatant pro-Hillary bias, backfired badly. Mainstream media is now largely discredited. Does anyone still take the Clinton News Network (CNN) seriously?

The elite mindset and its published products paraded Hillary as "superbly qualified," or even "the most qualified candidate in history" (wow!) based on her time in government; its authors never discussed the scandals that have dogged her career from the get-go. The Main Street, Old America mindset, whose stronghold is now the Internet and alternative media,

are content to note the scandals, events such as Benghazi and the destruction of Libya she owns, as well as the “dirty money” finding its way into Clinton Foundation coffers. They concluded long ago that the woman is a pathological liar, very possibly a criminal who, if tried by the laws that apply to ordinary mortals, would have been behind bars years ago.

The incommensurability of the mindsets is further manifest in that the pseudo-sophisticates remain headscratchingly clueless as to why their heroine lost this election all across Middle America—all despite the “experts” polls that placed her ahead. This headscratching cluelessness stretches across mainstream media, mainstream economic-financial commentary, and Hollywood.

Some of these reactions are truly bizarre. For example, one bimbo stated, “I feel like I’m about to give birth to a baby that’s already dead.”

Now that’s sophisticated!

At least it avoids the obscenities that are coming from other quarters: “Congratulations America; you f***** this one up!”

One has to love the language that often comes from the lips of the sophisticated and tolerant when they don’t get what they believe they are entitled to.

The bottom line: the Deplorables want their country back, and have used the electoral system to begin taking it back!

The interesting question now is: Will the power elites allow it to happen? Will their many followers, the types who get the bulk of their news from, say, the Clinton News Network (CNN)?

A friend of mine Skyped me this morning Trump’s victory was announced, asking, “Do you really think [the globalist elites] will sit back and be out of power for four years?”

No, no one in his right mind believes the globalists are

simply going to go away. If they do not attempt to assassinate Trump, as that would be too obvious, they may bide their time, allow him to settle in, and then crash the economy. We're talking about people able to move billions of dollars around with the ease of us unsophisticates changing our underwear. They could do it. Through their control over the six leviathan corporations that constitute mainstream media, they could see to it that Trump got blamed if the economy suddenly tanked, something we know is very likely to come anyway.

How Trump would handle such a fomented crisis will be crucial.

He won't be able to further his agenda alone. His first and most important task will be to find people who (1) will work with him to begin to implement his vision of the future; (2) are qualified; and (3) are untethered from the globalist elites.

So deeply is the latter mindset insinuated in the entire governmental fabric and financial communities he has to draw from, finding the right people is not going to be easy! I'd avoid people like Newt Gingrich, Rudy Giuliani, and Chris Christie. Wolves in sheeps' clothing, all three!

As I've also stated from the get-go, there are no guarantees!

These two mindsets are on collision course, and that's not going to change!

I will look down the road, long term, therefore, and suggest that they cannot exist indefinitely under the same government. The one will eventually use the machinery of government to try to destroy the other, which may be forced into violence to defend itself. The result will be a bloody civil war which could have millions of casualties.

Peaceful separation makes far better sense to me, not just as a strategy but as an inevitability. The elites have no reason to allow this to happen, either, and have been fairly

successful labeling all secession talk as “fringe.” I suspect not even the Trumpists are ready for this. But as gridlock and dysfunction continue to fester at the center, with national indebtedness continuing to rise (it is unclear that even Trump can prevent this), eventually the corporate state centered in Washington and Wall Street will lose the will to stop it – just as the Soviet Communists lost their will to continue their empire.

What the “secessionists” have to do in this case is be patient, gain in wisdom and strategy, and begin working towards influence and eventual control in state legislatures, governorships, and perhaps entire regions.

Perhaps, somewhere down the road, we will have several Deplorable nations! The elites, in this case, can turn their cities into cesspools of crime, corruption, bureaucracy, chronic instability, and cultural filth if that is their choice.

© 2016 Steven Yates – All Rights Reserved

Old America vs new America: what is at stake in this election

A recent Los Angeles Times column raises issues I wish to discuss here. While painting the contrast between Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton in usual corporate media fashion as Trump the villainous remnant of ages past and repository of the frustrations of the “deplorables,” vs. Hillary the vanguard and wave of a multicultural, cosmopolitan future, the concepts

of “Old America” and “New America” are interesting and worth exploring.

Yes, there is a sense in which Trump represents an “Old America.” And in the same sense Hillary represents the “New America,” as do Barack and Michelle Obama. What matters is the substance behind those expressions, as opposed to politically correct (PC) propaganda.

The “Old America” embodied easily identifiable values: Christianity, Constitutional controls on government, responsible freedom, family, involvement in one’s community. The “Old America” valued work. It understood enough economics to know that wealth must be produced. Wealth isn’t created by government handouts any more than it falls from the sky. The “Old America” didn’t see economics as the end-all, be-all of human existence, however. Money was not an end in itself but a means to other ends. Sometimes the “Old America” struggled to define those other ends. I do not believe it solved the problems created by the increasing secularization of civilization, which were causing it substantial problems with some of its offspring as early as the 1950s. “Old America” as not Utopian in its outlook, however. It had more things right than it had wrong.

The “Old America” was socially conservative in the sense of valuing what had passed the test of time insofar as ensuring social stability and domestic tranquility. While not opposed to change absolutely, change agents had to make a compelling case. The “Old America” disapproved of change for the sake of change. It disdained social experimentation. The “Old America,” now accused of being too white, too rural, and too “uneducated,” was more in touch with the land. It understood that food does not originate on grocery store shelves. It valued making and building things (i.e., manufacturing).

What does the “New America” embody? It now calls itself progressive (liberal having left a bad taste in too many

mouths). It speaks of the Constitution as a "living document," which tells us that in practice the Constitution will mean whatever the Supreme Court and other opinion-makers want it to mean, not what it meant to the Founding Fathers. In truth: the "New America" has no use for Constitutional controls on government. It describes the "Old America" in hateful, loaded language as racist, sexist, homophobic, you know the PC litany.

It ignores the fact that America's blacks are better off than their African counterparts, and that the past 50 years have seen programs designed to give them special advantages (affirmative action, set-asides, racenorming in law school admissions, speech codes, race-specific cultural centers, etc.), programs that would have been impossible without the support of a lot of well-intentioned white people. The "New America" ignores the damage such policies have done to relations between the races, and the damage radical feminism has done to that between the sexes, to the family generally: not just to men and boys but to women as well (as philosopher Christina Hoff Sommers has shown in her books *The War on Boys* and *Who Stole Feminism? How Women Have Betrayed Women*). Today the "alpha male" is out. Feminized "metrosexual" men are in unless they are nonwhite.

The "New America" ignores the clear sociological fact, documented all over the world and understood by the "Old America," that groups with different cultures and incommensurable values cannot be forced together into the same communities without the result being dislocation, tension, and potential outbreaks of violence if some suspect others are getting more government freebies.

The "New America," it is said, appeals to youth and to the "educated." It presents itself as urban, cosmopolitan, and forward-looking. It appeals, that is, to millennials who grew up never having known a world without PC. And who have attended schools including their universities which have

failed utterly to educate, so that whatever their ease with the latest gadgets, they cannot identify all the rights specified in the First Amendment or, in many cases, write a coherent, grammatically correct paragraph. Almost a third of millennials recently surveyed believed George W. Bush killed more people than Communist dictator Josef Stalin! How is that for "education" these days?

"New Americans" have entitlements instead of rights, employ groupthink, and have an irrational obsession with image instead of substance and actual accomplishment. They are products of longstanding dumbing down of the schools at all levels. Their mindset, that is, pseudo-intellectual rather than valuing, promoting, and dispensing real wisdom, whether in thought or action. "New America" thus plays right into the hands of globalists spread across government and corporations who advancing corporate-controlled world government. The bogus "free trade" deals Donald Trump fiercely attacked, starting with NAFTA and leading to the TPP, are key instruments of globalist-state architecture, as its own advocates have stated openly: according to Henry Kissinger, NAFTA "[was] not a conventional trade agreement ... but the architecture of a new international system."

"Old America" wants nothing to do with such deals, not just because they destroy millions of jobs but because they undermine U.S. sovereignty. "New America" under Obama has delivered a pathetic "recovery" of part-time jobs. It couldn't care less about U.S. sovereignty. "Old America" is suspicious of corporate media and of some of the technology millennials have grown up with. For one thing, "Old America" remembers using technology to send men to the moon and return them safely. "New America" uses it to take selfies.

"Old America" sees that in the environment "New America" has created, anyone running for office is going to have his/her entire life put under a social media microscope, as its leering denizens seek evidence of departures from PC or

anything sensational (sexual improprieties, perhaps). "Old America" recalls that when we didn't have all this techno-voyeurism we had better candidates and better leadership.

"Old America" was politically decentralized, however. It wasn't especially interested in politics. It looks back wistfully to a time when politicians and bureaucrats didn't have their fingers in everything.

"New America" is highly centralized. It is controlled from five centers: New York City, Boston, Washington D.C., Hollywood, and Silicon Valley; and from two places overseas: the City of London and Tel Aviv. The powers in these centers cooperate closely with one another. Like it or not, Google, Microsoft, Apple, Yahoo, Facebook, etc., are all in bed with the Deep State.

The "Old America," that is, was about the real America: government "of the people, by the people, and for the people"! The "New America" is not truly American at all, but a cover for (among other things) globalism!

This has not stopped spokespersons for the "New America" from denouncing the "Old America" as "deplorables" and "irredeemables," terms Hillary has used to express her hatred for millions of her countrymen (and countrywomen) outside those power centers.

"Old America," if you go back a few decades, built that once-great country called the United States of America. "New America" is pulling it apart! In the guise of "Stronger Together" (Hillary's soundbite), it actually divides group against group. "New America," it should go without saying, is staunchly pro-abortion ("pro-choice"). While defending a "woman's right to choose" on the grounds of cases where carrying a pregnancy to term will endanger a woman's life, its writers do not inform you that these number well under one percent of abortions. The rest are abortions-of-convenience.

What about sex-ed, as a means of reducing teen pregnancies?

The "Old America" recognized that our nature as sexual beings had to be controlled by morality or it would undermine civilization little by little. The "New America," with its pseudo-morality of don't-tell-me-what-to-do-I'm-gonna-do-as-I-please-it's-my-right, recognizes no meaningful controls on sexuality aside from PC ones. Hence, e.g., teen pregnancies, "comprehensive sex education" with its mixed message ("Don't do it, but here's how"), abortions, gay marriages, and "gender" confusion.

The "New America's" actual view of human life, in accordance with the secular materialism at its core, is that it is expendable if it is inconvenient. This explains how easily Hillary hopped onto the pro-war bandwagon long ago, and how she was central in turning Libya and Syria into war-scarred wastelands, breeding grounds for terrorism and ISIS-sponsored brutality, the latter a flashpoint that could trigger a nuclear confrontation with Russia.

So yes, this election is about more than just Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton. It is about two utterly different ways of looking at the world – two incommensurable worldviews. This explains the unprecedented hostility between the two camps. Neither sees the other as legitimate. The mutual hostility will survive this election no matter who wins.

So whose worldview is closer to the truth?

The "Old America" gave us the highest civilization anyone had ever achieved if that counts for anything. It was not perfect, just better. The "New America" has given us division and destruction. In its Orwellian worldview, hatred for dissent is masked by nice phrases like stronger together.

It has wrecked education at all levels, and could ruin many more lives before it runs its course. It would effectively end the real America as it ushers in corporate-controlled world

government. The latter, by the way, won't care about black lives mattering or about women's rights or gays – which explains the globalist Clinton Foundation accepting money from donor nations where women are treated like property and gays are thrown off tall buildings.

That is what at stake in this election. If you like the “New America,” then by all means knock yourself out voting for Hillary Clinton. But if you believe the “New America” is a cultural train wreck in progress, vote for Donald Trump on November 8. It is true that with Trump there are no guarantees. It is late in the game. But this will be your last chance to stop the derailment of the “Old America” and reverse the march to corporate-controlled world government.

© 2016 Steven Yates – All Rights Reserved

The 12 biggest blunders in U.S. history

Just recently my wife and I took a brief sabbatical from our respective work, hers for a private firm and mine from writing and editing. She'd had a work-related personal crisis, and I was weary of the dozens of disingenuous mainstream articles in which GOP empty suits or their shills called on Donald Trump to “step aside for the good of the party” or some such rubbish; others featured the usual SJW namecalling (“racist, xenophobic, Islamophobic” etc. ad nauseam); and a few saying he could cost the Republican Party an entire generation. Although Trump has Hispanic supporters who are U.S. citizens and want laws obeyed, his critics are playing the changing-demographics angle for all the mileage they can get out of it.

It is true, the “brave new generation” of millennials has never known a world without political correctness, and also has no idea how things looked before the NAFTA / Bill Clinton era. I predicted the rise of their mindset (here and here).

The bottom line: those intent on destroying America and establishing corporate-controlled world government have never been this scared, that someone they didn't select has come this close to upending their applecart; especially since even if Trump loses this election, the forces that led to his rise are not going anywhere.

A few years ago I published a book, *Four Cardinal Errors: Reasons for the Decline of the American Republic*. Its purpose was to document the main long term tendencies that led to the country's present decline, some traceable to specific events, others less so. Reviewing quickly: (1) the first generation of U.S. leaders failed to secure sufficient economic sovereignty to prevent foreign banker meddling. (2) The next generation to come along allowed the creation of a school system based on European, not American, first principles. (3) Over ensuing decades the country's Christian ethos was replaced by a materialist one. Basic moral valuation began to slide accordingly. (4) No one noticed the influence of the British Fabian Society (founded in 1884), prime movers of British-American collectivism.

This article will pinpoint specific blunders, as opposed to trends. These are, of course, blunders given a perspective which sees the rightness or beneficence of maintaining economic freedom, sound money, and Constitutionally limited government based around a Christian ethos. Globalists have never shared this perspective, of course.

1- 1787 – The “three fifths compromise” accepted slavery and for all practical purposes wrote the “peculiar institution” into the Constitution. Importing slaves and maintaining slavery, originally in every state, was a recipe for disaster,

as well over a century and a half after slavery's end, only a small minority within the minority of blacks has fully assimilated into the success ethos that drew European immigrants and built the nation. Their contributions have mainly been to the arts and entertainment, and while these are not negligible they are not what keeps a civilization running. Efforts to integrate the black masses into the white mainstream, whether by "affirmative action" preferences, "set-asides," or other means, have clearly failed, as can be seen in major cities turned into racial powder kegs. Multiculturalist ideology coming out of academia has further justified non-assimilation, whether of blacks or other groups including more recent immigrants.

2- 1791 – With the ink barely dry on the Constitution, President George Washington allowed Alexander Hamilton the new nation's first Secretary of the Treasury to create a European-style central bank on U.S. soil, the Bank of the United States. This was done over the explicit objections of Thomas Jefferson who warned anyone who would listen of the dangers posed by foreign bankers whom he'd seen first-hand during his time there in the 1780s. U.S. history still might have been a struggle between Hamiltonian mercantilists-industrialists who would centralize the economy and the country, and Jeffersonian agrarians who would try to keep it decentralized, but it would not have been a struggle the Hamiltonians won so easily, opening the door to European globalism of the sort the Rothschild octopus was quietly instituting.

3- 1852 – Horace Mann was granted permission by the State of Massachusetts to create the first public (government) school system, based not on American thinking but a Prussian model in which the individual person belongs not to himself and to his God but to the state. Prior to this, education had been essentially private and local, with literacy rates near 100%. Public school systems have been hubs of social engineering and dumbing down ever since, whether to produce obedient workers

for corporations or compliant taxpayers and mindless consumers. Literacy has fallen over time, since maintaining literacy beyond an ability to read and follow instructions was never the primary aim of public schools. Liberal arts learning in particular has gradually been destroyed, since the historical knowledge and thinking skills it imparts are by their very nature threats to power and systems of domination.

4- 1861–65 – When President Abraham Lincoln went to war to end the Confederacy and bring the seceded states back into the Union by force, subjugated and impoverished under Reconstruction, he permanently destroyed genuine federalism and its core concept dual sovereignty. The latter had defined the existing relationship between the federal government and the states, as implied in the Ninth and Tenth Amendments. This was also the source of states' rights (not a defense of slavery). The Thirteenth and Fourteenth Amendments, unlike their predecessors, presumed a federal supremacy which has been maintained ever since. In a sense, the word federal became a misnomer. Central government would have been closer to the truth. Writers did cease to speak of "these United States" in what was on its way to becoming an empire.

5- 1913 (December 23) – With much of Congress gone for the holidays, President Woodrow Wilson signed the bill creating the Federal Reserve System, a state-sponsored private corporation "independent within the government" according to its own literature and not a branch of the government. The growing superelite of globalist bankers led by Rockefellers and Rothschild agents had secretly convened on Jekyll Island, Ga. just a couple of years before, knowing that a central bank would enable them to seize control of the U.S. economy, a control they have maintained ever since. Federal Reserve actions, chiefly credit expansion, would be responsible for the Crash of 1929, as Ben Bernanke recently admitted. The federal government's panicked response led to the Great Depression and all that followed, including the Rooseveltian

New Deal, the first triumph of Fabian-style socialism that “saved capitalism from itself.” One can only wonder how much smoother history and economic development would have been had the superelite not been allowed to have their central bank.

6- 1913 – In the same disastrous year, we saw the creation of the personal income tax, which as a direct and unapportioned tax had previously been rejected by the Supreme Court as unconstitutional (*Pollock v. Farmer’s Loan & Trust Co.*, 1895). The Sixteenth Amendment reversed this. Whether this Amendment was properly ratified is an issue scholars of the income tax have periodically raised, their efforts typically being shut down as “frivolous.” The income tax had superelite support, as the elites knew most tax dollars would end up in their swelling bank accounts. Those gullible enough to believe that a tax on personal incomes is needed to support legitimate, Constitutional federal functions need only ask how the federal government was kept in business from 1791 through 1912. This said, the income tax clearly gave central government expansionism a green light.

7- 1917 – In yet another superelite-backed move by Woodrow Wilson, the U.S. involved itself in what had been a European conflict. It was the beginning of the foreign policy of interventionism, eschewed by George Washington in his Farewell Address. Had the U.S. not entered into the Great War on the side of the British, Germany would likely have won, and Europe would have been better off. I am sure there are lefties who will read that and shoot me angry emails calling me a Nazi-who-wants-to-kill-six-million-Jews, but absent the British-American victory there would have been no Treaty of Versailles calling for destructive reparations, no hyperinflationary depression in Germany, no Weimar culture, no rise of a Nazi Party, and no World War II (also no Bank for International Settlements, another huge superelite institution).

Adolf Hitler would likely have remained an obscure German artist. The future would have looked entirely different.

Assuming the Russian October Revolution happened on schedule, Germany would have served as a powerful bulwark against Leninism. There might never have been a League of Nations in Europe, or a Council of Foreign Relations in New York, or later a UN and its many satellites and products including the artificial Bretton Woods system. Human nature being what it is, different conflicts would doubtless have erupted, but globalism, understood as a political economy of advancing corporate-controlled world government ("global governance"), would have slowed to a crawl rather than advancing by leaps and bounds. There would have seemed to be no point to it.

8- 1953 (August 19) – a CIA-led coup brought down the democratically elected government of Mohammed Musadegh in Iran, in response to the latter's nationalization of the oil industry. Musadegh had wanted the Iranian people to benefit from the expropriation of an important national resource on Iranian soil, as opposed to its profits being taken out of the country to line corporate coffers. The Shah, Reza Pahlavi – Western educated, with Western values – was installed, and proceeded with a quarter century of brutality, while extractive business as usual continued. Terrorism began to incubate underground. When the Shah was finally overthrown late in 1979, the first Islamic fundamentalist regime came to power. Iran has been an avowed enemy of the West ever since, and a hotbed of international terrorist sponsorship.

9- 1964 (August 7) – Following the green light provided by the Southeast Asia Resolution passed by Congress, President Lyndon Johnson ordered troops into Vietnam in response to the Gulf of Tonkin false flag (August 4). The War in Vietnam became the first war fought not only on the battlefield but on millions of television screens that had appeared in living rooms all across middle class America, inspiring a generation to rebel against it. Martin Luther King Jr.'s increasing attention to antiwar efforts in the late 1960s was probably a contributing factor in his assassination (April 4, 1968). The Vietnam War,

fought for corporate interests in the region, crippled Johnson's presidency (in 1968 he declined to run for reelection), and later, under Nixon's continued mishandling, eventually became the first war in which the U.S. Empire was handed, not entirely figuratively, its rear end.

10- 971 (August 15) – President Richard Nixon “closed the gold window” ending the restrictive Bretton Woods system and what remained of the ties between currencies and gold. The dollar became fiat money, backed by nothing except legal tender laws and public acceptance. Printing presses turned on and never turned off. The shift began from an economy based on production to one based on financialization and credit, and on massive indebtedness rising eventually to its present unsustainable level. When Nixon killed the gold standard the official national debt was around \$400 billion. It crossed the \$1 trillion threshold under Reagan. By the Clinton years it had risen to over \$6 trillion. At the end of Bush the Younger's reign it was over \$11 trillion. It may reach \$20 trillion before Obama leaves office. This does not include total federal liabilities, which are magnitudes higher. The dollar, we should note, has lost roughly 83% of its purchasing power since 1971, and roughly 97% of its purchasing power since 1913. (As a sidebar: in 1970, Zbigniew Brzezinski published a book entitled *Between Two Ages: America's Role in the Technetronic Era* which laid out a specific framework envisioning a globalist future and its stages of development from nationalism through Marxism to globalism. David Rockefeller Sr. read the book, and three years later, the two of them plus Henry Kissinger created the Trilateral Commission to begin coordinating corporations within the U.S., Japan, and Europe, with an eye to furthering the book's ideas.)

11- Late 1980s–1994 – Bush the Elder and his CFR and Trilateralist allies pushed the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) on the country. Bill Clinton would sign it without hesitation, indicating how both parties were fully

under superelite domination, Reagan's appearances of difference notwithstanding (his VP had been Bush the Elder, ex-CIA and CFR member in good standing). Between them, NAFTA, the creation of the World Trade Organization the next year with the admission of China, would export over 5 million manufacturing jobs in the U.S. and, alongside the economic factors implied in (10), began sending the largest financially independent middle class in history into a tailspin. The middle class continued to shrink following the Meltdown of 2008, as globalism continued to advance in the hands of the "one percent" (it was more like .01%).

12- 2003 (March 20) – Bush the Younger launched the Iraq War, a war of choice. The "shock and awe" campaign easily destroyed Saddam Hussein's secular regime, but neocon-inspired notions of "nation building" proved another matter. They led instead to an insurgency and paved the way for the spread of radical Islamic terror – all this on top of the attack launched against the Taliban in Afghanistan (October 2001) which has continued unabated. Then, in 2009, the Obama-Clinton team mishandled an attempt to withdraw from Iraq. Since then, the secular Mubarek government in Egypt has fallen (2011), Libya (also a friendly secular regime under the Reagan-neutered Khadafy) was destroyed (2012), Syria has been turned into a war zone (2012 – present), Turkey (a NATO member) has increasingly become involved (2014 – present), and – most disastrously – we've seen the rise of ISIS (2014 – present), with its grotesque spectacle of mass beheadings, people burned alive, drowned, thrown off buildings, thrown into acid, etc.

ISIS is easily the most dangerous terror network in existence. Iran is one thing; I do not want to think about the scenarios conceivable if one or more of these lunatics got their hands on nuclear weapons. What matters is that they did not exist as an identifiable group prior to the Obama-Clinton era. A massive Muslim refugee crisis has overwhelmed Europe, and while most of the refugees doubtless just want to get out of

the killing zone, they have been infiltrated by ISIS loyalists as recent mass shootings and bombings in France and elsewhere demonstrate: the consequences to Europe of open-borders. This existential threat to civilization is likely to spread to the homeland of their blood enemy, what the Iranian imams called the Great Satan, if Donald Trump is not elected president in November 2016 and cannot move quickly to prevent it.

President Hillary Clinton will clearly keep the U.S. border open, and you will see several hundred thousand Muslim refugees resettled in middle-sized American cities and towns. Most will be unable to speak English, and will overwhelm state-level, county-level, and city-level institutions. A few in their midst will be sympathetic to the main goal of ISIS, which is to establish and spread Sharia Law across the world. The U.S. will begin to look more and more like Europe every day.

A thirteenth blunder, therefore, would be allowing an elite-directed “rigging” of the November election in swing states to ensure a Hillary Clinton victory. Yes, with manipulated polls, the relentless media propaganda against Trump I mentioned at the outset, and paperless electronic voting machines, it is possible. If something like this happens, is allowed by the powers-that-be to stand without challenge, and Her Royal Clintonness enters the White House in 2017, I dare say it will be America’s coup-de-grâce.

© 2016 Steven Yates – All Rights Reserved

Hillary’s vast “alt-right”

conspiracy

According to Hillary Clinton, there's a Vast Alt-Right Conspiracy in the land. On August 25, before a Reno, Nev. audience, she scolded: "Donald Trump ... [is] taking hate groups mainstream and helping a radical fringe take over one of America's two major political parties. His disregard for the values that make our country great is profoundly dangerous."

She does not tell us what she believes those values are.

Later she continues, describing how Trump "traffics in dark conspiracy theories drawn from the pages of supermarket tabloids and the far reaches of the Internet ... [L]et's not forget, Trump first gained political prominence leading the charge for the so-called 'Birthers.' He promoted the racist lie that President Obama isn't really an American citizen – part of a sustained effort to delegitimize America's first black president."

I lost track of the number of times she used the word racist in her latest speech?

Furthermore, "Just recently, Trump claimed President Obama founded ISIS. And then he repeated that nonsense over and over... This is what happens when you treat the National Enquirer like Gospel. It's what happens when you listen to the radio host Alex Jones, who claims that 9/11 and the Oklahoma City bombings were inside jobs. He said the victims of the Sandy Hook massacre were child actors and no one was actually killed there..."

Tying all this together is the "Alt-Right": "Race-baiting ideas. Anti-Muslim and anti-Immigrant ideas – all key tenets making up an emerging racist ideology known as the 'Alt-Right.' Alt-Right is short for Alternative Right. The Wall Street Journal describes it as a loosely organized movement, mostly online, that 'rejects mainstream conservatism, promotes

nationalism, and views immigration and multiculturalism as threats to white identity.’”

I’d not heard the term Alt-Right until a few weeks ago.

I knew, of course, that there were people, some of them lifelong Republicans, who had started to question the main emphases of their party since the fall of the Soviet Union: its favoritism towards Wall Street / big business / corporate donors, and its promotion of overseas wars. These men and a few women had become critical of the Iraq War, for example, promoting regime change and “nation building,” or allowing corporations to negotiate leviathan trade deals behind closed doors, and outsourcing middle-class jobs to cheap-labor countries while allowing illegal immigrants in on the grounds that his “helps the economy.” None of this is news. But it has all along played into the hands of those who branded the Republican Party as a haven for wealth and privilege.

There were also those of us who accused neoconservatives (“neocons”) of losing the culture war. Neocons dominated the Republican Party by the end of the first Bush presidency. Because the culture war wasn’t fundamentally about “macro” economics, most couldn’t be bothered.

The term RINO (Republican In Name Only) had crept into our vocabularies. It referred to Republicans who invariably sided with Wall Street over Main Street, combined with an abject fear of being labeled racist. Having written a book in the early 1990s critical of affirmative action and drawing attention to its harmful effects on academia and several occupations (Civil Wrongs: What Went Wrong With Affirmative Action, 1994), I found out who my friends were. They weren’t mainstream Republicans. By the mid-1990s I’d figured out that mainstream Republicans wanted nothing to do with guys like me.

Soon, with the emergence of the World Wide Web as a major new medium, news and commentary sites were appearing that

presented current events and ideas from points of view (libertarian, conservative) other than the approved left-liberal ones of CNN, ABC, and CBS. I wrote for some of them. Back in 2000, for example, I investigated and reported the definitive account of a black-on-white hate crime that had been spiked by all major media where I was then living. Sadly, that story is no longer up, so I can't link to it; oddly, a follow-up has survived the gradual purge of my archive, given that the editor of that site and I had a falling out some time ago. The follow-up summarizes the main details and puts them in broad context. Honest research, when possible, discloses that black-on-white crime vastly, vastly exceeds white-on-black crime in both numbers and in its level of brutality!

If it takes an "Alt-Right" to expose these realities, then I, for one, welcome it – without endorsing every idea written by every author able to be labeled that way by the likes of the Hillary Rodham Clintons of the political cosmos. One of my discoveries, after all, is of the many "Alt-Rightists" I'd never heard of before. There are doubtless many I still haven't heard of if obviously it hasn't occurred to them to use that label.

What the "Alt-Right" really is, is a collection of bloggers, talk show hosts (only a few with significant reach), and online commentary sites and editors united by their disdain for an Establishment they understandably regard as elite-controlled, exclusive, censorious, intellectually dishonest, and rife with corruption. They talk about things the Establishment won't touch, such as minority-on-white violence or whether official narratives of events like 9/11 hold up under scrutiny or whether what some call "racial biodiversity" is true, i.e., that there are real, biological differences between races. Mere interest in these will get you fired from an academic appointment or a major news outlet.

Naturally, many such folks gravitated to Donald Trump, due to his status as an outsider, his own disdain for political

correctness, as well as his raising issues ordinary people care about, such as the sensible many have of “self-radicalized” ISIS sympathizers wreaking the same havoc on U.S. streets that they present wreak in Europe, courtesy of the open borders policies of the tottering European Union. It includes such figures as Stephen Bannon, editor at Breitbart.com, also an outsider obviously, now being savaged in mainstream media for a 20-year-old domestic violence allegation (the charge was dropped) and for a supposed anti-Semitic remark he made back then. I am reminded that there are two definitions of an anti-Semite: someone who hates Jews and someone Jews hate.

Other heroes of the “Alt-Right” include the UK Independence Party’s Nigel Farage, one of the brains behind Brexit who recently endorsed Trump, and possibly Marine Le Pen of France’s National Front. Such movements surely gain support every time an ISIS recruit opens fire in a Paris nightclub or plants a truck bomb killing dozens of innocent people.

To be sure, there’s a Respectable Right which for years was led (dominated might be a better word) by William F. Buckley and the National Review crowd; also those at The Weekly Standard. The Respectable Right ostracized Patrick J. Buchanan following his acknowledgement of the culture war in 1992, hit him with the anti-Semite allegation, and have tried to ignore him as he publishes massive and quite well-argued books with titles like A Republic, Not an Empire (1999), Where the Right Went Wrong (2004), and Suicide of a Superpower (2011) among others. Now, with Buckley having passed away in 2008, we have the cast of Washington Post second-raters led by George Will who left the GOP over its decision to nominate Trump. That’s the present-day journalism wing of the Respectable Right. Its political wing includes Mitt Romney, the Bushies, John McCain, Lindsey Graham, Paul Ryan, and the rest of the empty suits who gave Barack Obama eight years in the White House.

Uh, respectable to whom?

To the Cultural Left, of course. Who else? Because aside from Buchanan, the late Russell Kirk, and Ron Paul (who straddles the fence between conservatism and libertarianism), the Right has collapsed. There has been virtually no consistent conservative presence anywhere near the U.S. intellectual or cultural mainstream for decades now – no body of ideas set out in any other way than in a “loyal opposition” defined by the Left!

What would such a body of ideas consist of? Belief, first and foremost, in a transcendent grounding of moral valuation that suffuses a healthy community organically and inspires the traditions and practices holding it together, prior to support for specifics like property rights and free enterprise. Trust that these traditions serve important purposes, have passed the test of time, and neither can nor should be changed to accommodate pressure groups without careful deliberation; attempts to do so create more problems than they solve. Rejection, because of original sin, of the Enlightenment view of the perfectibility of man through his own efforts. Rejection of the idea that human beings can be made economically equal without everyone except a tiny elite being equally poor and equally enslaved. Belief that in a fallen world, peace must be maintained through military strength, a province of men (not women), and that its exercise should be limited to a nation’s legitimate interests, otherwise restrained and humble to the extent others respect this.

There are probably other ideas that could be added, but I believe most who call themselves conservatives would have agreed with these at one time. They would also have observed that with rare exceptions, such notions were kicked out of mainstream journalism, academia, and government decades ago. This was the endgame of the replacement of Christian culture with materialism (Four Cardinal Errors: Reasons for the Decline of the American Republic, 2011, ch. 3).

Whether “Alt-Rightists” have thought all this through or not

(most probably haven't, especially those under 35), many outsider-writers who doubted the integrity of the "experts" found a home of sorts. It was one without institutional power or influence beyond their own blogospheric orbit ... until Donald Trump came along.

Getting back to Hillary's screed, it raises numerous questions. Are we allowed to ask, for example, when and where Trump treated the National Enquirer as Gospel? Are we allowed to question the official narrative on race that blacks are victims and whites all have "white privilege"? And given that some very smart folks with doctorates in fields like engineering and physics have raised them, are we allowed to ask questions whether there is more to those other events than a government-endorsed official narrative? Are we allowed to point out that conspiracy theory is a weaponized phrase thought up by the CIA back in the 1960s to demonize anyone questioning the official narrative of the Kennedy assassination?

I didn't think so.

Some of us have a problem with this.

Hillary's attempt to raze the city of Trump to the ground and sow its fields with salt will surely not be described by sympathetic corporate media talking heads as underhanded, dishonest, and not addressing a single substantive issue. No one (except, perhaps, a few readers of sites like this one) will see it as full of weaponized language and innuendo no one can prove or disprove: words and phrases (hate group, radical fringe, conspiracy theory, racist, etc.) used as verbal clubs designed to beat people into submission.

Has it occurred to either the Hillaryites or to Respectable Right types that through their combination of weakness, ineffectiveness, intellectual bankruptcy, corruption, neglect of their base, and neglect of the country's (and the

culture's) best interests, they set themselves up for the Donald Trump candidacy?

Again, I didn't think so. But they look silly denying that Bush the Younger's presidency and the last two Respectable Right candidacies were anything other than disasters.

In the same way, the Respectable Right, from that time back in the 1990s when it elbowed critics of affirmative action and NAFTA aside, set itself up for the rise of the "Alt-Right" on an Internet it couldn't control like the pages of National Review. This, of course, is to the extent the "Alt-Right" even exists as a cohesive movement. One correspondent tells me that many who identify with its sensibilities are basically nihilists content to troll official sites and make fun of an Establishment over which they consider themselves powerless, even as it self-destructs. This could change. The chances of a more unified "Alt-Right" are now somewhat better, even if Donald Trump is not elected, because as I and many others of varying persuasions have noted, the issues that empowered Trump's rise will not go away under a Hillary Clinton presidency. If anything, they will grow stronger. They will find new and more articulate voices. Trump has never been the best spokesman for "Trumpism."

Whatever else ensues over the next few weeks, November will witness an election of historic importance, because as we have also pointed out, this election will offer a referendum on globalist economics, open borders, political correctness – power-elitism generally – centered in Wall Street, the Establishment of international high finance, and corporate media (and academia).

A vote for Donald Trump is a vote to reject all those things, on the grounds that they are running the country (indeed, Western civilization as a whole) into the ground. A vote for Hillary Clinton is a vote to continue with business as usual: more corruption, more globalist-elitism, more political

correctness, more war, and probably more terrorist attacks in a nation that will look more like Europe every day. A vote for pseudo-libertarian Gary Johnson, or for Jill Stein, or anyone else, might as well be a vote cast for Hillary.

The dominant narrative on the major polls says she is ahead. It is true enough that the nearly 14 million strong in the GOP base who voted for Trump in the primaries are just a small fraction of the totality of eligible voters. If Hillary Clinton wins this election, especially if she wins by a large margin, I will see it the same way Paul Craig Roberts does: proof that Americans are now, on average, too dumbed down to live in anything other than a plutocratic oligarchy. George Will and his fellow NeverTrumpsters believe the GOP should let Hillary win and try to retake the White House in 2020. I wouldn't count on that. If she wins, signs the Trans-Pacific Partnership, and appoints two or more Cultural Leftists to the Supreme Court, the Respectable Right will be dead in the water for the foreseeable future. As for the "Alt-Right"? We'll see what happens!

© 2016 Steven Yates – All Rights Reserved

Election 2016: America at its crossroads

Almost 50 years ago, Professor Carroll Quigley of Georgetown University's School of Foreign Services wrote the following, which I regard as the most significant political quote of the last century:

"The chief problem of American political life for a long time has been how to make the two Congressional parties more

national and international. The argument that the two parties should represent opposed ideals and policies, one, perhaps, of the Right and the other of the Left, is a foolish idea acceptable only to doctrinaire and academic thinkers. Instead, the two parties should be almost identical, so that the American people can 'throw the rascals out' at any election without leading to any profound or extensive shifts in policy... [E]ither party in office becomes in time corrupt, tired, unenterprising, and vigorless. Then it should be possible to replace it, every four years if necessary, by the other party, which will be none of those things but will still pursue, with a new vigor, approximately the same basic policies." ~Tragedy & Hope: A History of the World in Our Time, pp. 1247-48.

It sounds like a cliché to say that Election 2016 is turning out to be the most important election in over 50 years! But for the past half century, every election without exception has fit Quigley's pattern – except this one!

Election 2016 threatens to upend globalism at its core!

Donald J. Trump is proving to be the mouthpiece of a rebellion that has been brewing ever since millions of ordinary people began to participate in the Internet Reformation, some call it, going online, reading uncensored news, and realized that much of the official history and economics they have been fed is a tissue of lies, and have voted to support the one person who promises to change the country's direction before globalism and political correctness finish running it completely into the ground.

I have gone from being skeptical of the Trump revolution to realizing that Trump really is the last hope of turning the U.S. back from the cliff it is rapidly approaching.

That will mean breaking Anglo-European power elite control over the political process (the "rigged system," both Trump

and Bernie Sanders call it), over U.S. foreign policy, and over the economy.

It will mean putting an end to the situation Professor Quigley, an Insider's Insider, described in the opening quote.

This is thus the first election in my adult life where Americans have a real choice between competing political and economic philosophies! (I am more than happy, incidentally, to have had my fears of a last-minute anti-Trump coup at the GOP Convention proven groundless – !) although the danger is far from over

A vote for Hillary Rodham Clinton is a vote for the Establishment – for globalism and all its trappings – because as Trump noted in his speech, the Anglo-European power elite (my phrase, not his) owns her. When Goldman Sachs, one of the power elite's main financial corporations, pays her over half a million dollars per speech, common sense informs us that the globalists have an enormous investment in her.

She would further their goals, which include more foreign wars, continued open borders and more cultural mayhem, more political correctness, and a country in ruins – a country suffering as parts of Europe are suffering now in the aftermath of terror attacks and floods of refugees.

Imagine, too, more ZIRP, more QE, a national debt skyrocketing ever higher. A second Clinton presidency would mask its enormous problems the same way the first one did – with a soaring stock market, ensuring that the rich are getting richer, on paper anyway. The largest financial bubble in history will continue inflating – for a time! The middle class will continue shrinking and the working class, especially whites, will continue dying of treatable illnesses. The suicide rate among the latter will continue climbing.

A vote for Donald J. Trump is a vote for a turn away from this cliff!

Trump is the biggest Black Swan the Anglo-European power elite has seen in our lifetimes! He came nearly out of nowhere, a little over 13 months ago. At first no one took him seriously, myself included. He went on to garner a record number of primary votes which stopped just short of 14 million. Now, in the present, his acceptance speech may go down in history as a major declaration of our intent to turn back from the brink!

Trump is the only candidate in my lifetime who has stated openly, "Americanism, not globalism, will be our credo!"

Those whose power and gravy trains he threatens are absolutely livid!

I expect Trump will face truly vicious attacks in the weeks to come: attacks on his past businesses where he's had both successes and failures, having made the same mistakes as others have made; attacks we've already seen on his character and personal psychology will intensify; they will be joined by attacks on the proposals he laid before the American people the other night. He will be dismissed as a dangerous economic illiterate, because he cares about the American people instead of "macroeconomic" abstractions.

These attacks will reach such feverish pitches that their authors will not notice the irony of their charges that he is the one appealing to fear and insecurity. Obama has riposted. Clinton herself has counterattacked. Elizabeth Warren shrieked that his speech sounded like that of "a two-bit dictator." Bill Mahar made the truly stupid comment that it could have been lifted from a Saw movie! Other fifth rate comedians of the present Age of Decadence (see below) are chiming in with the childish attempts at humor so popular today. European controlled media has weighed in. If you want hysterics, scroll down the main page of hard-left Salon.com where every other article is anti-Trump (most of the rest are about aspiring celebrities, which speaks volumes about the juvenile mentality of sites like that). If you want to read truly silly stuff,

illustrating the impoverishment of academia, go here instead. Scroll to comments 27, 30, 38, 41, 47, 50. Hold your gag reflex if you're shelling out money for kids to attend these universities where these people profess to dispense wisdom.

Are there a few things that still bother me? Of course there are.

I would want Trump's appeal to "law and order" and his support for law enforcement to be tempered by a call to demilitarize the police, and end the flow of battlefield-ready weapons to police departments from the Department of Homeland Security over the past 15 years. Militarizing law enforcement with battlefield-ready weaponry was a mistake of ghastly proportions! There is now huge distrust between law enforcement and segments of the public because the killings of unarmed citizens by police vastly exceed those of every other advanced nation, many times over. This needs to end, or there will never be peaceful relations between police and the communities they once served and protected – no matter who wins this election.

A few things are out of Trump's hands, at least initially. The financial bubble I mentioned is going to pop, almost assuredly between now and 2020, again no matter who enters the White House in 2017. How Trump handles the situation will be absolutely crucial, as doubtless he will be blamed for any economic calamity to come along! What I would hope for: (1) no bailouts of power elite controlled banks this time around; (2) abolition of the Federal Reserve System, which enabled power elite control of the economy; (3) creation of a public banking system capable of issuing debt free money. This would destroy power elite control over our money system. I do not know if Trump is thinking in these terms. One can only hope he is surrounding himself with people who are.

Trump is, I am confident, serious about ridding the world of ISIS. Given how ISIS has spread during the disastrous Obama-

Clinton years, eliminating them will prove to be a gargantuan undertaking.

My hope is that Muslims the world over will see the need to repudiate ISIS and speak with a single voice, as Christians repudiate the Westboro Baptist Church: "These lunatics do not speak for us!" There are around 2.08 billion Muslims in the world. The vast majority just want to live in peace. ISIS has brutalized many of them, no less than it has brutalized Christians. If one reads what Trump actually said, he was not calling for a permanent ban on Muslims entering the U.S. Rather, he was calling for a ban that stays in place until this threat can be eliminated to the greatest extent possible.

I doubt that putting ISIS out of commission will be possible without the support of Muslims of good will, who realize that peace is better than violence.

And I must add my hope that Shiite and Sunni Muslims can be motivated to talk to one another instead of killing one another, that they will work together to rid their nations of corruption. This is also very much in their best interests. They shouldn't make the mistake of thinking globalists care about them. There is some evidence that globalists are trying to orchestrate internecine war between Shiites and Sunnis. Such a war would span the Middle East and could last decades. It would kill millions of innocent people – those in the way of what the Anglo-European power elite wants: total control over the region's oil, to be extracted as cheaply as possible without local interference.

One hopes that Trump and Russian President Vladimir Putin, hated by neocons but who continues to conduct himself as an adult, can work together to rid the region of ISIS. Both have more to gain from cooperation than from the present neocon-led saber-rattling which is sure to continue under a Hillary Clinton administration, likely leading to a war which could turn nuclear.

Yes, between Donald J. Trump and Hillary Rodham Clinton, the latter, not the former, is the one who should be kept away from nuclear codes. She, not Trump, has a well-documented volatile temper, in addition to the policies she is likely to further in regions close to Russia's borders, e.g., in Ukraine, where the Establishment brought down the democratically elected government of Viktor Yanukovich and instilled a dictatorship. His is not the only democratically elected government Hillary Clinton was instrumental in destroyed. Ask the Hondurans.

Lastly, a Trump Administration might help answer a question I confess has plagued me for years. Having written about the trajectory of empires ([here], [here], and [here]), the question is: can an empire, in its Age of Decadence as the U.S. clearly is, turn itself around?

Remember what an Age of Decadence is: an empire's final stage prior to collapse or dissolution. Roughly: (a) religion and transcendent values are weakened and replaced by materialism; love of money reigns supreme; (b) the culture's moral compass is lost; its masses pursue frivolity and hedonism as they "eat, drink, and be merry"; (c) cultural heroes are sports stars and celebrities instead of people with real leadership abilities; (d) border controls are lost; influxes of immigrants fill major cities and unlike previous generations of immigrants, they do not learn the dominant language and assimilate, meaning that public institutions are overwhelmed; (e) more and more people seek to live at the expense of a bloated state bureaucracy; (f) an obsession with sex permeates everything, as families disintegrate, traditional marriage declines, the number of singles grows rapidly, and sex-related scandals end careers; (g) because of widening cultural and economic fault lines, no longer is there any sense of the common good.

Other characteristics of empires in decline include military aggression against threats that do not exist (think of Iraq's

“weapons of mass destruction”), irrational monetary policy to keep the masses spending so that a dysfunctional economy stays afloat (think of ZIRP and QE), a widening gulf between rich and poor with reduced social mobility except downwards, increasing cynicism and a withdrawal of people into their own private affairs, and pessimism among professional intellectuals. Attempts at a national conversation are strained and fractured by distrust, often ending with unproductive recrimination, juvenile name-calling, or worse.

For this last, just think of the relationship between Trump’s supporters, many of them victims of globalism who know they have no “privileges,” and his mainstream center-left critics. The latter accuse Trump of lying while they present utterly misleading statistics about unemployment (real unemployment is much higher than 4.9%). They accuse Trump of presenting a dark view of America even as they pretend that the Federal Reserve money creation spigot can continue forever.

Can this be reversed? Or is an empire, once mired in its Age of Decadence, doomed?

It hasn’t happened before. Each previous Age of Decadence presaged collapse or breakup.

But I’ve not encountered iron laws of history, analogous to those of physics, that tell me it can’t happen!

We certainly have the technology to make the attempt! That, too, has not occurred before! The question is not over means, but over our wills and convictions.

Could Donald J. Trump, by leading a revival of American manufacturing, energy production, and infrastructural rebuilding, be the key to something genuinely new?

Look at it this way. Everything that’s been said about the man by pundits has been proven wrong. The pundits, instead of learning from their mistakes, have redoubled their efforts. A

lot of economists are very worried, I think, that given the opportunity Trump might succeed, which will force them to throw out the neoliberalism they've imbibed for the past half century, including everything they thought they knew about "free trade" – just as neocons will be forced to scrap their insanity about nation building in the Middle East.

The U.S. had a chance to become a beacon to the rest of the world following the end of the Soviet Union and the rise of a unipolar world. Beginning with the election of the first of the Clinton Crime Family, the signing of trade deals like NAFTA, actually a product of the Bush Crime Family, and then electing another Bush whose response to 9/11 was to attack Iraq and destabilize the Middle East, we blew it. Then we blew it worse by putting President Community Organizer in there. He pushed even worse trade deals like the TPP when not injecting himself into and enflaming every racial incident.

Now the other half of the Clinton Crime Family wants the helm of state back.

Einstein defined insanity as doing the same thing over and over again and expecting a different result.

Trump is indeed Americans' last chance to pull their country back from the brink. Elect Hillary Rodham Clinton, and it won't happen! Remember, the financial bubble will pop anyway, and Hillary will give you more of the same. After eight years of Bush the Younger and eight years of President Community Organizer, America will not survive eight years of its First Woman President! You might not survive four years!

With Trump at the helm, America may begin to rebuild. It won't be easy. It won't be a paradise. There is much to undo, and many bridges that need to be rebuilt, or sometimes just built. And this, again, will be possible only if he is allowed to do so – if his enemies do not attempt the ultimate insanity that would destroy the country permanently.

It is time to begin some new conversations – again if we are allowed to do it.

By the 2020s, those of us who identify with ideas that originally made America great may be in a position to help create a more serious and humane internationalism. Technology also makes this possible. It will take cultural differences seriously and learn from them; it will stress localism and not globalism; it will base itself on acceptance of the faiths of others to the extent those faiths promote peace and not violence; it will not seek to impose a centralized, materialist, mass-consumption monoculture on the world. Try to envision an international mindset based on ethics, peace, local control, mutual respect, open communication, voluntary trade that meets real and not manufactured needs, a conviction that all lives matter, and a devotion to peaceful resolutions where we disagree – and to elections that offer a people genuine and not sham choices.

What this novel internationalism will shun like the plague is the ethos of political and economic centralization, calls for domination, and all else that characterizes present-day globalism.

© 2016 Steven Yates – All Rights Reserved

Will the globalists keep trump from receiving the GOP nomination?

THIS IS GETTING VERY SERIOUS NOW

A month from now as I write this, the 2016 GOP Convention in Cleveland will be over. Either Donald J. Trump will be the Republican nominee, or someone else will. If the latter, it may be because GOP elites sponsored rule-changes freeing delegates from their obligation to support the will of the voters in their state and instead "vote their consciences," whatever that means.

GOP elites are aware of the ambient noise outside, moreover.

Corporate media have regaled us over recent polls showing Trump losing ground to Hillary Rodham Clinton over his criticism of the judge's Mexican heritage in the Trump University case, and over his claims of vindication following the Orlando shootings. Those of us writing about these matters continue to underestimate just how deep political correctness has penetrated public consciousness. The left immediately set out to make Orlando about guns, not jihadism. Two weeks later, Democrats were staging sit-ins in Congress over gun control. As multiple writers have noted, the left never lets a crisis go to waste.

PC thought control is hardly total. Fourteen million people voted for Trump in their state primaries: a record high, an index of the frustration with PC culture and the hollowed out economy of globalism. The GOP, by refusing Trump the nomination, will literally have handed Hillary the presidency – and handed leftists the country's future. GOP elites will have committed political suicide, since many of those 14 million voters will go elsewhere. Some may vote Libertarian, unless they see that Gary Johnson and Bill Weld also support open borders and lean left on social issues. Most will go fishing on Election Day. As they won't be back, the Republican Party might as well close up shop. It will not be a force to be reckoned with again. Its base will be gone: politically homeless, isolated, and angrier.

The problems that led to Trump's meteoric rise will not have

gone away. I've seen online comments and received emails that are very, very dark. I'll leave the details to your imagination.

What it comes down to: whichever empty suit the elites will have nominated will get buried in November: the fate mainstream pundits are predicting for Trump if he is the nominee. So who will it be? Jeb? Ted Cruz? Someone who didn't stick it out for the first debate, such as Scott Walker? Depends on who is willing to fall on his sword? No one appears in a hurry to step forward.

Meanwhile, the other day, Secret Service thwarted what would have been an attempt on Trump's life. The would-be assassin was an illegal alien – British, but illegal nonetheless. His name is Michael Steven Stanford. What is interesting is how little attention this has received, compared to the chatter about Trump's poll numbers, his comments about the judge and Orlando, and his firing a staffer.

There have been cases of open violence against Trump supporters. Some have been caught on video. Police – ever ready to use violence when they feel they can get away with it – have stood down when it comes to these radical (Soros-bankrolled?) lefties.

Naturally, the collection of liars and useful idiots that dominates mainstream media blames Trump and his supporters. That is when they report it at all.

One leftie HuffPo blogger openly opined that violence against Trump supporters is justified.

Can you imagine what would happen to some keyboard commando who urged violence against supporters of Hillary Rodham Clinton? Or Bernie Sanders, for that matter?

I doubt he would suffer mere castigation in the comments section under his article!

Large-scale protests are planned for Cleveland. The usual suspects are anticipated to be there: Black Lives Matter, Mexican groups, etc. Law enforcement is already making extensive preparations. Parts of the city will almost assuredly be on lockdown. The same will be true of Philadelphia. The culture has done this to itself.

Trump supporters will also be in attendance. I have acquaintances planning on making the trip. They will need to get in and out of the area, physically. Will police protect them, or obey "orders" to stand down as they were in California?

Violence in Cleveland streets wouldn't surprise me in the least! None of us wants it, but who will stop leftists from instigating it? Trump supporters going should take every precaution and be prepared to defend themselves if assaulted, in case the police have other priorities!

GOP elites are risking trouble right on the convention floor, if they change the rules to allow delegates to reject Trump after he gained the nomination fair and square. These are not Ron Paul supporters willing to let themselves be walked on, after all. Trump needed 1,237 delegates to clench the nomination. He received 1,542 in all, including 1,447 who are required by present rules to vote for him on the first ballot.

Should the dump-Trump lunacy somehow succeed, GOP elites will have confirmed what both he and Bernie Sanders have insisted from the get-go: that the process is rigged. That primaries are nothing but expensive shows, helping media and other corporations make money prior to the coronation of the candidate the elite class wanted all along.

Trump is urging unity behind the need to keep Hillary Rodham Clinton out of the White House. In a recent speech, he told listeners, "She believes she is entitled to the office!" He is right. She is a hard-core globalist-elitist. Sanders's

supporters do not like or trust her. They realize she is not really a progressive leftist. She is beholden to money and power. She is, as I've noted before, destructive. How many former Secretary of States can take credit for almost singlehandedly destroying an entire nation (Libya)?

Those who consider themselves entitled to rule are facing rebellion everywhere except for elite-dominated East and West Coasts. The seats of money and power.

Just yesterday as I write this, I saw a missive in one of my newsfeeds suggesting prayers for Donald Trump – whatever his personal beliefs, whatever your personal beliefs – and intended for his supporters as well.

If what happened the other day is any indication, the man's life is in danger ... and given that video, his supporters' lives are in potential danger in Cleveland.

Trump has a family. Their lives could be in danger as well.

If he wins the nomination, the danger will increase.

In the past, elites have murdered people they saw as threats to their plans for war and economic domination, as everybody knows unless they are stupid enough to believe the lone-gunman / "magic bullet" theories of the JFK assassination.

My last column mentioned Brexit in passing. A few days before Great Britain's historic vote to leave the European Union was taken, George Soros and Jacob Rothschild sounded off with what could only be interpreted as threats: the sort of threats megabillionaires are in a position to make.

These are more than scare tactics. Unlike Huxley's imaginary world rulers in Brave New World with their "soma," the real ruling elite can't make anyone love them. But they can punish, simply by moving investments from rebel strongholds. This results in job losses and a drop in the standard of living for

the unprepared.

The ruling elite can threaten rebellious nations with a cruel descent into poverty. Ask the Greeks, whose Syriza Party leaders were forced to cave in to EU bankster demands and restore "austerity." This while their historical landmarks are plundered and sold to corporations for profit.

Should the global populist revolt continue, the future could get very ugly! I would not put it past the ruling elite to provoke a destructive world war capable of killing billions and reducing cities to ashes, Hiroshima-style, if they decided such a war was their only means of staying in power!

They like wars, after all. War is profitable. Ask Dick Cheney (Halliburton).

In 20 years now, Hillary Rodham Clinton never saw a war that didn't meet with her approval.

These people are sociopaths on a grand scale. Hillary is a bit player compared to Soros and Rothschild. The rest of us goyim are cattle, to be herded wherever: culled, if necessary.

Ever allowing this kind of moneyed "superclass" to develop was a bad idea, although I confess I am at a loss as to what could have prevented it in this sinful, materialist world. If one of the purposes of modern political thought was to find ways to contain the lust for power, it failed miserably. Among its errors was not realizing that money in sufficient accumulation is power. Classical liberals left this door open. Neoliberals walked right through it.

The immediate question is what the ruling elite will do, should anti-globalist Donald Trump gain the nomination and get on track to become President of the United States, leader of what is still the largest economy in the world with the strongest military, filled with millions of people who still believe in Christianity, the Constitution, and the rule of law.

Will we get the chance to find out?

© 2016 Steven Yates – All Rights Reserved

The orlando shootings: a vindication of “Trumpism”?

If we can believe the official government / corporate media story – sadly, always a big ‘if’ these days – at around 2 am, June 12, Omar Seddique Mateen entered Pulse, a “LGBT”-oriented nightclub in Orlando, Fla., armed with an AR-15 assault weapon, and opened fire on a crowd of around 300 clubgoers. He killed 49 and injured 53 more, took hostages of those unable to escape, until at around 5 am a SWAT team stormed the club and took him down. Mateen, 29, a radicalized Muslim (Islamist, or jihadist), had sworn fealty to ISIS.

There are plenty of unanswered question here. How did Mateen get into the club with that kind of a weapon, which would have been visible to anyone at the front desk? How was he able to get off over 100 shots, stopping to reload, with no one rushing him or throwing anything to stop him or at least distract him so others could rush him? Was there more than one shooter, as some allege? If so, those other shooters are still at large! Was this attack part of something larger, with the other shoe yet to drop?

Mateen was not unknown to authorities. The FBI had him under surveillance during a ten month period back in 2013. He was interviewed by at least two informants. There are indications the FBI may have been trying to set him up. He had been working for a large international security firm, his branch based in nearby Jupiter, Fla. Somehow he was able to keep a

security clearance and gun permits despite having been heard by coworkers to express sympathies with radical jihadism.

Did the FBI stand down and allow this to happen? The organization has set up Muslims before in order only to take them down and proclaim having thwarted a "terrorist." Did this one get away? Was it allowed to get away?

Emergency medical personnel were required to sign nondisclosure agreements; anyone not doing so was escorted out by federal agents. This was not standard HIPAA fare. Clearly there is more to this than just a terror attack in a gay nightclub. Were people actually killed? Some have posted videos showing a lack of medical personnel such as paramedics at the scene. Instead, friends are helping friends limp away.

A guy I've known since high school, whom I am confident I can trust, lives in the Orlando area now. He told me his son works at Disneyworld and lost two coworkers. Others have told me they have acquaintances or neighbors who were killed or injured. So I am working under the assumption that this is not a hoax. A jihadist forcing his way into a "GLBT" nightclub with murderous intent is a credible scenario, after all.

Islamists hate homosexuals with a passion. In areas they now control, homosexual conduct is punished by death. And it is frequently an extremely brutal death at that! Islamist executioners have been known to hurl convicted homosexuals from the roofs of tall buildings onto concrete surfaces, and sometimes onto stone steps. Anyone resisting is tied to a chair which is then pushed over the side. If someone somehow survives the fall, he may be left to lie in agony for several minutes before being shot in the head. For a brief while there was a video of several such executions on YouTube. Needless to say, it was soon taken down. This was no surprise. YouTube generally removes videos depicting graphic violence and brutality.

This is the sort of thing the open-borders crowd risks bringing into the cities and suburbs of America. It suggests three things that should be self-evident to a rational person. (1) An open clash exists between all-cultures-are-equal multiculturalism and all-lifestyles-are-equal homosexuality. (2) Islamists will no more assimilate into a culture embracing open homosexuality than water will flow uphill. (3) Therefore, bringing unvetted Muslims into the U.S. and trying to settle them in American cities and suburbs out of misguided altruism is asking for trouble!

But, but, but ... – I can hear lefties out there spluttering – Omar Mateen was not an immigrant! He was a U.S. citizen, born in New York City, of Afghan parents who were successfully assimilated immigrants!

Yes, yes, yes, he was a U.S. citizen. An anchor baby. And this did not preclude his embrace of Islamism, ISIS-style, did it?

What does this suggest about Muslims brought to the U.S. from war-torn Syria – war-torn because the U.S. government has been a key player in destabilizing their homeland? ISIS grew, after all, from the effort to bring down the Assad government. Suppose some of these people have become radicalized after have lost family members to bombings or other assaults traceable to U.S. actions? Will they be motivated to embrace U.S. culture? That the U.S. has tried to mainstream homosexuality is bad enough, but is hardly their only beef with the West.

Use your heads, folks! They're not hat racks!

Regrettably, Obama, Hillary Rodham Clinton, left-leaning academics, so-called journalists, a lot of libertarian intellectuals, and a significant fraction of the brainwashed public, just don't get it. Witness Obama's scolding response to Donald Trump taking to social media essentially declaring the Orlando incident a vindication of his call for a ban on

Muslim immigration: "That's not the America we want."

So what kind of America do "we" want, Barack? One that allows unvetted people onto U.S. soil who will murder U.S. citizens? One that proposes disarming its citizens as a solution to events like the Orlando shootings, so they are at the mercy of these crazies?

"We are to blame," intones President Community Organizer.

Huh? Small wonder some people believe this guy is himself a closet Islamist!

Witness, too, the many (too numerous to link to) who declared Trump's response to the Orlando shootings as "racist, Islamophobic", etc., etc., you know the mantras. Or the fact that his numbers have dropped significantly since his calling out the potential bias of a Mexican-descended judge and the Orlando shootings. The powers-that-be in his own party continue conspiring to dump him at the GOP convention next month, despite what is again obvious to any thinking person: this would hand Hillary the presidency, which corporate-globalist power elites have wanted all along, of course; and which even supposed conservative groups are anticipating. This would confirm what he and Bernie Sanders have both insisted from the get-go: that the process is rigged.

Before I go on, it might be useful to say that despite the goofballs who go on TV and pontificate about the "gun culture," or about a generalized "homophobia" for which they blame Christians, I wish to state unequivocally that as a Christian I do NOT support mistreating homosexuals or other sexual minorities. Christians reject such lifestyles on Biblical grounds, but I know of no Christians, anywhere, aside perhaps from a few Westboro Baptist Church type nutjobs who do not qualify as Christian in my book, who want them shot down like animals.

But this is what Islamists want!

These people cannot be bargained with, nor reasoned with; nor will they be deterred by PC allegations of “homophobia.”

Perhaps one day the “LGBT” community will figure it out: as I’ve noted before, those with real power do not care about them. Those with real power have been using them as a cultural distraction and source of division all along. Divide and conquer is the oldest strategy in the book.

Mateen, incidentally, was a registered Democrat. He had nothing to do with any Christian conservative or “Dominionist” (whatever that is) movement. His problem with homosexuality was a product of his jihadism, and nothing else. Jihadists are a direct threat to the “LGBT” community. Period.

In that case, let’s ask again: Do the Orlando shootings vindicate Trumpism, as I spelled it out a few days ago?

If you believe the U.S. is worth conserving, and that one way to do so is to keep potentially dangerous individuals out, then the question answers itself.

Yes, among the implications of the Trumpism I discussed the other day is that because of the kind of immigration policies that have been dominant for the past 50 years, there are dangerous individuals already inside U.S. borders. In many respects, that horse left the barn some time ago.

But one may hope that a Trump administration, should it be allowed to happen, would compel the FBI to stop playing games with people’s lives and start reducing the risks of more massacres occurring. The very mosque Mateen had attended was once under FBI investigation. The investigation was ended ... by none other than Hillary Clinton when she was Obama’s Secretary of State! It “unfairly singled out Muslims”!

You can’t make this stuff up!

Trump, among other things, proposes restoring surveillance of

mosques, and ignoring the PC wails about profiling – at least until Muslims who are U.S. citizens unequivocally, as a community, repudiate ISIS / jihadism, and do more to police their own.

American Trumpism proposes a trade policy, a foreign policy, and an immigration policy that place U.S. sovereignty and prosperity, American lives, and American safety first. Everyone who wishes to survive in a dangerous world does this. It also calls for the clear identification of those on U.S. soil who have the potential to do harm.

Allow me to thwart likely misunderstandings, especially among those inclined to misunderstand. Trumpism does not propose isolationism. It proposes that relations with others be conducted in ways that benefit Americans, with the assumption that other peoples are doing the same. At one time, it was understood that this is how freedom works: that it does not involve becoming the rest of the world's doormat. Trumpism does not deny international trade, nor does it advocate closed and sealed borders. It involves insisting that the rule of law be reinstated and obeyed. Even Trump's suggested ban on Muslim immigration is temporary: conditional on determining "what is going on." Trumpism suggests that for those who choose to isolate themselves from the dominant culture, which many Muslims have, trust must be earned and not given away free.

If, as some pundits insist, this cannot be done within the bounds of Constitutional limitations on government (as if Trump's left wing critics really care about those!), then it is already too late, and you can kiss your country goodbye!

Americans are running out of time to sort all this out. Establishing border security is necessary now if you are to have any chance at avoiding more attacks of this sort – which will not be limited to homosexuals but will soon target Christians and even Americanized Muslims who are deemed "not

radical enough” by ISIS-supporting lunatics.

Trumpism is not a perfect option, any more than Trump is a perfect candidate. But given the utter collapse of the GOP Establishment, successfully unmasked by Trump as a collection of empty suits, you have little choice except to play the hand you’ve been dealt; for the reasons you do not want Hillary Rodham Clinton to enter the White House in 2017 are what they are.

For starters, whoever becomes President in 2017 will nominate at least two and possibly as many as four Supreme Court Justices. Hillary Rodham Clinton will pack the Court with anti-Bill of Rights hard-leftists. Among their actions will be to reverse *District of Columbia v. Heller* (2008) which found the gun ban in Washington, D.C. to be unconstitutional. This will open legal doors to gun confiscation, assuming the gun-grabbers have the nerve to try placing presently well-armed communities at the mercy of lunatics ready and willing to kill them – not excluding agents of their own government.

If Hillary Rodham Clinton becomes president, by the 2020s the U.S. will be an unrecognizable war zone!

Is your Plan B in place?

© 2016 Steven Yates – All Rights Reserved

What is American Trumpism?

Do the Orlando shootings vindicate Trumpism?

What does this question mean? While all we need is another ism in our political-economic lexicon, some have tried to define Trumpism: for instance, these guys who appear to have gotten

cold feet. Maybe their computers were hacked, too; or maybe the sudden deletion of their entire site except for a rather mysterious farewell statement is explained here.

Trumpism is paradoxical. It implies an ideology, and Donald Trump is no ideologist; he's an empiricist, not a systematic thinker. He goes off what he sees, not abstractions. What the term Trumpism implies is the possibility of ideas separable from the man himself, and which might survive if his candidacy is sabotaged or if he loses in November. That makes it important. My reference to American Trumpism suggests that there might be other forms of Trumpism, populist equivalents, elsewhere around the world. This is confirmed by the Le Pens in France, Geert Wilder in the Netherlands, Joerg Haider and Norbert Hofer in Austria, Viktor Orban in Hungary, Jaroslaw Kaczynsk in Poland, Rodrigo Duterte in the Philippines, and – indirectly – the “Brexit” movement in Great Britain.

My focus will be on the U.S., but we're looking, somewhat ironically, at a global rebellion against the coercive globalism being led mostly by corporations and a few “global-citizen” types whose view of the people left unemployed by their policies is an indifferent shrug: “let them find gigs” (which recalls an earlier one: let them eat cake).

One of the pseudonymous folks at the above site identified three components (sadly, no longer linkable):

- (1) Immigration policy that puts the interests of America and Americans first.
- (2) Foreign policy that puts the interests of America and Americans first.
- (3) Trade policy that puts the interests of America and Americans first.

The author who called himself Decius added, “Trump seems to grasp intuitively something our elites have forgotten or smugly deny: Politics is by nature particular.” He might have

added: left to itself, most actual free trade is local and also particular.

Before we expand on these remarks, a warning. What follows should be presumed dangerous! I am almost surprised if this essay is posted. It is clear: there are people who want this kind of discussion stopped. They will go beyond mere namecalling ("Trump's a racist, a xenophobe, a fascist, an Islamophobe"). I am grateful (1) I am semi-retired, with no employer trolls can email, to derail my career; and (2) for the extra layer of security on all my devices. Trump may be the biggest black swan globalists have yet encountered, in the U.S. at least. As I wrote last time, I think they and their many "useful idiots" scattered across the media and elsewhere are in abject terror. Their scare tactics are everywhere! For even if they thwart Trump himself, whether at the GOP convention or in November, the movement he's galvanized – and the issues his candidacy has brought to the surface of American consciousness – are not going away!

I suggest Trumpism has four elements we can pin down.

(1) A brand of conservatism that wants, first and foremost, to conserve the American nation – while CINOs (conservatives in name only) who dominated the GOP until Trump came along aren't interested in conserving anything; their interests are money and power.

(2) Calls for ending open borders policies that have cost American jobs and, it should now be clear in the wake of the Orlando shootings as well as others such as those in St. Bernardino, Calif., place Americans' lives at risk. (The Orlando shootings raise additional issues I will defer to a separate article next week.) If one doubts the wisdom of border security, look at the costs of open borders in Europe where cities and towns have been overrun by unassimilable Muslims, courtesy of the pro-war foreign policy of U.S. neocons whose wars of choice have laid waste to their

homelands, and the open borders policy of the disastrous (and hopefully doomed) European Union. Immigrants from Mexico are no longer assimilating into the U.S. No borders = in the long run, no nation!

(3) A pro-American foreign policy which eschews “nation building” that does not work and wars of choice that make Americans enemies. Fighting a war means intending to win it – which means not getting involved in unwinnable regional squabbles. Trumpism also promotes arrangements in which the U.S. aids other nations but insists that they carry their weight by paying us back; no more free lunches.

(4) Economic nationalism: which means trade deals and employment policies that favor Americans, not foreigners, and which favor all Americans who work for a living, not just a privileged elite whose “work” involves moving money around all day. Free trade in this view is a misnomer for controlled trade by elite-dominated corporations in partnership with governments (corporatism or “soft fascism”). The latter understand freedom as the freedom to do whatever increases their profit margins no matter who gets stepped on. Sometimes it’s the American working class, as when factories close and go to Mexico for cheaper labor. Other times it is indigenous peoples elsewhere, as John Perkins shows in his *Confessions of an Economic Hit Man* (2004; new 2nd Ed. 2016).

Behind Trumpism, as Ben Boychun explains (he’s one of those rare writers who, while opposing Trump himself, appears intent on getting the ideas right) following our friend Decius, is this kind of sentiment: “ ... in the real world most of us recognize the difference between a fellow citizen and a foreigner, or a friend and an enemy. Some people belong; some people don’t. A country that can’t tell the difference won’t last long.”

In other words, Trumpism does involve an us-versus-them perspective: a view of the world Enlightenment ideals of

Universal Reason (UR) and Universal Human Rights (UHR) sought but ultimately failed to transcend. I find this saddening, but I didn't make the rules.

Like it or not, UR and UHR were creations of White Anglo-Saxon Protestant (WASP)-males, especially pivotal philosophers such as Kant who was among the first to dream of a global village, a "kingdom of ends." Kant's intellectual descendants wrongly assumed that peoples everywhere would welcome with open arms the Western world of positive science, market capitalism's economic and technological encirclements (material embodiments of UR), and so-called liberal democracy (that of UHR).

The results have been mixed. A few cultures have embraced some of these ideals and done reasonably well. Singapore comes to mind, although Singapore is no democracy! Others came into contact with Western systems and suffered near-irreparable harm, e.g., the Ladakhi about whom Helena Norberg-Hodge writes in her illuminating *Ancient Futures: Lessons of Ladakh for a Globalizing World* (1991, 2009).

But let's focus on the home front. How consistent has been its commitment to UR and UHR? Answer: not very. They've proven expendable when inconvenient!

The purveyors of political correctness (PC) abandoned them. They implied affording everyone the same rights and holding everyone to the same standards under the rule of law ("colorblindness," as opposed to, e.g., "racenorming" in law school admissions). They conflicted with men's and women's roles being interchangeable in military service.

They did not bring PC-friendly outcomes for minorities and feminists, in other words.

Hence the PC crowd restored a tribalism which tried to keep WASP-males out of its loop. When a radical academic (e.g.) argues that every ethnic group has its own consciousness, based on its members' own collective experience that can only

be understood from the inside, they are expressing this new tribalism. Or when Justice Sonia Sotomayor was described as a "wise Latina," it was implied that her group identity was essential to her capacity to help decide Supreme Court cases "fairly" for her people.

Trump is hated for bringing WASP-males into this loop. He's just being consistent. Consciously or not, he employed the same tribalism to benefit a white guy, himself, by questioning the objectivity of a Mexican-descended judge (a member of a La Raza-affiliated law organization) to decide the Trump University case "fairly."

The other tribes have cried foul at the top of their lungs, as if WASP-males could be expected not to embrace the new tribalism eventually. Part of official PC dogma, as everybody knows, is that all WASPs are privileged. This is nonsense, of course, but it hasn't stopped white privilege from a leading mantra today. Another PC / multiculturalist dogma is that objectivity does not really exist but is a "WASP-male social construct." Never mind the logic of wondering if, in this case, PC / multiculturalist judgments can be objective, because logic too is a "white male social construct."

So does anyone still believe UR / UHR?

Libertarians as rationalist-individualists tend to believe them, following their ancestors, the classical liberals. Those who accept the mindset of Science (capital S) do. Think of guys like Richard Dawkins (emphasizing UR more than UHR). Or possibly Pope Francis (emphasizing UHR more than UR). You will find progressives and so-called conservative Republicans paying them lip service. I used to argue from such premises.

The problem: nations that try to practice them while simultaneously embracing globalism, open borders and multi-ethnicity, end up divided and shattered, as groups with incommensurable cultural values battle over the spoils.

“Diversity,” contrary to the celebrated adage, is not “our strength.” It’s an academic fantasy. In the real world of flesh and blood masses who are not intellectuals or economic abstractions (homo economicus as a sort of walking utility-maximizer), diversity is threatening, divisive, and destructive – especially if one or more of the parties did not agree to the arrangement, its members stripped of control over their lives and culture.

Why? Expanding on Boychuk’s remarks, peoples automatically distinguish between their own who are familiar and trusted, and those outside who are unknown quantities and not trusted – not without a lengthy period of vigilant observation. The outsider, who looks different, has different customs, believes a different worldview and speaks a different language, has to prove himself. This is not “racism” but common sense! Contact by outsiders could be a friendly overture or prelude to an invasion!

Nothing here precludes trade relations developing between different peoples, but will place natural limits on them and ensure that most trade will be local or at most, regional, among known quantities ... unless it is socially engineered to be otherwise, as corporate globalists have spent the past hundred years doing. Then you have accusations of imperialism, revolutions, wars, terrorism, false flag events, and the kinds of tensions (between rich, middle class and poor; between the sexes; between different regions and ethnicities) we have everywhere peoples are forced under vast, impersonal, technocratic structures of governance and economic domination against their will.

This also explains why ambitious trade negotiations like Doha stall and collapse. The bottom line: those involved do not trust one another. Where trust exists, documents thousands of pages long do not seem necessary. Says Francis Fukuyama in his magnificent treatise *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity* (1995): “people who do not trust one

another will end up cooperating only under a system of formal rules and regulations, which have to be negotiated, agreed to, litigated, and enforced, sometimes by coercive means... Widespread distrust in a society, in other words, imposes a kind of tax on all forms of economic activity, a tax that high-trust societies do not have to pay" (pp. 27-28). Fukuyama was talking about nation-states, but his remarks surely apply to our globalized world. Corporate globalists learned from Doha that from the standpoint of their goals, transparency is a bad idea. Hence the secrecy of their more recent projects, the Trans-Pacific Partnership and the Trans-Atlantic Trade and Investment Partnership. Claims of conspiracy be damned!

Trumpism is a late American empire response to the division and distrust globalism and the PC / multiculturalist axis have sowed. While the latter see global economic growth, minorities rising to power, and angry white males fearful of losing their privileges, Trumpists see a hollowed out economy, a ruined educational system, and a shattered culture.

Trumpism also rejects as nonsense that "we are a nation of immigrants." "We" are a nation of Anglo-Saxon settlers and their descendants who allowed immigration primarily for other Europeans willing to assimilate into a dominant culture: English-speaking, Christian in an organic sense built into community life and mores, based on the rule of law derived from English common law, embodied in the U.S. Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

This culture went on to build what indeed became the greatest civilization history had yet seen! Which then began to self-destruct!

Immigration-requiring-assimilation held sway until 1966, when President Lyndon Johnson signed the Kennedy-sponsored Immigration Act which made it more difficult for Europeans from similar cultures to immigrate to the U.S. and easier for peoples from the second and third worlds. The latter

snowballed, and not simply under left-liberals' watch. President Ronald Reagan signed a similar immigration bill in 1986. The corporate world had grown more hostile to workers (recall Reagan's breaking the air traffic controllers' union a few years before). It was also becoming more materialist, as was the rest of the culture. The outsourcing of jobs to cheap-labor countries was picking up.

It is no accident that real, inflation-adjusted wages have been stagnant or falling since the Reagan-Bush years, that permanent jobs paying livable wages have gone overseas replaced by part-time "gigs," and that what was the largest financially independent middle class in history is shrinking.

Is there any wonder that Trumpists look to the past in order to build the future: a future that repudiates globalism, accepts a tribalism acknowledging WASP identity (rejecting PC because it rejects them), and proposes to Make America Great Again by putting Americans first in all things?

A few final, somewhat random notes are in order:

For what it's worth, slavery was the West's biggest blunder. Our ancestors should have eschewed it altogether. Only a fraction of blacks have successfully assimilated, and now that the rest have either succumbed to welfare-statism or fallen under the sway of the PC / SJW mindset, they are moving en masse in the wrong direction. Neither Trumpism nor leftism nor UHR nor anything else is likely to prevent this from ending badly!

Libertarians do not provide a real alternative. The Libertarian Party just nominated two cultural leftists (Gary Johnson and William Weld) who favor open borders and "free trade." Given the supposed unpopularity of both Trump and Hillary Clinton, this should be a banner year for the LP. But again it hasn't caught on outside its own echo chambers. The reason, I think, is the sense that libertarianism is too

academic and out of touch with the thinking of common people.*

Millennials' support for Bernie Sanders, alongside recent polls suggesting that many are giving up on capitalism in favor of socialism – with neither term defined – indicate both their frustration with the hollowed out economy that may well have destroyed their parents' livelihoods, as well as the need to rebuild education from scratch – and without its presently ludicrous price tag!

Declaring, as many pseudo-pundits doubtless will, that Trumpism is just intellectual fascism with a new face, misses the point entirely. Trumpism affirms white identity – indeed, (alpha) white male identity – alongside the other tribalisms. Did those of us who find it tempting want this result? No, but as far as I am concerned, it just makes sense as a response to the collapse of UR and UHR, as well as the hostility towards everything that build this civilization, including white men. None of this was our doing.

Trumpism rejects the dominant “neos” (neoconservatism, neoliberalism) as having run their course. The former has given us a destructive war machine. The latter, massive inequality, and among those who feel well off, a pseudo-prosperity based on debt. Places like Chile may seem like exceptions. I submit, having lived here four years now, that what prosperity Chileans have, has had its price. Chile, too, is controlled by a tiny elite. Although it's a separate article, the fact that neoliberalism promised prosperity but has delivered rigid class stratification and ridiculously overpriced higher education that has become an increasing source of unrest here, particularly among the young. It is equally true that Michelle Bachelet's center-left corporatism-lite with its undeliverable promise of “free education” has worsened, not alleviated, the situation.

The two “neos” are flipsides of discredited worldview, rooted in the materialist view of the universe and of human nature,

economics über alles, and the possibility of unlimited growth and expansionism no matter who gets hurt. This worldview should be repudiated before it does more damage. And no, UR and UHR do not fit into it, either, which is why they are losing ground on all fronts. Trumpists may reject them; the global elite has no interest in them either, but for a completely different reason: in helping accrue wealth and power, they are useless.

Donald Trump would not think these thoughts, of course. But we can, and we must.

*I used to think of myself as a libertarian (lower-case l). I voted Libertarian several times (e.g., in 1988 when Ron Paul ran on the LP ticket). When asked, I sometimes tell people that I did not leave libertarianism, it left me. I defended Constitutionally limited government, which Dr. Paul supported. Today, however, you'll find libertarian writers who reject the Constitution as a mistake. Those who haven't become anarcho-crazies who imply governing institutions can somehow be abolished on a large scale have embraced cultural leftism (some were there all along): pro-abortion, pro-gay marriage, etc.: often anti-Christian as many are also locked into materialism with all four claws.

© 2016 Steven Yates – All Rights Reserved

**Anti-Trump stormtroopers:
campaign of destruction,**

dishonesty and fear

It finally happened: following the posting of my Open Letter to the Social Justice Warriors (SJWs) of Oberlin College, my computer was hacked and malware planted on it. The culprit(s) couldn't have known that I recently contracted with a firm to keep a watchful eye on my equipment. No one can ensure 100% security, however, and the result was several hours disinfecting my computer and installing an extra layer of protection. We have a record of the hack. When the time is right we will be acting accordingly.

I don't believe in coincidences. If you write a piece like that and it gets circulated, you make enemies. These days, you risk the high-tech equivalent of a brick lobbed through your front window. Behind such acts is a need to intimidate or destroy what is perceived as a threat, whether it's to the offense-free "safe space" SJWs want or the prospects of a President Donald Trump.

My aim had been to throw cold water on the sort of politics dear to a generation that grew up with Internet access, mobile devices, social media, and hackers (not all of whom are psychos, by the way). This generation has probably forgotten more about technology than geezers like myself who went through college barely knowing what computers were have learned. What few in this generation can do is, though, argue credibly for their convictions, whichever government school inculcated them, that America is deeply racist, sexist, "homophobic," and now "transphobic" (the latest PC neologism).

And speaking of Trump, do we not see the same destruction being visited upon his events and supporters, coupled with mainstream media dishonesty by omission?

A guy filming a group of so-called progressives protesting a Trump appearance is attacked and is lucky to escape with his

scalp intact.

A large group of protesters in Chicago back in March compels Trump to cancel an event out of fears for attendees' safety.

Groups of blacks and so-called progressives block roads leading to a Trump event just outside Phoenix, Arizona.

Pro-Trump writing appears on sidewalks on Emory University campus. SJWs go berserk. "Come speak to us!" an anguished student group demanded of the Emory administration. "We are in pain!" One student even broke down in tears during a meeting. The poor thing. (One reader took me to task for using sarcasm in my Open Letter. But do these kids have any idea how they look and sound to rational beings?)

More violence erupted in San José, California. Images of one woman in particular, spat on and pelted with eggs and tomatoes by Mexicans, have gone viral. This reinforces the convictions in many Trump's supporters' minds that these people are not just lawbreakers but criminally violent, just as Trump insists, and need to be sent home on the next train.

Have you noticed that these people, likely supporters of Hillary Clinton or Bernie Sanders, show up at Trump events with the intention of being disruptive? Trump supporters do not show up at Bernie Sanders rallies or Hillary Clinton ones. Mainstream media has yet to report this. Small wonder Trump calls reporters sleazy and dishonest to their faces.

I presume the vast majority of corporate media footsoldiers have their marching orders, which they follow to keep from losing their jobs.

They refuse to give him credit for things he does, such as raise millions for Veterans. When he does not produce an exact count of what was raised, with every i dotted and every t crossed on how the money was distributed, mainstream media accuses him of nefarious deeds, neglecting to tell us that

Trump is the only candidate to have raised any money for Veterans. (What the Clintons have donated to Veterans groups is insulting by comparison; although plenty of money goes to the Clinton Foundation!)

Last in this litany: George Soros, hard-left globalist billionaire, MoveOn.org and Occupy Wall Street sugar daddy, is discovered to have bankrolled at least one group of anti-Trump Stormtroopers. Again, total silence from mainstream media.

Behind the disruptive tactics and professionalized dishonesty: frankly, I smell fear. No, it's more than that. One looks at these events, in light of half-assed stunts such as GOP neocons trying to nominate the comparatively unknown David French to run as an independent, and one recognizes stark, abject terror!

The neocons have lost control of the GOP for reasons in addition to their neglect of the party's base. When Trump called present-day (neocon-crafted) foreign policy "a complete and total disaster," he was spot on. Should he become president, this will mean an end to the quixotic "nation building" the Bushies started, which has cost American taxpayers trillions of dollars, killed or maimed thousands of our troops, left tens of thousands of Iraqis homeless. Obama and Hillary continued this madness, destabilizing much of the Middle East, causing the massive refugee crisis inundating Europe, and making Americans still more enemies. Neoconservatism, for those who showed up late to this party, has nothing to do with traditional conservatism which has been dead in the Republican Party for decades. It is either uninformed or dishonest to call present-day GOP elites or corporate donors "conservatives." In the interests of balance, neither does neoliberalism, which I'll get to in a minute, have anything to do with the classical liberalism of Adam Smith and John Stuart Mill which is just as dead in the water.

We see abject terror among the Western power elites generally,

those with real privilege gained from having financialized the U.S. economy (production having been offshored) or moving money around all day (the way Soros got rich): abject terror that Trump may actually win this election, set out to keep his promises, and end the party. Whether he'll be able to build a wall on the Mexican border, I have no clue. I'm not even sure it's a good idea when there are better strategies for dealing with illegal aliens (penalizing employers caught hiring them, for example), but Trump would be the first president in decades to take securing the border seriously.

Trump might also stand firm on his previously-stated moratorium against unvetted Muslims being resettled in medium-sized U.S. cities and towns, in light of events such as that of San Bernardino, California. Yes, yes, I know: there are over a billion Muslims on the planet, and the majority are peaceful. True, and completely irrelevant! A minority of Muslims, especially those from the Middle East, are not peaceful! We cannot read their minds. Therefore we have no advance means of knowing who has evil intent until a bomb explodes in a workplace or a nightclub or a supermarket somewhere in an American city instead of Paris!

Folks, this is not rocket science!

Even more frightening for the elites and those who identify with them (I have both received email and corresponded with others about this, sometimes in agreement and sometimes in fierce disagreement): Trump may follow through with his plan for the global economy, working to implement responsible trade instead of "free trade" (corporate-controlled trade). He charges China with protecting its industries and manipulating its currency to boost exports. There is every reason to take such allegations seriously and to hold the Chinese accountable. Incidentally, last time I checked, China was still a Communist country, its corporations state-controlled. How Americans can have "free trade" with a Communist country, one of the most centralized and repressive regimes in the

world, is one of those mysteries of neoliberal-globalist economics.

So suppose Trump is elected, makes deals, and however it happens, his policies begin a renaissance of U.S. manufacturing! That would discredit roughly 70 years of neoliberal economics. Just about everything since the first Mont Pelerin Society meeting and the formation of what economic historian Philip Mirowski calls the Neoliberal Thought Collective (NTC) will have to be thrown out. Small wonder neither the academic nor the Beltway economists like Donald Trump!

According to neoliberalism, the “free market” is akin to God. Neoliberals do not really oppose central planning, though. They never believed in pure laissez faire, and haven’t minded furthering plans that empower global corporations. This is because the latter (Walmart, Halliburton, Monsanto, Merck, etc.) represent the “free market at work.” Yes, neoliberals appear to believe such things. Privatization is good; it shifts control from “the state” to corporations, even if the latter proceed to plunder entire nations driven into “austerity.” Neoliberals believe free migration is good for an economy; cheap labor means higher profits. Outsourcing jobs to third world countries for more cheap labor is good for the same reason, regardless of how many domestic workers are dumped into the streets. Professor Mirowski observes that neoliberalism has a conception of the human person: we are malleable, like lumps of clay, no less than what any leftist or behaviorist has said; the best of us respond to “market incentives” and continuously retool to “monetize” ourselves. If the “free market” is God, then money is salvation!

Perhaps I simply don’t understand “economic theory” (i.e., the NTC paradigm) but I am at a loss to understand how any of these has been “good for the U.S. economy” understood in terms of real, flesh-and-blood Americans on Main Street. I can see it has been good for Wall Street and Walmart. No one says it

hasn't created millions of jobs in China, which pay pennies on the dollar compared to their former U.S. equivalents. No one argues it hasn't allowed floods of cheaply made Chinese products onto the shelves of Walmart and its affiliates: products that last anywhere from a few weeks to a few months before they fall apart. U.S. consumers buy them because this is all the former middle class can afford. A real craftsman dares not give up his day job (if he has one).

Perhaps I don't understand the benefits of the jobs base disappearing, real wages for average Americans having flatlined, or public institutions from schools to hospitals being overwhelmed by people who can't speak English.

Perhaps I do not understand the benefits of structural economic inequality (as opposed to natural inequality caused only by some working harder than others). As everyone knows, inequality within nations has skyrocketed, especially since the Meltdown of 2008. Not "one-percenters" but a 0.01% has been the primary beneficiary of neoliberal economic policies. Actually, the number could be more like 0.0001% or even 0.00001%; recent findings show that the world's richest 62 billionaires now control more wealth than the entire bottom half of the world's population.

This is not the "free market at work." This can happen because billionaires are positioned to exercise their free choices to buy the world's cooperative political classes and build global structures of domination. None dare call this protectionism!

Those who call Trump a fascist need to check their definitions. If we define it as Mussolini did – as the merging of corporate and governmental control for policy purposes – then do we not have "soft" fascism now??? Surely we have the anti-Trump Stormtroopers!

Missing from the status quo is, of course, the nationalist element Trump has brought back into the conversation.

Neoliberal economics has no use for national borders or local laws (e.g., food labeling), because they interfere with the freedom of corporations to do as they please, whatever the consequences to the people who live within those borders.

We have to keep in mind the goal of the billionaire elites: establishing corporate-controlled world government. A single, global regime would replace the nationalist element present in old-style fascism. United Earth Über Alles! One “free market” under corporate boards! It is towards such a regime that globalist political economy has been taking the world: actually for over a century, but when the Soviet Union collapsed the pace accelerated, and since the Meltdown of 2008 it has accelerated faster!

The elites never let a good crisis go to waste!

They both are and should be worried about rising populist unrest all over the world, much of it prompted by inequality and a sense that absent the uprisings we are beginning to see, the majority of the peoples of the world would be denied a say in what happens to them and their communities. Credit the Internet: the fact that people the world over can investigate for themselves, find out who the elites are, and figure out at least a rough sketch of what they want. They see that their lives, livelihoods, and cultures are little more than expendable roadkill on the creative-destructive superhighway leading to United Earth Über Alles.

Upshot: with a President Trump, and with other populist and nationalist leaders around the world (e.g., Rodrigo Duterte, just elected president of the Philippines), we might approach the cusp of what the historian and philosopher of science Thomas S. Kuhn would call a paradigm change in political economy – away from neoliberal corporate-globalism, which has led to massive inequality, civil unrest, cultural devastation and the plundering of natural resources, and finally financial instability via massive indebtedness, the creation of asset

bubbles, and fiat currency manipulation and debasement.

Even the International Monetary Fund is now hesitating over the neoliberal political economy it has done much to help create.

Were the SJWs taking note of all these things, instead of whining about “white privilege” and demanding “safe spaces” free of “micro-aggressions,” I would be impressed. But very few if any seem aware that there are more important things than their feelings of safety.

Be this as it may, where do we go from here?

That’s a much bigger issue, requiring attention to what has worked in the past. It requires, that is, attention to university subjects SJWs have partly destroyed, like history, moral and political philosophy; and a subject the globalists have mostly destroyed, what E.F. Schumacher once called “economics as if people mattered.”

© 2016 Steven Yates – All Rights Reserved

Open letter to students of Oberlin college

WHO WANT TO END MIDTERMS AND GRADES LOWER THAN “C”

To: The politically active “Social Justice Warriors” and their 1,300 supporters at Oberlin College who want an end to written tests and forbid grades less than C for this semester; and SJWs elsewhere.

From: Steven Yates, Ph.D., Writer; Independent Scholar,

Philosophy; Small Business Owner.

Re: This, and this.

Dear Students of Oberlin College who want to end midterm tests and forbid grades of less than C for this semester:

First things first: I am not sure any of you will read this, as it depends on your finding your way to this site; and if by some chance you do, I doubt any of you will read it all the way through. Your loss, not mine. I am not your professor, although in other circumstances I could have been (see fifth to last paragraph). So I won't be grading your inattention. But you might benefit in some small way by reading this, because you need a wake-up call – and that's putting it mildly!

Yesterday I read of your frustrated petition to your College from struggling academically due to your political activity on and off campus, i.e., activity on behalf of “diversity, inclusion, equity,” etc., and your calls to abolish written tests and put an end to your professors' giving you grades of less than C.

You poor darlings! My heart is bleeding for you, all over the floor!

Why did you decide to go to college? Why, in particular, did you opt to attend an elite and rather expensive private liberal arts school like Oberlin? Did you think you'd have a free ride? Did you think you could choose to spend your time engaging in political activity instead of studying, and your choice would have no consequences? Speaking more generally, did you honestly expect to never run across any words or ideas you might find “offensive” (i.e., disagree with, or which violate your sense of what is culturally appropriate in this politically correct age)?

What planet are you on, anyway? I'll tell you: it's called

Earth. And on Earth, there are no free lunches. Not really. Not in the long run. On Earth, cupcakes, your choices have consequences. If you choose to drink yourself into oblivion on Friday night, you're going to wake up with a massive hangover Saturday morning. Just to cite an example some of you can probably relate to. It's called cause and effect, and it applies to everything you do. If you choose to party instead of do the assigned reading for your remedial reading class, you're going to be unprepared. If you skip the class out of avoidance, you're going to be even more unprepared. Keep up with the avoidance, and you'll fail the class. You should. That's life, where choices have consequences.

Black students, listen up! No, I will not use the politically correct term African-American, and for the obvious reasons: with few exceptions not one of you is from Africa, has ever been to Africa, or has anything to do with Africa. I'd wager, many of you could not walk up to a map of the world and find Africa. So why should I call you African-Americans (other than that you demand that I do so and will scream at me and call me bad names if I refuse)?

I read the list of "nonnegotiable" demands you made to the administration last year. You will tell me I cannot "know" your experiences because I am a white male, and that this whole letter is a litany of "micro-aggressions." You know something? I don't care about your opinions. Here is what I know:

Your country and its educational system, which used to be my country and educational system as well, has bent over backwards for you – for 50 years! You've had preferential admissions programs, minority-only scholarships some of you are probably attending college on right now, affirmative action, etc., in various forms for five decades now. Today you demand "safe spaces" and you get "safe spaces" – never mind that you are reinstituting a form of segregation. You want trigger warnings; you get trigger warnings. You want your own

Afrikan [sic.] Heritage House, you get that as well. You would doubtless get more black faculty were there more blacks applying for faculty jobs (there aren't, and your administrators have probably drawn the line at pulling them off street corners).

All this was, and is, being instituted by white people in most cases. The civil rights movement back in the 1960s (have you studied it?) would not have succeeded without the cooperation of benevolent, well-intentioned white people. Yet today you demonize white people.

Instead, you might try showing a little gratitude!

You cannot help Tamir Rice, or his family. You know something? I agree with you about that. His shooting was malicious and needless. It shouldn't have happened, not even in this post-9/11 world. But it isn't your fight, and frankly, until you get some real education, you will only make matters worse.

Women students, listen up! Sweethearts, much the same applies to you. There was a time (again, have you studied it?) when feminism meant something other than male-bashing. You, too, have been given a great deal. Affirmative action in the workplace has helped you more than it has your black classmates. Look it up if you don't believe me. Stop seeing "gender-bias" everywhere you see that men are in the majority. Being in the majority is not always peaches and cream. The vast majority of those killed in wars are men.

"Transgender" students? My most honest, heartfelt advice: get help!

Now I know you are living in confusing, stressful times – times that are what they are because of how badly the country's elites (both major parties, the Federal Reserve, Wall Street, etc.) have screwed up everything they've touched, and because over 90% of what you've ever been told is lies and BS. You want to "unlearn most of what you've been taught"?

Maybe you should listen to Joy Karega instead of jumping on some bandwagon of weaponized words like “anti-Semite” and “conspiracy theorist.” You’d be wise to forget what you’re “supposed” to believe, i.e., what you get from “official” government narratives and corporate media celebrities, do some snooping around on your own, and figure out who, what groups, and which organizations actually bear primary responsibility for the present predicament.

Many of you support Bernie Sanders for president. Yes, I get it. Hillary Clinton is joined to Goldman Sachs at one hip and the foreign war machine at the other. And it’s a given, you don’t like Trump. But my cats understand more economics than Bernie Sanders.

Do you really think a \$15/hr. minimum wage will help low-income workers? Think again, sugarplums. Many jobs aren’t worth that. Increasing the minimum wage to \$15/hr. will force small businesses to lay off employees they can’t afford to keep. You will also accelerate the replacement of human beings with technology. McDonalds is already testing automated kiosks, and others will follow. Yeah, I suppose the guy at the top could take a cut in his profits. But what do you think he’s in business for? If you’re in business and you don’t turn a profit, you’re out of business and your workers are out of work.

It might be helpful to know: when you have a job, you’re not paid what you’re worth (whatever that is), you’re paid what the job is worth. Don’t like that? Start your own business, honeys. People used to do it every day.

It’s capitalism, you say, and down with capitalism!! Bernie’s a socialist, or says he is. Again, have you actually studied the subject? Could you produce a clear and accurate account of what socialism is, in a concise, well-organized paragraph of grammatically correct sentences? If not, you need to learn about socialism and its actual track record, so that when you

have a conversation with adults you'll have a clue what you're talking about. Or, if you want first-hand insights how well socialism works, move to Venezuela!

Now if you were talking about, say, the Federal Reserve, or neocons in connection with what's wrong with U.S. foreign policy, I'd be impressed. But I never see those things come up. What I see from here, in whatever form it takes, is the same old griping about too many mean ol' white guys on your campus and in your textbooks. Imbalances, boys and girls? Feeling "marginalized"? You might help rectify perceived imbalances, or end your sense of marginalization, by getting an education and making an intelligent contribution to the world of ideas, or starting a business, whichever you choose. You want to be the Firebrand Generation? Quit whining and go do something useful for your fellow citizens. I've noticed that a lot of blacks in business, or programming computers, or what-have-you, don't seem to have as many complaints about "micro-aggressions" or demands for "safe spaces."

Have you noticed that?

I didn't think so.

Who am I to be saying all this "desensitized" mean ol' white male stuff? A guy who once interviewed for a faculty position at Oberlin, eons ago, back in slightly saner times (just as well I didn't get the job!). I'm a guy who figured out that much of academia is now a racket, and fled the premises. It's the same racket presently taking you to the cleaners, forcing you into five and maybe six figures of student loan debt, granting you worthless degrees in return. Yes, if your major is anything ending with the word studies, you're degree will be worthless, whether from the standpoint of actual scholarship (admittedly verging on extinction) or just finding work after you graduate. Incidentally, do you think even a degree in a real subject will be worth anything to an employer who knows your professors were forbidden to give you anything

less than a C? One of the things that needs to change is your institution treating you like customers and trying to satisfy your every whim on that basis. You are not customers. You are college students.

And you do want to be something other than social parasites, because frankly, your country is broke and can't continue supporting you. Its official national debt is over \$19 trillion, \$8 trillion of that added since President Community Organizer stepped into the White House. The Federal Reserve you've barely looked at can't keep creating money out of thin air indefinitely to keep the Obama-era disaster of an economy afloat much longer. So if you don't wake up, you'll find out the hard way that the real decision-makers, those with real power, don't care about you. If you're playing Social Justice Warrior games when the next major downturn hits, you may see your meal ticket disappear so fast your head will spin.

Nearly all of you will ignore this, I know. You'll call me names, like racist, or cissexist (whatever that means). What I'd do if I was you, sweet peas, is reexamine why you went to college. Is there even a slight chance you might choose to set aside your uninformed political activism long enough to get an education, including learning how to take care of yourselves financially – before it's too late? You may have heard it before, but: grow up! Stop lodging harassment complaints against professors who correct you in class. That's part of their job. Don't be so hypersensitive! And quit using silly, made-up words like "cissexist" and "Afro-Latinx" (I was going to call them neologisms, but they don't rise to that level, and I am sure that word isn't in your vocabularies anyway).

Lastly, stop expecting things to be done for you just because you demand it. I have news for you, ladies and gentlepersons. Your employer, assuming you find one, won't care that you feel "micro-aggressed" against. He or she won't give you a "safe space." What he or she will tell you if you try making "nonnegotiable" demands is to not slam the door on your way

out. That's because he or she will just want a job done. And he or she will be in the right, because that's how the real world works. As you will find out soon enough.

If you have any questions, I will be happy to answer them, but do keep the namecalling and obscenities to yourselves. I'm not as pliable as one of your administrators.

All the best,

Steven

© 2016 Steven Yates – All Rights Reserved

Hillary Clinton presidency would be an unmitigated disaster for U.S. and the world

Now that Donald Trump has inched to within 200 delegates of an outright victory that avoids a brokered GOP convention, the knives are out. George Will's latest hate blast openly calls for "conservatives" to keep Trump out of the White House, even to "help him lose 50 states ...". This more sophisticated-appearing pro-elite analysis by Andrew Sullivan does its best not just to call him a fascist, the culmination of "hyper-democracy" run amuck, but to portray him as the political equivalent of an "extinction level event" in liberal democracy's self-destruction.

Perhaps it's worth another look at how we got here, a path presently embodied in Trump's presumed opponent, Hillary

Rodham Clinton. If you love the Establishment, you will have no trouble supporting Hillary Rodham Clinton ... even if you are an Establishment "conservative" of the Mitt Romney / Jeb Bush sort. It is one thing to utter the cliché that people are angry at the Establishment. Old news. Do you wonder why? When we look at the Establishment, what do we see?

We see the folks who lost the culture war hands down. It indeed was, as Sullivan says, a rout, because the Establishment is interested primarily in economics and couldn't be bothered to fight it. Now we have on our hands a possibly doomed struggle to keep sexually confused biological males (not to mention sexual predators) out of women's public bathrooms!

We see the folks who have destroyed the country's educational system from top to bottom via one fashion after another (Common Core being the latest), because they aren't interested in real education but in global workforce training (economics über alles once again).

We see the folks who very likely have deceived us about the 9/11 attacks from the get-go, and continue to deceive us about such events as the supposed killing of Osama bin Laden in Pakistan five years ago.

We see the folks who got us into a war of almost mindnumbing stupidity in Iraq, which snowballed and has nearly destroyed the Middle East, precipitating a migration crisis that is presently destroying Europe and threatening to come to the U.S.

We see the folks whose recklessness with complex financial instruments nearly crashed the economy five and a half years later, without significant consequences. Indeed, Wall Street has profited splendidly as all that QE money ballooned the stock market.

We see the folks who continue to tell us the economy has

recovered nicely when the majority of jobs readily available are part-time, service-sector affairs that pay starvation wages. Main Street continues to stagnate amidst "gigs." Trade deals like the Trans-Pacific Partnership which the Establishment supports will almost surely mean more money and power for corporations and more jobs leaving the U.S. for cheap labor countries (Vietnam, most likely). American workers will be expected to compete with Third World laborers paid the equivalent of pennies per hour.

Is it any wonder Donald Trump questions whether any of these people truly know what they are doing? Unless, of course, their goal really is to destroy U.S. sovereignty and culture, paving the way for corporate-controlled world government. Not that the Establishment "conservatives" recognize this. To the George Wills of the world, the idea of an elite-sponsored goal to end U.S. sovereignty, destroy the educational system and the culture, to institute a de facto world state, is, at best, preserving the "international system" and at worst, a "conspiracy theory."

If you support this, or think the Establishment "conservatives" know what they are doing, go ahead and vote for Hillary in November in order to stop Trump. You should, however, have some idea of what you will be voting for.

Hillary has an elite education, of course, taking her undergraduate degree from the private, women-only Wellesley College (reputedly a lesbian haven). Her senior thesis was on radical community organizer Saul Alinsky. She got her law degree from prestigious Yale Law School, where she and Bill Clinton first met.

She attracted the wrong sort of attention in one of her first jobs out of law school. During the Watergate investigations, she conspired to deny Nixon appropriate legal counsel, leading a superior to describe her as "a liar ... an unethical, dishonest lawyer." She may not have been fired as some

careless accounts alleged, but she clearly raised the hackles of those around her.

Hillary married Bill Clinton in 1975, impressed by his powers of persuasion (I'm not inside these people's heads but I doubt it was love). Working through the University of Arkansas's legal aid clinic, she took a rape case, that of Thomas Alfred Taylor, the victim a 12-year-old girl. She got the man off after he passed a polygraph, laughing that the case "forever destroyed my faith in polygraphs," suggesting to my ears that she knew the guy was guilty and had disclosed this, a violation of attorney-client privilege. Evidence had been carelessly destroyed in a crime lab. The victim said later, "You took me through Hell ... I realize the truth now, the heart of what you've done to me. And you're supposed to be for women? You call that for women, what you did to me? And I hear you on tape laughing."

She went to work for the Rose Law Firm in Arkansas. Again her activities fell under clouds of suspicion. We may never know the full truth about Whitewater, of course; nor "Travelgate." There are those who believe she had something to do with Vince Foster's death: suicide as mainstream media alleged, or the murder of a guy who knew too much.

It is one thing to say nothing has been proved in any of these cases. It is quite another to claim no pattern is gradually emerging here.

Hillary's role back in the 1990s as a kind of "co-president" was clear even then (remember the "Hillary-care" fiasco?). According to Roger Stone (author of *The Clintons' War Against Women*), Bill never did anything without running it by her first. Her threats against Bill's mistresses dating back to his Arkansas governor days appear to be the stuff of legend. A couple of these women have stated they are afraid of her, given her rise toward possible Executive Branch power (no, I am not linking to these accounts because with more people

reading this site now I don't want to expose people to potential danger).

Bill, moreover, was sometimes seen with marks on his face and neck. In rages, Hillary had struck him and thrown objects such as books and ashtrays at him. She got truly vicious following the exposure of his affair with Monica Lewinsky. Hillary is reported to have slapped him hard across the face [warning: language!] while screaming, "You stupid, stupid, stupid bastard!"

Bottom line: Hillary Rodham Clinton is a sociopath with a violent streak in her personality and a lust for power. Her treatment of her own secret service people and other staffers during the 1990s bordered on inhumane. [Warning: language!]

Predictably, Hillary never saw a war she didn't like. She supported the NATO bombing of the former Yugoslavia under her husband, and George W. Bush's wars of choice in Afghanistan and Iraq (propaganda to the contrary now circulating notwithstanding).

Easily the worst Secretary of State in modern times, she oversaw "regime change" in Libya, i.e., the replacement of the secular Qaddafi regime by Muslim radicals and the destruction of the country. "We came, we saw, he died," she said with the kind of cynical chuckle only sociopaths can muster. The Benghazi disaster saw our Ambassador there, J. Christopher Stephens, lose his life probably after hours of torture, along with three other Americans.

Hillary supported the military coup against a democratically elected government in Honduras, now the most dangerous place in Central America. She supports the ongoing attempts at "regime change" in Syria which originally empowered ISIS fanatics.

At home, she recently declared whites to be racists almost by definition (except, I presume, for pseudo-progressives such as

herself). Under a Hillary Clinton presidency, political correctness may well reach such extremes that whites risk assault in public in broad daylight by blacks seeking to take away their "white privilege." White students are already unsafe on campuses such as the University of Missouri, which after last fall's disruptions is looking at a 25% drop in enrollment next fall as students speak with their feet.

In other words, Hillary Clinton has brought distrust, death, and chaos to everything she's touched. Her foreign policy blunders have led to more Muslim extremism and more danger to the West. What's next? As president will she back continuing efforts by neocons to intimidate Russian president Vladimir Putin? Good luck with that! Will she threaten Iran? We know she backs the Zionist theocracy emanating from Tel Aviv with a zeal equal to that of any religious fundamentalist (read her recent speech before AIPAC).

This, of course, doesn't cover her Wall Street / Goldman Sachs connections which bother progressive Democrats about her and led them to support Bernie Sanders who mounted a very credible campaign with only a fraction of her money. Hillary's transparently obvious fealty to Wall Street should tell anyone with a functioning brain: this woman knows who is buttering her bread, and will act accordingly.

In sum: if anyone thinks Barack Hussein Obama has been bad for America: if Hillary Rodham Clinton follows him, then in the immortal words of Bachman and Turner, "you ain't seen nothin' yet"!

And GOP Establishment shills like George Will are willing to hand this woman the presidency in order to stop Donald Trump??? Are you kidding me???

Trump is not a perfect candidate. He's said things I disagree with. On the other hand, I do agree with him when he says our recent foreign policy has been "a complete and total disaster"

(April 27 foreign policy speech). But as I've said previously, I don't know how much he'll be able to accomplish. He won't be able to run the U.S. federal government the way he runs his businesses, simply firing, e.g., members of Congress who won't fall in line. The Establishment won't be going anywhere, after all. I fear that a Trump presidency will face massive gridlock. I also see a great potential for fomented civil unrest, as George Soros bankrolled "social justice warrior" haters like Black Lives Matter take to the streets before he even assumes office.

But I doubt Trump will start World War III. Hillary is far more likely to do that! His speech (which has raised its share of superelite hackles) portends a fundamental change of direction for U.S. foreign policy, one which would put an end to the stupid and destructive interventions neocons have undertaken since the end of the cold war. If there is any strategy there, it has been toward building corporate-controlled world government, which Trump also opposes whether by accident or by design.

And Trump wrote the book on deal-making (The Art of the Deal, 1986). If he can negotiate a deal with Vladimir Putin and work with him instead of against him as the Establishment is doing, he may be the last chance we have to assume real leadership in bringing the increasingly volatile situation in the Middle East under control before it ignites a world war. He might do it without importing potentially dangerous people into American communities against their will. For as I like to point out, it isn't the Southern Baptists who are blowing things up and cutting off heads, some of them belonging to their own people.

Look! Go back with me four years, to 2012. Republicans had an opportunity to nominate and support the most intelligent, forthright and honest statesman then in Washington: Dr. Ron Paul. Dr. Paul's singular theme: Restore Constitutionally Limited Government. The GOP blew it, big time, as did many

writers including the same shills now attacking Trump who put Dr. Paul down as “unelectable.” The Tampa, Fla. coronation of Mitt Romney resulted in an unfocused mess and four more years of Barack Obama.

I was sure even then, there would be a price to pay for that act of stupidity. Now the GOP has to pay it.

Sadly, not even Dr. Paul sees this. Libertarians and libertarian-leaning conservatives are bitterly divided between those of us who have seen the light and stopped calling for ideological purity, and those who have joined the Establishment in calling Trump a fascist, warning about brown shirts to come (as if we don't practically have them now).

Here's your choice, folks. This is reality, not PlayStation. Nominate Donald J. Trump for President of the United States, get behind him, and do what it takes to get him into the White House. Or put Hillary Rodham Clinton in there. No one else has a chance. Hillary would step on Ted Cruz or any Establishment empty suit like an insect. And then hers would be, hands down, the most violent and corrupt presidency in U.S. history, and very likely the most dangerous!

Please, click on “Mass E-mailing” below and send this article to all your friends.

© 2016 Steven Yates – All Rights Reserved

How far will the elites go to stop Donald Trump?

The other morning when I accessed NewsWithViews.com my

malware-blockers again blasted prominent warnings – for the fourth or fifth time. The problem appears solved. I never believed there was malware on the NewsWithViews.com site, of course, even before receiving a communique that the site had been hacked.

[Note: The editor says the NWV has not been hacked and there is NO Malware. Google is doing this to stop people from reading pro-Trump articles. A lawsuit against Google is in the works. If readers are using Google Chrome browsers here is what people can do to remedy the problem. Click on the 3 bars on the upper right side of your browser, Then click on SETTINGS, Go to bottom of the page and click on SHOW ADVANCED SETTINGS, Scroll down to PRIVACY then Un-Check PROTECT YOU AND YOUR DEVICE FROM DANGEROUS SITES]

It comes down to the support for Donald Trump found here. And to the fact that powerful people, the GOP elites – its so-called corporate donor class – and the globalists behind them, have never been this worried. Trump, whose political obituary media shills for the elites have been writing over and over again for eight months now, has proven to be the power elite's ultimate black swan.

Nuisance harassment is the least of our worries, however. Trump's candidacy is under attack by Soros-funded groups such as Black Lives Matter with protests that could turn violent when convention time comes, as well as from within his own party where one "clarification of the rules" after another makes it clear: a determined attempt will be made to deny Trump the GOP nomination, even if he has won the requisite 1,237 delegates.

I don't make predictions. I only develop scenarios. A scenario works like this: if X happens, one set of events may ensue. If Y happens instead, a somewhat different set of events is likely.

While it's not impossible, of course, I cannot come up with a credible scenario in which Trump is assassinated, e.g., by a "lone gunman." That would be too obvious, especially given the low credibility now assigned certain previous "lone gunman" narratives of assassinations of former presidents, candidates, and others. Given the present tense state of affairs, moreover, something like that could provoke deadly retaliation against whoever got blamed for it – including GOP elites who could find themselves having to wear bulletproof vests in public. They're not stupid. I'm sure they've figured this out.

Sticking with more likely scenarios, either Trump wins 1,237 delegates prior to the July convention, or he falls short. If he wins the delegates, an effort will ensue to deny him some of them, enough to pull him back under the line. As we know, the rules for delegate selection differ from state to state. Some states are winner-take-all; others are not. Some states allow open primaries; others do not. All these facts can be used against an undesirable nominee. Many of the rules are (one suspects purposefully) confusing. Efforts to exploit these facts are already underway. One result has already enabled Ted Cruz to take more delegates in Louisiana than Trump although Trump won more votes in the state. Another enabled Cruz to take Colorado's delegates without evidence of anyone voting at all. One wonders what shenanigans will transpire in the remaining states, now that Trump won New York so commandingly as to leave no doubt where Republican voters stand.

If Trump does not win 1,237 delegates, we will see what is now being called a contested convention (the term used to be brokered convention). The chances of Cruz catching Trump on delegates is mathematically negligible at this point, so we can safely assume Trump will have the majority of delegates going into the convention even if he hasn't reached 1,237. Presumably he will have attempted to cut deals with Marco Rubio and John Kasich to obtain their delegates.

Patrick J. Buchanan has argued reasonably that either Trump wins on the first vote, or he doesn't get the nomination. The attempt to commandeer delegates on the second vote will succeed. The elites will also have made deals. In this case, the nomination will go to an elite-vetted insider (Cruz, remember, is disliked by the elites almost as much as Trump, although he's proven a useful tool in the effort to deny Trump 1,237 delegates). The elite choice will be someone who supports the Trans-Pacific Partnership and other corporatist trade deals under negotiation behind closed doors. It will be someone who supports open borders. It will be someone motivated exclusively by support for corporatist economics, with no interest in social or cultural issues, or in education.

Should this happen, voters will infer reasonably that Trump was right about the contest being rigged and that those (including Bernie Sanders, whatever else he gets wrong) alleging that the U.S. is an plutocratic oligarchy, not a republic or a democracy, are also right. They will have seen the power-playing first-hand. Arguably, we saw this four years ago when the GOP elites changed the convention rules at the last minute to block Ron Paul's influence.

Voters will abandon the GOP in droves, handing Hillary Clinton the presidency assuming she remains the presumptive Democratic Party nominee.

Trump can attempt a "third party" run, although so-called sore loser laws as well as complicated ballot-access procedures could be significant barriers. I did a little research on the former before writing this article and learned that such laws are not typically applied to presidential candidates. But with party elites operative at the state level as well as the national level, and practically making up rules as they go along to ensure that they stay in power, who can say that sore loser laws won't be invoked to keep Trump's name off state ballots?

Such an effort, in any event, would siphon votes from the elite-anointed Republican and again give Hillary the presidency. I doubt Trump could emerge victorious running as an independent, given the deep pockets that would be employed both within whatever is left of the GOP and from outside (think George Soros again) to destroy what remains of his candidacy.

Now suppose all the shenanigans fail, and Trump wins the GOP nomination. The scenario question then changes to: will GOP elites at both the national and state levels get behind him and work to defeat Hillary Clinton in November, or not? If they get behind him and mount the right kind of strategy, they could conceivably draw some of those who supported Bernie Sanders away from Hillary, increasing the likelihood that Donald Trump will become the next President of the United States.

If they refuse to get behind him, either deciding to run an elite-sponsored candidate on a "third party" ticket, or simply supporting Hillary instead, they will instead again ensure her victory.

This may be the starkest choice GOP elites have ever faced, the choice they've been trying to avoid at all costs. Support Trump, and work with him to build a national campaign able to defeat Hillary Clinton, or withhold support from the unambiguous choice of the party's voting base and put Hillary in the White House. One of the things that got the GOP elites into their present mess was losing touch with voters and their values. Supporting Hillary instead of their own nominee will destroy their credibility for good.

For let's not kid ourselves: Hillary Clinton in the White House would make Americans wish they had Obama back! One reason Bernie Sanders has been able to mount a credible campaign is because so-called progressive Democrats trust her about as much as the GOP base trusts its elites. The fact that

she was invited to Goldman Sachs several times and paid over half a million per speech tells you all you need to know about her deep connections to the power elite. In positions of power herself, moreover, her track record of one negligence and recklessness. She singlehandedly oversaw the destruction of a sovereign nation – Libya – where one of our Ambassadors, J. Christopher Stephens, died following what may have been six hours of brutal torture, along with three other Americans (Benghazi). “We came, we saw, he died,” she chuckled cynically referring to Moammar Qaddafi. Qaddafi was a secular ruler, hardly a saint but no longer an enemy. Today, Libya is controlled by Muslim radicals of the sort who behead Christians and their own apostates. More recently, Hillary supported the overthrow of a democratically elected government in Honduras, now the most dangerous place in Central America. She continues to support the push for “regime change” in Syria and the casual saber-rattling against Vladimir Putin’s Russia.

She is the first presumptive nominee of a major party that I know of to be under investigation for having committed felonies. No one thinks she will be prosecuted, because Goldman Sachs is higher on the national pecking order than either the FBI or the DOJ.

If the choice in November is between Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton, and GOP elites either support Hillary or nominate one of their empty suits, reasonable conservatives will conclude that the Republican Party does not deserve to survive.

They should immediately begin creating an American Party that reflects their values and priorities, not those of power-hungry (and money-hungry) elites. Such a party would be the absolute last chance for the country’s survival as a sovereign nation able to hold itself together. Even then there would be no guarantees. The combination of changing demographics, political correctness / identity politics, and lower educational levels (all products of 50 years of policies that have aimed at just this result), are working against us even

as I write.

There is nothing to do, however, but try. An American Party could field a candidate with grassroots support in 2020, if not Trump again then someone with a similar outlook whom Trump could use his nonnegligible resources to support. If the organization Trump has surrounded himself with moved on this, they could conceivably field state and local candidates as soon as 2018 to establish credibility.

After all, just two years of Hillary (not to mention four) could leave the U.S. and the world at large in such chaos that the grassroots clamor for change will be magnitudes louder than it is now, and it will hardly be limited to whites who tend to vote Republican. Add to this whatever probability exists that the bubble economy, after a decade of quick fixes and doctored statistics, will have burst, wreaking further havoc with working and former middle classes of all groups, as well as former students swimming in debt who cannot find jobs. The time will have come for a political party that can draw in a large swath of voters who have had it with elite control – if the movement galvanized by Donald Trump is willing and able to build it.

© 2016 Steven Yates – All Rights Reserved

The real class war

“There’s class warfare, all right, but it’s my class, the rich class, that’s making war, and we’re winning.” ~Warren Buffet

Is anyone so naïve as to believe that a new Cold War hasn’t started? This one isn’t about capitalism vs. communism. It’s not even two-way but three-way, because there are now three

major distinct classes, each with its own culture. They are presently pulling the U.S. in three incompatible directions. Donald Trump, as of this writing still the GOP frontrunner, is drawing the bulk of his support from one of these classes. The other two hate everything he stands for. There should be no surprises here.

There is, first, the U.S. branch of the globalist superelite (my term for them), housed in entities ranging from the Trilateral Commission to Goldman Sachs to the Federal Reserve, and their bought-and-paid-for political subclass with all its functionaries. This class includes GOP corporate donors who threw millions down the Jeb Bush rathole as well as those who have donated millions more to Hillary Clinton. Their original goal for Election 2016 was another Bush vs. Clinton non-event! One may thank the good Lord we were spared that particular cure for insomnia!

Second is the politically correct (PC) crowd: Black Lives Matter militants, radical feminists as well as large numbers of single career women influenced by them (a-woman-needs-a-man-like-a-fish-needs-a-bicycle types), homosexuals, secular Jews, at least some Muslims (when not throwing homosexuals off tall buildings in their own countries, that is), illegal immigrants, academic leftists, and those in government aligned with the so-called progressive mindset.

Finally, there is the increasingly self-aware white working class and former middle class. They don't always have their t's crossed and the i's dotted, and are routinely dismissed as "uneducated." But with information now available on the Internet to compare with the song and dance they get from government, corporate media, academia, etc., about the economy, race, and much else, they can see that what they are told does not fit reality. They conclude that they have been lied to and screwed up one side and down the other for at least the past quarter century. Small wonder they are angry! And although millennials have come up more recently, I would

reluctantly place many of them in this group, to the extent they've been taken advantage of by unscrupulous university student loan officers and lied to about their income prospects.

Hence the massive support Donald Trump has gotten from this third group. Note also the support Bernie Sanders is getting from millennials, many trapped in student loan debt serfdom. The "populist" insurgency of 2015-16 is not limited to Republicans, after all. Trump, we should note, has created tens of thousands of jobs. Sanders has never worked outside government in his life. This speaks volumes about the most poorly educated generation in U.S. history (and the institutions "educating" them), their agility with the latest gadgets notwithstanding.

The Elite Class has no interest in social issues such as abortion and gay marriage. They have little interest in minorities beyond their potential to keep the masses divided and distracted. They want the "little people" to be good employees (or, these days, good career-changers), obedient taxpayers, and mindless consumers. The Elite Class is about political economy. Its goal – as I have patiently explained in many articles – is to build piece by piece, "free trade" agreement by "free trade" agreement, a de facto world government answering to corporate interests: technofeudalism. While they have no interest in philosophy, obviously, they are operational materialists as I explained this concept. The idea of answering to a Higher Power is meaningless to them. There should be little doubt that Hillary Clinton is their first choice for President of the U.S. starting in 2017. She may be corrupt to the core, but she knows who is buttering her bread.

The PC Class cares passionately about social issues. They care about their so-called rights; rarely about responsibilities. It is now abundantly clear, given the campus disruptions last fall: many in this class would shut down free speech and even eliminate the First Amendment if they could get away with it.

They pontificate about inequality, but in their Orwellian world, "some are more equal than others." They are economic illiterates. They believe redistribution of wealth and jobs will make us all one big happy prosperous, diverse family, despite hundreds of years of history testifying to the contrary. While many of them also prefer Bernie Sanders, they will join the Elite Class in backing Hillary if she is the Democratic nominee. They will ignore her labyrinthine connections to the war machine that has destabilized the Middle East and to Wall Street, the most visible manifestations of her own Elite Class membership. Hillary's disdain for those outside her class, whom she sees as "beneath her," comes through loud and clear in clips such as this, and also explains her treatment of the women her slimy husband has sexually abused his whole life. Almost all are in that third class.

The Country Class (I am borrowing political scientist Angelo Codevilla's term, for those who identify with the U.S. as a country, and with individual freedoms) tends to be conservative. Their conservatism is frequently a conservatism of the heart, not the head, of experience and instinct rather than reason. They will turn to their Bibles and say that they know some things are right and others wrong, absolutely. They also care about social issues, but come down on the other side from those in the PC Class. They have no interest in transforming the world. They don't identify with the economic agenda of the Elite Class. The better informed recognize how NAFTA and GATT II sent millions of U.S. manufacturing jobs overseas for cheap labor, and how the Trans-Pacific Partnership threatens to continue hollowing out the U.S. economy and destroying what was once the largest financially independent middle class in history. They see open borders and unlimited immigration as threats to their culture even as it drives down wages.

The three classes are barely civil to one another. They have

no interests or values in common. For all practical purposes, they inhabit different worlds. The first lives in a connected world of high finance, global confabs, and quasi-secret agreements able to move nations. They indulge the PC Class as it generates sensational non-events and disdain the Country Class as dumb rednecks. The PC class inhabits an academized world of activism, where you either agree with us or else! They hate the Country Class and are barely aware of the Elite Class. The world of the Country Class includes the Ten Commandments and NASCAR, the workaday world of men and women who entered adulthood wanting to do honest work feeding their families, be good neighbors, attend church, hopefully send their kids to college, and otherwise be left alone. They despise politicians of the Elite class for wasting their tax dollars. They believe the PC class should grow up, quit whining about how mistreated they are, and take some responsibility. Their ideal was a peaceful retirement late in life with a sense of having contributed something to society. Their hope was to see their children do better than they did.

The primary benefit of the Elite Class's globalism to the Country Class has been the flood of cheap goods at Wal-Mart, made with Chinese slave labor, items that break or fall apart six weeks later. Which means, back to Wal-Mart, since it's all they can afford. The "new economy," after all, created mostly low paying "services" jobs. NAFTA left many of them unemployed or underemployed; the Meltdown of 2008 and ensuing Great Recession made matters worse. Their college degrees, if they have them, are wasted since the majority of "new economy" jobs can be done by high school kids with a little vocational training and a few tech skills that can be acquired online. Seeing their millennial children return home from universities unable to find decent-paying work and saddled with crippling student-loan debt, they've largely given up on that last above – not to mention that peaceful retirement.

The Country Class's members came to realize they have no real

representation in the political system. They are routinely denounced as racists, sexists, homophobes, etc. ad nauseam, especially if they stand up for what they believe in, which may be Christianity or genuine race neutrality as opposed to affirmative action preferences. They recognize the fundamental absurdity, moreover, of a man tying the knot with another man and calling it a marriage. They've spent a quarter century watching their economic fortunes decline and their influence on the public conversation wane. They know they have no "white privilege." Many have begun to suffer from the maladies afflicting lower classes and the increasingly hopeless in any society: alcoholism and substance abuse, premature death from treatable illnesses, and suicide. A recent widely-cited study shows their life expectancies dropping, while that of other groups is still rising.

This group has been animated as never before by the Donald Trump candidacy, which (as of this writing, post-Super Tuesday) is looking increasingly likely to deliver Trump the GOP nomination. The pundits are shaking their heads as Republican primaries have seen record turnouts. Did the other two classes really believe they could continue their agendas without eventual pushback? Donald Trump dominates the airwaves of corporate media. He's ratings. He knows it, and they know it. Democratic capitalism in action, folks!

I do not know what Mr. Trump's actual chances are of becoming president. Some of the GOP elites are openly refusing to support him. This reflects their commitment to their class. Some have floated the idea of running their own candidate, should Trump win the GOP nomination: dividing the GOP vote and giving Hillary a landslide. This won't bother them because as we noted, the Elite Class prefers her anyway.

Nor do I think it realistic that Trump or anyone else could reverse a half century of engineered economic decline and cultural decay in just four years (or in eight). It might be quixotic in any event. Republics tend to turn into empires.

Empires do not tend to turn back into republics, no matter who is at their helm.

Lastly, I'm not sure Mr. Trump or his supporters realize the full scope of what they're up against, given the global connectedness of the Elite class. What they're up against is not merely other billionaires but well organized groups able to control trillions – who, with a few private text messages could lead to movements of investments able to precipitate the next economic downturn in the U.S., possibly even a depression. Since they control mainstream media's six corporate leviathans, they could see to it that President Trump got blamed. He was a "con man" who "lacked experience." He was "hateful." He was a "bully." He was "reckless." Have another narrative? You're a "conspiracy theorist."

This is just one of the scenarios someone has to think about. Also what could happen if things are not allowed to progress to that point, because something happened to Donald Trump between now and November. No one in his right mind, after all, thinks the Elite Class is going to roll over, while one man with a Country Class following they despise upends a world they've spent the past century building.

2016 Steven Yates – All Rights Reserved

Is the class “Cold War” about to turn “hot”?

“I need some muscle over here!” –Melissa Click, formerly of the University of Missouri (here, 6:34).

We live in amazing times! The very night before my article The

Real Class War appeared, a Donald Trump event was disrupted by members of the politically correct (PC) Class I discussed in that article (which, incidentally, you should read before continuing with this). Trump himself called off the University of Illinois – Chicago event out of safety concerns. It is clear, the provocateurs were working for others. The disruptions both inside and outside the UIC arena were clearly planned by MoveOn.org, the hard-left organization funded, in turn, by George Soros's Open Society Foundations (formerly: Open Society Institute).

In other words, Black Lives Matter (BLM) militants along with others are working for the Elite Class, or at least, for its Soros branch. To be fair, I doubt they knew. To say of these people that are not very bright is to pay them a compliment. I wonder how many could get Rosa Parks in the right decade.

As others have noted, corporate media (which also works for the Elite Class) blamed ... who else? ... Donald Trump. Most corporate media pseudo-pundits and talking heads also have no idea who they are really working for. Small wonder Trump can call Megyn Kelly a bimbo. Guess what? Megyn Kelly is smart compared to some of what's out there!

The problem now is, Soros-backed groups are promising more disruptions. They discovered, after all, that they can get away with it. Corporate media hates Trump, after all. Both they and other GOP nominees dutifully reported events from the PC Class perspective. That means blaming Trump and his supporters for whatever happens at his events regardless of the truth. They might get away with it. Or perhaps the Country Class will decide it's had enough. That will mean: the "real class war" could turn "hot" at almost any time. There is definitely a potential for one of these events to explode into a riot, on a level with those of Ferguson, Mo., and Baltimore (Soros-backed organizations also funneled millions into at least the former).

Corporate media would spin such an event in such a way as to inflict as much damage on Trump as possible. The present strategy, after all, as Paul Walter reports, is to deny Trump the 1,237 delegates he needs to secure the GOP nomination. Then the GOP wing of the Elite Class can stage a brokered convention in which they – literally – steal the nomination from Trump and put one of their own back in the driver's seat. Mitt Romney, perhaps? No, they would not just be being stupid. There would be no plan for Romney to win. As Walters also correctly notes, now that Jeb Bush is out of the picture the Elite Class wants Hillary Clinton in the White House. Another Romney nomination would accomplish this as he would lose in a landslide, even more so if Trump bolted the GOP and ran as an independent, something which he has repeatedly promised. The effort to deny Trump 1,237 delegates might fail, of course. The ball will then be in the Elites' court. They might run their own candidate as an independent, again dividing the vote and assuring Hillary the presidency. Or they might show their true colors and just back her against their own nominee. That (not a Trump nomination) would be the death of the Republican Party!

This is the reality: whether anyone likes it or not, Donald Trump is the only thing presently standing in the way of a Hillary presidency!* If she becomes president, the Country Class is screwed! So is the effort to stop globalist technofeudalism!

The Country Class has one collective character flaw. Its members, especially those who are older and grew up in a saner world, are too nice. The people – I have to include myself in this category – who supported Ron Paul, were also too nice, as was Dr. Paul himself. This is because their best instincts are to be productive, good citizens: earning their livings, raising the next generation morally, etc. When something gets under their skin, they might write a letter to the editor. Or make a polite speech at Toastmasters. They are not, by nature,

agitators. They don't have "transformative visions" of society. They want to reason with the other side. The problem is, being unused to the Machiavellian world of politics and assuming the other side is amenable to reason, they end up being bullied and then marginalized.

Gradually they have wised up. They learned, for example, about NAFTA. They began to show up at town hall meetings. They watched the bailouts of the "too-big-to-fail" banks and watched Wall Street soar amidst the economic non-recovery on Main Street, about which Washington pseudo-pundits lie like a rug with phony-baloney job statistics. They've been pushed into political activity (e.g., Tea Party groups) because their backs are to a wall. As I noted in my previous article, they've figured out they have no real representation in a political economy that works systemically to their disadvantage. They are routinely libeled in academia and made to look silly on major media.

Not being practiced organizers or trained operatives, their tactics are bound to be rough and ready, the product of those who have just discovered that nice doesn't work. The incidences of violence at Trump events are unfortunate. But watch the videos that are available. You won't see a single case in which Trump supporters initiated the conflict. In each case, they were provoked. In the case of the photographer thrown to the ground by security personnel, he had yelled an obscenity at one of them that can be clearly heard here. A protest instigated by BLM troublemakers was in progress as can also be seen. Security personnel do not take kindly to being cursed at. That's not the most intelligent or professional way to exercise your First Amendment rights.

Trump has been accused of being a bully. I submit that the PC Class is full of bullies. I've had my share of run-ins with these people, struggling to begin an ill-fated academic career in the late 1980s / early 1990s. One idiot even thanked me in his own letter to the editor for "exposing [my]self" in an

American Philosophical Association publication. That little metaphor speaks volumes where these people's minds are. Another idiot called me racist because, he argued, most of my articles were then posted on Lew Rockwell's site, and Rockwell cofounded the racist (because pro-South) League of the South. He did not, of course; he founded the Ludwig von Mises Institute. These people make fools of themselves when they can't do the most basic fact-checking.

Today, the problem is magnitudes worse, as I predicted back then it would be. Last fall, BLM militants ran amuck on university campuses, including an incident (at Dartmouth) where BLM militants disrupted the library filled with white students trying to study, bullying and screaming obscenities at them. Anyone with a functioning brain should see that PC Class students and faculty, are on the edge of violence, as the Melissa Click incident demonstrated last fall.** To their credit, the University of Missouri fired her. She'd clearly crossed the line. But she's just one person, and the videocam just happened to be in the right place at the right time. The PC Class has access to Elite sources with very deep pockets. The "cold war" in danger of turning "hot" is between the PC Class and the Country Class, to the extent some of the latter decide they are fed up and decide to stand up for themselves. Today's college students are, after all, racking up tens of thousands of dollars in student loans. Were my studies interrupted by a group of troublemakers, I would not simply sit there and take it!

The Elite Class does not need to bully people, of course. It indulges the PC class, because they distract, while being culturally destructive. The two have the same targets: your rights under the Constitution, in a sovereign nation, under the rule of law. All Elite Class members such as George Soros and his functionaries need do is direct their money wells in certain ways, and not others. They can ensure that certain agendas (e.g., BLM) are bankrolled. Others struggle for

survival. Were Trump not a billionaire with instant name recognition because of his businesses and especially his reality TV show, he would doubtless have disappeared by now.

Occasionally, in leftist commentary, intelligence slips through. Bernie Sanders is surely right about the U.S. being an oligarchy. Moreover, those who support a near-absolute right of corporations and other organizations to use money any way they see fit (e.g., as a form of "free speech," as in the Supreme Court's disastrous Citizens United decision), appear not to realize that in a social order in which money is worshipped, like a surrogate for God, and easily used to buy political loyalties, this is a bad idea! One of the hardest lessons the Country Class has had to learn is that today's leviathan corporations are not their friends, are not friends of freedom. A friend of mine, good at crunching numbers and starting small businesses, put it this way:

ideally, in an enlightened world, an unhampered free market is the best economic system. I was about to observe that we do not live in an enlightened world, if indeed we ever did, but in the next breath he beat me to it. Such thoughts enjoin upon us the need to reexamine the Liberty movement and its premises.*** But that's another article.

*I am assuming Hillary will not be indicted. That ball is in the court of the head of the FBI, James Comey, who looks for all the world like an Establishment man to me. Were he not, he probably wouldn't be in that job. According to his Wikipedia entry he gave money to John McCain's campaign back in 2008. Need I say more?

**Melissa Click was also filmed screaming obscenities at police (3:02). She was a faculty member, mind you. Incidentally, the title of her doctoral dissertation was "It's 'a good thing': the commodification of femininity, affluence and whiteness in the Martha Stewart phenomenon." Don't take my word for it; read her CV for yourself. You will find other

stunning exemplars of what passes for scholarship in academia today.

***By way of preview, it is badly divided and scattered. Some of it has simply cracked up. One guy, who had an office next to mine in the Mises Institute in 2002-03, calls Trump a “fascist” and anyone finding merit in his campaign a potential “brown” (see, e.g., here, which begins with a credible account of the establishing of the GOP Establishment but then devolves into a rant about “hate” and “brownshirts” worthy of the most PC-addled leftist; cf. also this). He irrelevantly recommends visiting the Holocaust Museum (communication on a Facebook thread). He is an “anarcho-capitalist,” part of a movement believing that a society of millions of anonymous human beings would maintain itself, by some kind of market-driven magic, without any leadership from governing systems able to control greed, impose penalties on bullies and scam artists, and correct for stupidity – however imperfectly, in this sin-drenched world. People who believe this should consider visiting Somalia.

2016 Steven Yates – All Rights Reserved

Materialism Pt. 1 of 4

Most of my email is positive (alas, due to time constraints I am often unable to answer most of it). When I get something critical, I spend time reading it. I am not perfect. Sometimes readers catch errors or have worthwhile suggestions. Among my favorites is an email from one Terry Hayfield, sent back in 2004 in response to my initial “The Real Matrix” series. I still have the printout. It presented itself not as a criticism but as an “offer to share research.” His results

differed from mine, and he argued that there was a false premise in my reasoning. He did not launch a personal attack, or attack NewsWithViews.com. He argued a rational case in a way that got my attention and led to a correspondence that continued for several years.

I contrast this with an email from someone I'll call RB (his initials; I'll not use his name to save him embarrassment), received the day Part 3 of "Materialism" appeared. He labeled himself: "a secular, agnostic, non-observant liberal Jew." This after an opening sentence not offering to share research but describing my article as "typical of NewsWithViews; utter poppycock, drivel, hogwash, bunk, tripe etc."

Great way to win friends and influence people, dude!

But I've learned that debates over what is very fundamental to our thinking and our moral lives – over worldviews, that is – will sometimes invoke hostility instead of constructive dialogue. RB's email, having begun on a bad note, went downhill from there. I wondered if he'd really read what I'd written or just scrolled up and down, saw a few words and lines he didn't like, then took to his keyboard to bang out a long paragraph of hysterics against what he assumed I'd said.

RB "[found] it highly offensive that Christians like yourself arrogantly claim to have a monopoly on morality and virtue, and fatuously pretend that you can only be a good person if you are a believing Christian ..."

Hold the bus. Did I say Christians were good people because they were Christians? Now admittedly Part 4 was still a week or so away and so unavailable, but somehow I doubt RB's having the whole thing in front of him would have made a difference. I never said that Christians were "good people." In Part 4 I was explicit about their being prone to the same weaknesses and temptations as non-Christians. Even prior to that material, I had not said we have a "monopoly on morality and

virtue," whatever that is.

My argument vis-à-vis morality was that given the failure of every secular ethical theory, Christian accounts of morality are surely no worse off!

RB then went on an extended rant about sex / sexual misconduct and promiscuity / abortion / contraceptives (which I never mentioned). The sexual revolution he called "nothing but a myth" which would astonish those who lived through it, especially parents who lost communication with their children over it. But what sketchy details RB offers about sexual peccadillos and misadventures prior to the 1960s actually lend strong support to my thesis, that we are a fallen species who cannot save ourselves. For again I'd not stated that "no one engaged in sexual misconduct and promiscuity [or that] there were no abortions or hardly any ..." What I'd noted was that now we had ethical theories in which these were all very much at home. RB continues: "Sexual promiscuity has existed all over the world for thousands of years and abortion has also been common all over the world for thousands of years. However, Christianity has also fostered an extremely harmful prudishness, puritanism and sexual repression for 2,000 years ..."

Very Freudian sounding, Freud having been a leading "secular, agnostic, liberal Jew." It's the height of political incorrectness to say it, but "secular, agnostic, liberal Jews" have an obsession with sex I've long found puzzling. Conversations I've had with them (mostly academics, admittedly) tend to veer in that direction sooner or later. Since most "gentiles" do not share this fascination, at least not as a core part of their worldview, I suppose we're "repressed." Another feature of the "secular, agnostic, liberal Jew" is their assumption they've gotten inside others' minds and psyches, divining their supposed neuroses. We're the arrogant ones? What do they propose as the cure? A sexually "liberated" culture – which is pretty much what we have in the

twenty-first century, with (e.g.) Miley Cyrus performing nearly naked, is it not?

That aside, one could just offer the obvious *reductio ad absurdum* that murder has “also been common all over the world for thousands of years.” Maybe we should get rid of all laws and traditions and worldviews that “repress” our hidden desires to slaughter one another in cold blood! Yeah, that’ll work!

RB’s next few lines are about poverty, perhaps unsurprisingly. As I noted – again it had to wait for Part 4 – Christians have been remiss in this area and are vulnerable to criticism. I stated specifically that Jesus did not command us to care for the poor, or offer health care, only if we can make a profit doing so.

But having conceded that much, I’d like to see what “secular, agnostic, liberal Jews” are doing about poverty. Those I’ve known tend to support the status quo, which means mindlessly supporting the leviathan banks and the bought-and-paid-for political classes whose policies bear primary responsibility for widening inequality and worsening poverty in our time. Pot, meet kettle. I wonder how many donations RB or his buddies have made, or fundraisers conducted, to alleviate poverty in places like, e.g., Haiti. (I have, incidentally.) My response: put your money where your mouth is, or shut up!

There was more to make me wonder if English is this guy’s native language: “The notion that if you are an atheist, you think there is no such thing as right and wrong and that everything should be considered permissible is abject poppycock.” Did I say atheists as a group believe there is no such thing as right and wrong? I did not. Indeed, the bulk of Part 2 takes up secular efforts to elucidate right versus wrong in a material universe – efforts which make no sense if they think there is no right or wrong. My argument is that these efforts fail, often giving breathtakingly bad advice in

the process. That's hugely different from saying those making them don't believe in right or wrong. (Maybe RB did not read Part 2. Not my problem.)

Finally there is that now-familiar canard about a "Christian Taliban" trying to take over the U.S., an "extremely dangerous" conspiracy that "must be stopped before they get power in America" and "some of its members are contributors to News With Views" [sic.].

I am sure my fellow NewsWithViews.com contributors will be surprised to hear of their cultural influence! By the way, I often see this Taliban reference in atheist-leftist rants. Perhaps RB can point to Christians who practice some equivalent of Sharia law, kill apostates, mutilate women's genitals, burn villages, etc. I've never seen them. Am I blind or is he hallucinating? I don't think it's the former.

There is no Christian Taliban! The idea is absurd! As I noted in my very brief private reply to RB, there are no Christian groups with the resources, even if they had the will. Most have been effectively marginalized in the present culture of materialism, hedonism, and multiculturalism. No Christian I know of has the deep pockets of, e.g., a George Soros (another "secular, agnostic, liberal Jew") who has been bankrolling leftist causes for decades, or of those running the leviathan banks, other corporations, the political class, or the Hollywood culture where "secular, agnostic, liberal Jews" predominate whether anyone cares to admit it or not.

No doubt RB and perhaps others will interpret such remarks as "anti-semitic." This, too, has gotten to be a tiresome canard, made by some Jews in response to someone outside their orbit noting their economic and cultural power. It usually comes prior to their honoring Godwin's Law and invoking the specter of Adolf Hitler who, in RB's words, "was NOT an atheist and never renounced his Catholic faith." Take that, Catholics! By the way, do Catholics or any other Christian denominations

have special organizations such as B'nai B'rith or the Anti-Defamation League to function as attack dogs to destroy the reputations of their critics? The late Joe Sobran once said, "An anti-semite used to be someone who hated Jews. Now it's someone Jews hate."

Why bother with a "Postscript" such as this? Because it offers an interesting case study. Most of the issues raised are only indirectly related to my central claim, which is that materialism as a worldview (its premises and reasoning laid out in Part 1) does not offer a viable account of the way reality is put together, nor a moral backbone to support a large civilization.

The past hundred years show this conclusively. We've illuminated the ties between materialism and leftism, ties going back at least 250 years. Both reject original sin and instead follow, e.g., Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712 – 1778), arguably the founding father of modern progressivist leftism, holding that our institutions are to blame for moral turpitude and modern corruption (Rousseau singled out private property, the family, and unsurprisingly, the church). Both believe that the right kind of technocratic and sexual tinkering can save us and build a global, hedonist Utopia. Responses to critics of materialism and leftism tend to be either as incompetent as RB's, intellectually dishonest, or both. Leftists especially are threatened by the avalanche of evidence against their dearest assumptions – to the point where some of their number will set out with efficiency and enthusiasm to destroy the careers of scientists who offer detailed exemplars of said evidence. Thus perhaps it should be unsurprising that leftist keyboard commandos, Jewish or not, go into attack mode when some of us take aim at their false premises and absurd canards.

2016 Steven Yates – All Rights Reserved

Materialism Pt. 4 of 4

“Jesus, help me find my proper place
Jesus, help me find my proper place
Help me in my weakness
Cause I’m falling out of grace.
Jesus. Jesus.”

~The Velvet Underground, “Jesus” (1968)

I confess I had a difficult time choosing an open song lyric for this final segment, if only because explicit Christian themes are rare in rock music (it does happen, however). Yet that world contains many artists who have engaged in intense self-exploration often reaching out to a spiritual reality even if by accident. Lou Reed (1942 – 2013), author of the above lyrics, is an example. He had clearly seen the seamy side of human existence including from the standpoint of a heroin addiction when he was in his early 20s. The song cited above sounds surprisingly like a prayer for someone who was not a Christian (I am assuming). Reed’s music has always struck me as that of an observer and seeker, someone commenting on the dark side of human life as if from a vantage point somewhere above.

According to materialists, there is no “vantage point somewhere above,” of course. There is just this world, and whatever neural synapses are firing in your brain. The New Atheism (Dawkins, et al) has reiterated Nietzsche’s “God is dead” by proclaiming the impending death of Christianity.

I wouldn’t hold my breath. The Soviets spent over 70 years trying to eradicate Christianity by force; the Maoists, in China, also tried to wipe it out. It is true that, e.g., church attendance is dropping on the part of millennials, a

source of commentary on Christianity losing ground in the U.S. It is incompatible with the political correctness that dominates the mindset of millennial students, for sure. But Christianity is the fastest growing religion elsewhere in the world, such as (ironically) in Russia and China. Why would anyone think Christianity is going away voluntarily? What we should be thinking about is where the Christian worldview stands in the present, and what its future might be.

What is the Christian worldview? It stands, as I argue in *Four Cardinal Errors*, in sharp contrast to the materialist worldview. Here are some proposals.

1- God exists, as a Being who transcends space, time, and causality. The things of God, including morality, transcend space, time, and causality. God created the world of space, time, and causality. Logos and Ethos (logicality and morality) are inseparable aspects of God's eternal nature. God's existence is a starting point, not a conclusion of our reasoning.

2- There is therefore the world of space, time, and causality – the world of human experience and of science – and whatever noumenal realm exists “beyond” these, outside possible human experience. Neither reality nor God are limited to space, time, and causality. The philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein (1889 – 1951) would say we are pushing at the limits of language. In a sense, he was correct. But limits to human language and understanding do not limit reality. In the last analysis, God's nature as both one God and as “three persons” (the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit) are mysteries, as is how Creation was accomplished, how our free will operates, and possibly how consciousness itself works. Positivism and scientism disliked and distrusted mysteries. Materialists believed they had explained them. Rorty, who also admired Wittgenstein, believed the problems were artifacts of our insistence on “mentalistic” language. But some recent philosophers of mind – Colin McGinn (1950 –) is an example –

now sound very Kantian in concluding that consciousness has remained fundamentally mysterious despite decades of hard, patient, sustained inquiry and analysis ... because our reason just isn't structured so as to fathom its mysteries. If materialism is false, the mysteriousness of consciousness makes perfect sense! It just can't be forced-fitted into the materialist conceptual straightjacket!

3- What science does it does reasonably well, when not corrupted by politics or other sources of dollars. Again, though, science is designed to answer questions and solve problems in this world. Again as Kant showed, it cannot address metaphysical problems, any more than can reason itself. Reason, though its starting point is Logos, is human, all too human, is finite therefore, and not designed to reach or grasp an eternal God. From what successes science has enjoyed it does not follow logically that this world, the world of space, time, and causality where science and technology operate, exhausts reality.

4- According to Christianity human beings were created in God's image. Hence the fundamental ontological and moral differences between us and the rest of the Creation. As St. Thomas Aquinas (1225 – 1274) put it, our reason is an imprint of God's eternal nature within us. Thus we have the finite capacity to acquire knowledge of the Creation, whether through science or rational insight.

5- The Christian worldview's diagnosis of the human condition is not ignorance but sin: the fact that the first humans (whether we read Genesis literally or not) turned away from God. They believed they could do better on their own, autonomously. They were wrong. Sin corrupts everything, including the quest for truth. Most thinkers have sought to avoid any frank discussion of sin. The idea flies in the face of the idea of human perfectibility, or at least of indefinite improvability by our own efforts, legacies of the Enlightenment. But any honest, empirical look at ourselves

ought to suggest that we cannot save ourselves, or improve ourselves wholesale as ethical beings. We can make small improvements here and there, akin to learning to bathe; most of us tend to behave better when we are comfortable and when our stomachs are full. But morality is simply not our “default setting”; it should be obvious that even children can be hideously cruel to classmates who do not “fit in.” While many of us adults doubtless mean well because we have internalized moral principles to some degree, others among us remain pretty much untouched by these niceties. We try to devise systems of rules that operate under the assumption that the desire to do good should be a primary motivator, when it usually isn’t. Most of us have little interest in what does not affect us directly, or bring us benefits. All of us have our lapses, some of which are truly breathtaking! Secularists believe we can be autonomous, but absent an external moral compass, we often just act as destroyers, of others if not ourselves, whether on the grand scale of the wars of choice in the Middle East or the small but from the victim’s standpoint all-too-real one of the teenager who is bullied or cyberbullied until she commits suicide. Unless such things happen to one of our own, we drift with the herd, with the quiet secularists Peter Watson noted.

6- Christian ethics are found in the Ten Commandments, the Sermon on the Mount, and elsewhere in the Old and New Testaments. Yes, there are often problems interpreting what we perceive God’s will to be, and religious communities are bound to disagree over specifics. But the problems understanding what Christianity requires of us surely pale next to the failure of secular ethical theories, and of secularism more broadly. One thing is crystal clear: Christian salvation is to be found in Jesus Christ who alone promises salvation from the consequences of sin (Romans 3:23; Romans 6:23; John 3:16; elsewhere), something we cannot do ourselves (Ephesians 2:8–9; elsewhere). Recognizing that if we try to start with ourselves we get nowhere, and that our ability to get nowhere on our own

is entirely consistent with what we observe in history and society, are good places to begin one's appreciation of Christian ethics, or of the Christian worldview generally.

Christians do not get everything right, of course. The Christian does not cease to sin nor even to suffer the consequences of sin; the most he can do is confess sins, and turn away gratefully acknowledging God's forgiveness. What Christians get wrong could fill a separate article: failure in their families; failure to care for their neighbors and fellow citizens as God commands (Jesus did not say to treat the sick only if you can make a profit doing so); failure to care for the Creation itself, over which God gave humanity dominion, which means assuming moral responsibility, not destructive plundering; and more besides.

But these human failures do not give us an argument against Christianity and for materialism, which in the end gives us no basis for condemning any of these failures other than expedient ones.

What of other faiths? some might ask. I was born in the U.S. (grew up in Atlanta), and have been surrounded by Christians for much of my life (except for time spent in universities surrounded by materialists). Suppose I'd been born in, say Baghdad. Would I not be writing my condemnations of Western materialism as part of my submission to Allah, as a devout Muslim scholar (the word Islam means submission)? Would I not be a Hindu or possibly a Buddhist, had I been born in, say, India? Or a Confucian, had I been born in Tibet?

There are no easy answers to such questions. I do not know if Christians can have the best answers to them, as those answers (obviously) presuppose Christianity and to a logical mind, will sound circular. The fact that everyone considers his/her religion to be "the right one" is a given; no one would believe in his/her faith otherwise. Other faiths stand at the center of other worldviews, of course, non-Western ones in

most cases. That means (by definition) they are not widely represented in those regions of the world identified as “the West.” High or low representation has no logical implications for truth or falsity, however.

Technology, a product of the West, has brought these different worldviews into the same meeting space as never before, however: cyberspace, which transcends the fact that some of us are able to travel anywhere and experience the cultural embodiments of other worldviews firsthand.

The thing to do, it seems to me, is to encourage interfaith dialogue as never before, conducted respectfully and with an eye to seeing what is similar, and not being so eager to focus on what is different. And looking to the future rather than dwelling on the errors of the past. The world needs people both able and willing to communicate, especially with divisive and destructive personalities everywhere. We can then show how the world looks to Christians, and present what we believe is true in Christianity.

This, we must add, goes along with acting as Jesus Christ would have as act, in accordance with His words during the Sermon on the Mount and elsewhere: for example, working to ensure that impoverished peoples here and afar have food to eat, whatever their beliefs, and to help them learn those practices that will help them feed themselves. Words without deeds, after all, are idle chatter. Having attended to such matters, the most constructive thing we can do is to step aside and trust God to do His work.

2016 Steven Yates – All Rights Reserved

Materialism Pt. 3 of 4

“Turn off your mind, relax and float downstream

It is not dying, it is not dying.

Lay down all thought, surrender to the void

It is shining, it is shining.

That you may see, the meaning of within

It is being, it is being.

That love is all, and love is everyone

It is knowing, it is knowing.”

~The Beatles, “Tomorrow Never Knows” (1966)

The upshot, so far, is that in our moral lives in a material world, everything is up for grabs.

Reactions to this varied. One was the turn to mind-altering drugs, led by such writers as Aldous Huxley (1894 – 1963) whose *The Doors of Perception* (1954) was the source of a different 1960s rock group’s name, and of course Timothy Leary (“Tune in, turn on, drop out”). Transcendent reality may not exist in the material world but can be found in your head! The 1960s hippies began to “drop acid” (LSD, lysergic acid diethylamide). Some would claim to “see God.” Acid rock was its musical expression, proclaiming mystical revelations of peace and love. Others, of course, experienced sometimes terrifying hallucinations caused by the drug’s radical altering of their perceptions. I recall from my graduate student days a past user telling me how he’d seen his stereo grow a mouth, as the music coming from his speakers took the form of two arms reaching his way as it tried to eat him. People with latent personality disorders, or just the anxiety-prone, were especially susceptible to bad experiences with LSD. Some users ended up with psychoses, or simply “burned out” from repeated usages with permanent brain damage: “acid casualties.” All of which makes the reality-is-in-your-head route a risky one to travel down!

Many of that generation's parents, however, had turned away from the problem, leaving them vulnerable to criticisms of them as morally shallow, having sold their souls to the corporate system. "If it feels good, do it" is a phrase associated with the hippies, but there was a sense in which the prevailing ethos was closer to this sort of phrase than their elders cared to admit. Convenience reigned. This was true in business, in government, in academia. If it's convenient, do it. Consider abortion, which had become an issue well before Roe v. Wade (1973). Sexual license (also a problem in some communities before the liberation movements of the 1960s) led to unwanted pregnancies; simple as that. Despite the prattling about those cases when "the mother's life is in danger," over 99% of abortions are abortions of convenience. Abortion's legal acceptability has led to the killing of over 50 million unborn babies and counting. I will not torture readers with the bizarre rationalizations feminist philosophy professors have produced (it is hard to call them philosophers with a straight face), except to note that the linguistic sleight of hand used has been intended to deprive the unborn and sometimes even the newly born of moral standing, and hence any claim on life that others are obligated to respect. The Nazis and other totalitarians did the same thing, removing those to be eliminated from the moral community.

But then again, if Benedict, Dewey, Rorty, and others are correct, then the only moral standing anyone has is what their society, or the state, gives them. What the state and social approval give, the state and social approval can take away, whether its targets are Jews, Gypsies, homosexuals, etc., under the Nazis; those who resisted collectivized farming under Stalin; or the unborn in our own culture. It is possible, by this reading, that a future Christian civilization might regard this last as one of the largest and most insidious holocausts of all.

The tendency, as we have seen, has been to evade the issues, or to simply stop thinking about them. Many theologians would succumb fully to the “death of God” by the 1960s, even as their children were “finding Him” in recreational chemistry. Secularization was one of the manifestations of materialism having captured Western culture. Harvey Cox (1929 –), one of the leaders of the “death of God” movement, wrote in his *The Secular City* (1965) that secularization “bypasses and undercuts religion and goes on to other things... The world looks less and less to religious rules and rituals for its morality or its meanings.”

I recently finished one of the most comprehensive accounts I have seen of the modern, secular attempt “to live after the death of God”: *The Age of Atheists: How We Have Sought to Live since the Death of God* (2014) by British intellectual historian Peter Watson (1943 –). Watson’s account ranges across philosophy, art, poetry, literature, and science – or, more exactly, science-promotion, as he includes evangelical atheists such as Richard Dawkins, Daniel Dennett, and Sam Harris, which is materialism promotion in my sense of that term. Watson is a reasonably honest thinker, and those who maintain (as I do) that materialism has no hope of providing society with a sound moral foundation and direction will find support for their views in his work. So despite the title and themes (and tediousness at times), the book merits study. At the end, Watson does not endorse mere science-promotion but rather seeks to explain why many credible authors, writers, poets and artists have found the “scientific worldview” too narrow. His answer isn’t especially satisfying.

It comes down to the idea that, given God’s absence, the “central sane activity” (title of the book’s meandering closing chapter) is “sheer wondering inquiry,” and a grasping for those lonely moments of meaningfulness and life-affirmation. Different authors have given them different names. Abraham Maslow, for example, called them “peak

experiences"; James Joyce spoke of "epiphanies"; Malroux, of "temporary refuges"; Yeats, of "brief moments of ecstatic affirmation"; Ibsen, of "flashes of spiritual value." These moments, Watson insists, can be had in loving relationships, the satisfaction of various desires, the experience of hearing an especially moving piece of music or seeing a work of art or reading poetry, or in any number of other ways including just the mundane satisfaction of a job well done.

Even if you are a secularist, are you really satisfied with this?

Study them closely, and you see that these experiences, real though they may be, are private and personal; one comes away sensing the difficulty the writers have in communicating their content to others. They are more the stuff of poetry than philosophy. They are, however, pleasant – momentary "highs" – and we are inching our way back to the possibility that psychoactive drugs can be used to trigger such experiences artificially and expand them indefinitely if the results are satisfying enough to outweigh the dangers.

All this seems like denial to me. Of the obvious. By turning away from the larger picture, the one both Nietzsche and Russell were courageous enough to face, to focus on those nice little particulars we experience or arrange for ourselves, whether in our private lives or by using recreational chemicals, we evade the important consequence of materialism:

That once you've removed God and transcendence from your worldview, there are no binding moral values, binding in the sense of being definitive and authoritative, and suggesting a lasting, inescapable, personal penalty for their violation. There is only state authority, popularity, physical pleasure, and these ephemeral on-top-of-the-world moments – all of which end in death, which the materialist understands as the permanent extinction of consciousness and personality. You cease to exist as completely as the nonexistence that preceded

your conception. Presumably after those final anxious moments before you wink out, you won't be worried about it.

Watson correctly observes that many people in secular society seem to have no problem with this. They have either rejected "religion" without further thought, or simply grew up without it. He writes:

"We need to remind ourselves ... that many people – and perhaps the quieter souls among us – see no problem in God being dead. For them his death is no source of anxiety or perplexity... [S]uch individuals are not "metaphysical types" and seek no "deep" meaning in existence. They just get on with their lives, making ends meet, living from day to day and season to season, enjoying themselves where they can, untroubled by matters that so perplex their neighbors. They have no great expectations that the big questions will ever be settled, so devote no time to their elucidation. In some ways, they are the most secular people of all and perhaps the most content" (The Age of Atheists, pp. 532-33).

Such folks blend smoothly into the majority, the masses of humanity in advanced civilization, meeting its demands on them, and no more thinking independently today than the third or so who were content with British rule in the 1770s and another third who didn't care so long as they had food on the table. If asked, they will say they have no time for such matters as these. They will vote for mainstream candidates without question, and only start asking questions when their supposed leaders send their kids off to die in foreign wars as cannon fodder, if even then. They are first veilers. While many are nice people and good at what they do, should we trust their collective judgment with matters as far from everyday experience, and as important, as whether or not one should believe in God as the source of moral valuation?

2016 Steven Yates – All Rights Reserved

Materialism Pt. 2 of 4

“Same old song, just a drop of water in an endless sea
All we do crumbles to the ground although we refuse to see.
Dust in the wind

All we are is dust in the wind.”

~Kansas, “Dust in the Wind” (1977)

I’ve always enjoyed progressive rock, even if it raises my Christian friends’ brows sometimes. Much of it is well done, and sounds like some thought went into it. As implied by my referencing Madonna at the outset, popular music is often a good guide to the zeitgeist of a culture. Many singers/songwriters are sensitive to this in ways academics are not. Our cultural worldview, as I’ve emphasized, is fundamentally materialist, and even those uninterested in the philosophical specifics laid out in Part One will find themselves immersed in its consequences, one of which is the exclusive preoccupation with material goods amidst ethical ambiguity. One of the questions underwriting this ambiguity was best put by one of the first philosophy professors I was a teaching assistant for, back in the early 1980s. Are there any absolute values? was the question she posed in class. Must we rest content with the relativism of the anthropologists?

The German philosopher Immanuel Kant (1724 – 1804) believed we could deduce absolute duties from Pure Reason, and they would apply to all rational beings. He called his main principle the categorical imperative: always act as if the maxim or principle guiding your action could apply to everyone (I am paraphrasing, of course). Always tell the truth out of respect for the truth and respect for others as moral agents. Always keep your promises out of the same respect. Honor contracts. What is morally wrong is making exceptions for oneself, or

treating oneself as a special case. Morality is universal or it is useless. Kant had problems, however, when universal duties appeared to conflict, as they sometimes did.

Great Britain's John Stuart Mill (1806 – 1873), a Utilitarian, argued that morality is a matter of following the greatest happiness principle: your action is ethical if it creates a greater balance of happiness over unhappiness in the world, where happiness tends to mean pleasures of various sorts (those of the mind, such as scientific knowledge or appreciation of the arts, take precedence over those of the body, involving sensuality and appetites). This kind of position logically permits the sacrifice of some if it brings about enough knowledge and social benefits for the rest to enjoy a greater balance of happiness. And by the way, these are not idle games played by intellectuals locked away in academic cubicles. Mill's ideas were widely studied and absorbed into governing bodies throughout the English-speaking world. They came to affect policy decisions in a variety of arenas, and were furthered by people who barely even heard of Mill himself. The sacrifice of dozens of black men in Macon Co., Ala., during the Tuskegee syphilis experiment is consistent with utilitarian thought! The public health community got away with this for decades! Also compatible with utilitarianism is every decision to send the children of the masses to fight wars of choice!

So is it the case that, as Russian novelist Fyodor Dostoevsky's (1821 – 1881) character Ivan Karamazov put it, "If God does not exist, then everything is permitted"? Twentieth century secular ethics has been a struggle against this wretched conclusion, as well as against the relativism of anthropologists such as Benedict. Thus far, the results are less than promising!

A few major thinkers of the later twentieth century weighed in with fresh proposals. Among the best known is John Rawls (1921 – 2002), who pursued a theory of social justice as fairness.

He sought to identify rules that would be adopted by rational persons from behind a veil of ignorance: that is, from an ideal vantage point where the adopter does not know his race or class standing or other particulars. What principles would be most worth embracing by the rational and fair-minded? Rawls's answer: every person should have basic liberties no government can take away, to the extent compatible with equal liberties for all (the liberty principle); "offices and positions" should be open to all persons regardless of race and sex (an equality of opportunity principle); inequalities, to be acceptable, must work to the advantage of the worst off (the difference principle).

Rawls's critics noted that his original position (behind the veil of ignorance) works under the assumption that most people are risk averse. They would not want to risk the results of principles that left disadvantaged groups to fend for themselves, as they might be in one such group. Saying this is a bit strange, however, and others wondered if the thought experiment was realistic. Can anyone actually imagine themselves behind a "veil of ignorance"? It certainly doesn't comport with the identity-politics that has come about since Rawls wrote his major work *A Theory of Justice* (1971). Rawls did not see any connection between morality and justice on the one hand and metaphysics or worldviews on the other. The idea that these areas can be divorced from one another is part of secular ethics in the material world.

One of Rawls's Harvard colleagues, Robert Nozick (1938 – 2002), developed an individualist ethic, as have other notable libertarian philosophers such as Tibor R. Machan (1939 –), some influenced by Ayn Rand (1905 – 1982). They focused instead on negative rights of individuals, rights to be left alone in ways that imply no duties to others except to leave them alone. These they contrasted with supposed positive rights to specific goods someone is obligated to supply, which led to collectivism. Their view was that all individuals have

the right to act freely, pursue their own goals, and keep the fruits of their labors (private property) so long as they do not interfere with the same negative rights of others. All should deal voluntarily with one another in the free market. According to the non-aggression principle, central in the libertarian ethos, what is forbidden is physical aggression or coercion against others.

This view appeals to defenders of freedom and Constitutionally limited government, obviously, since to the libertarian government is the primary aggressor against individuals' rights, to be kept very small (minarchism, what Nozick called the night watchman state) or eliminated (anarchocapitalism), therefore. The downside is that individuals rendered helpless or infirm, e.g., by illness or infirmity late in life, would have no inherent right to care, as that would be a positive right. For libertarian purists, even social security is the collectivized and forcible taking from some and giving to others. Negative rights do not do you much good, however, if all they come down to is a "right" to starve, or to die helpless. Families are considered responsible for helping their own, but reality is that in industrial civilization family members have had to spread everywhere in search of work, often leaving elderly parents behind.

Nothing in libertarianism forbids a person from acting on his own to help, e.g., Alzheimer's patients who are alone. This is hardly reassuring, though. An ethic of purely negative rights seems neither realistic nor humane. Libertarians assumed, moreover, that free market dynamics plus what Nozick's night watchman state would be sufficient to control corporate greed or prevent the dominance of the state by corporations acting in consort as they hungered after power. History suggests that this is wrong, that the locus of power is not government per se but networked corporate leviathans who can buy political loyalty. One need only read John Perkins's (1945 -) Confessions of an Economic Hit Man (2004) to see the role corporations have played in controlling governments and

bringing about a wide variety of regime changes and cultural catastrophes against those who resisted.

While all these various notions have all received great discussion and debate, no one position has emerged as dominant. Richard Rorty (1931 – 2007), arguably the last major philosopher of the twentieth century (and possibly the last major philosopher the West will produce), put it like this in his *Consequences of Pragmatism* (1982): again to paraphrase, in the actual world, people have the rights and obligations society says they have, no more and no less. We are back to the anthropological view. Society, neither Rorty nor they quite tell us, devolves upon authority, especially those with the capacity to enforce their will on others, or to use language in ways ensuring psychological conditioning and de facto control. One of Rorty's favorite philosophers was educationist John Dewey (1859 – 1952). Dewey, who had studied under Wundtian G. Stanley Hall whom we mentioned earlier, had also seen merit in behaviorism.

All of the philosophers we have considered were atheists except for Kant who believed society benefited from a general belief in God, although from a philosophical standpoint Kant decoupled God from morality. Later philosophers just built on this separation. Kant did not believe our reason was capable of solving the problem of whether or not God exists; its categories, Kant called them, limited its possibilities.

But we cannot really evade the choice: believe in God and His commands, or not? To not choose is to be an operational atheist, acting as if God does not exist while going along with what is fashionable, ethically speaking.

Rorty's implicit answer to Dostoevsky is: "If God doesn't exist, then everything is permitted that your fellows allow, the state permits, or that you can get away with." The infamous "eleventh commandment": thou shalt not get caught. If your culture has not convinced you that you shouldn't lie,

cheat, steal, or go on stage and perform nearly naked (think Miley Cyrus!), then so much the worse for your culture! Any ethical objections to the idea that corporations may do as they please and call it “the free market at work” turn out to be toothless.

Next week part three.

2016 Steven Yates – All Rights Reserved

Steven Yates Archive 2004 – 2015

- [Materialism](#), Part 1, 12-30-15
- [Higher Education: The Coming Implosion, and After](#), 12-5-15
- [Political Correctness is Killing Higher Education](#), Part 2, 11-14-15
- [Political Correctness is Killing Higher Education](#), Part 1, 11-14-15
- [There Is No Such Thing As Settled Science](#), 11-7-15
- [Converging on Techno-Feudalism](#), Part 2, 7-26-15
- [Converging on Techno-Feudalism](#), Part 1, 7-26-15
- [U.S. Approaching an Abyss](#), 5-30-15
- [How Mainstream Media Lies, Worsens Race Relations, And Protects The Police State](#), 4-25-15
- [Incivility and Gullibility: Online and Offline](#), 2-3-15
- [Civil Wrongs: 20 Years After](#), 10-14-14
- [The Real Matrix](#)Â Part 14, 9-27-14
- [The Real Matrix](#)Â Part 13, 8-16-14
- [The Real Matrix](#)Â Part 12, 8-9-14
- [The Real Matrix](#)Â Part 11, 8-5-14

- [The Real Matrix](#)Â Part 10, 6-21-14
- [The Real Matrix](#)Â Part 9, 6-14-14
- [The Real Matrix](#)Â Part 8, 5-31-14
- [The Fate of Empires](#), Part 3, 5-17-14
- [The Fate of Empires](#), Part 2, 5-17-14
- [The Fate of Empires](#), Part 1, 5-10-14
- [The Conditions of Liberty](#), 4-22-14
- [If I Still Lived in the U.S., I'd be Getting Pretty Worried Right Now](#), 10-20-13
- [Building Sustainable Communities in Chile](#), 9-11-13
- [Ticking Time Bombs](#), Part 2, 7-16-13
- [Ticking Time Bombs](#), Part 1, 7-16-13
- [Liberals are Simply Not Very Bright](#), 3-6-13
- [Piercing the Veils](#), 12-2-12
- [Moving Day](#), Part 2, 8-8-12
- [Moving Day](#), Part 1, 8-8-12
- [Sociopathocracy](#), Part 2, 4-28-12
- [Sociopathocracy](#), Part 1, 4-28-12
- [America: A Nation in Decline and Slowly Cracking Up](#), 3-27-12
- [Directed History is Not Conspiracy Theory](#), Part 4, 3-17-12
- [Directed History is Not Conspiracy Theory](#), Part 3, 3-17-12
- [Directed History is Not Conspiracy Theory](#), Part 2, 3-17-12
- [Directed History is Not Conspiracy Theory](#), Part 1, 3-17-12
- [On Ron Paul and "Electability"](#)Â 1-14-12
- [Leftists, Sarah Palin and Vitriolic Rhetoric](#), 1-30-11
- [The Four Cardinal Errors That Almost Destroyed America](#), Part 6, 1-9-10
- [The Four Cardinal Errors That Almost Destroyed America](#), Part 5, 1-9-10
- [The Four Cardinal Errors That Almost Destroyed America](#), Part 4, 10-1-09
- [The Four Cardinal Errors That Almost Destroyed America](#),

Part 3, 9-17-09

- [The Four Cardinal Errors That Almost Destroyed America](#), Part 2, 9-27-09
- [The Four Cardinal Errors That Almost Destroyed America](#), Part 1, 9-13-09
- [Premises](#) 9-20-08
- [States to Homeland Security on REAL ID: No Thanks](#), Part 2, 5-11-08
- [States to Homeland Security on REAL ID: No Thanks](#), Part 1, 5-11-08
- [McCain Would Continue the Bush II Disaster](#), Part 2, 3-16-08
- [McCain Would Continue the Bush II Disaster](#), Part 1, 3-16-08
- [Dissent in America to be Relabeled 'Homegrown Terrorism'](#), Part 2, 12-2-07
- [Dissent in America to be Relabeled 'Homegrown Terrorism'](#), Part 1, 12-2-07
- [The Latest Grounds for Abandoning Government Schools](#) 11-10-07
- [Aaron Russo, Freedom Fighter](#) 9-7-07
- [We the People vs. Corporatist-Globalism](#), Part 2, 8-5-07
- [We the People vs. Corporatist-Globalism](#), Part 1, 8-5-07
- ["Real ID" – Real Rebellion Boiling Over](#) 6-21-07
- [The Ron Paul Rebellion](#) 5-21-07
- ["Real ID" – Real Rebellion Brewing](#) 2-18-07
- [Ron Paul for 2008?](#) 1-17-07
- [Quietly, Quietly Building the North American Union](#) 10-5-06
- [Ben Bernanke and the New International Economic Order](#) 9-11-06
- [Radical Feminists: Useful Idiots](#) 8-1-06
- [America: "Freedom to Fascism" A Must See Movie](#) 7-10-06
- [The North American Union "Matrix"](#) – Part 9, 6-3-06
- [The North American Union "Matrix"](#) – Part 8, 6-3-06
- [A Look Behind America's Immigration Nightmare](#) 4-20-06
- [Solution to the Evolution, End Government School](#)

[Monopoly!](#) 3-4-06

- [The Global-Governance Deception](#) 2-12-06
- [Our Money System](#) – Part 3, 12-28-05
- [Our Money System](#) – Part 2, 12-28-05
- [Our Money System](#) – Part 1, 12-28-05
- [Erasing America!](#) 11-23-05
- [Free Trade: The Myth and the Reality](#) 9-12-05
- [The CAFTA Los—and Beyond](#) 8-14-05
- [The Globalists' Best Friend: Americans' Ignorance](#) 6-21-05
- [Scuttling Bad Trade Agreements](#) 5-6-05
- [The Real Matrix](#) Part 7, 12-7-04
- [The Real Matrix](#) Part 6, 12-7-04
- [The Real Matrix](#) Part 5, 12-7-04
- [The Real Matrix](#) Part 4, 12-7-04
- [The Real Matrix](#) Part 3, 12-7-04
- [The Real Matrix](#) Part 2, 12-7-04
- [The Real Matrix](#) Part 1, 12-7-04