

RUNNYMEDE GAZETTE

A Journal of the Democratic Resistance

SEPTEMBER 2014

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL

**THE IMPERATIVE OF A CONVENTION
KEEP THE NOISE DOWN!**

CONSULTATION ON "A NEW MAGNA CARTA"

House of Commons; via Nathon Allonby

THOUGHTS TOWARDS CONFEDERALISM

Frank Taylor

EVICITION STOPPED

Ilkeston Advertiser; via David Pidcock

STOP TTIP

38 Degrees

SUTTON'S THEORY OF ELITE ACTION

D Senti; WashingtonsBlog; via Critical Thinking

DEBUNKING DEBUNKERS

Foster Gamble; Thrive

THE SHOCK DOCTRINE: THE WAR ON ALL OF US

Gregor Bingham; Beams and Struts; via Critical Thinking

**EU COMMISSION WANTS TO WIPE OUT CITIZENS' INVOLVEMENT IN TTIP
AND CETA**

Stop TTIP; via Critical Thinking

I AM A LIBERTARIAN

Laurence M. Vance; LewRockwell.com

**MICROCHIPS WILL BE IMPLANTED INTO HEALTHY PEOPLE SOONER
THAN YOU THINK**

Dina Spector; Business Insider Australia

SURVEILLANCE CAMERAS WILL SOON BE READING OUR LIPS

MassPrivatel via Activist Post

5 BIG BROTHER TECHNOLOGIES FOR TRACKING AND SURVEILLING CHILDREN

Terrence Newton; Activist Post

MIND CONTROL SCIENTISTS TURN OFF EMOTIONAL LINK TO MEMORIES

Nicholas West; Activist Post

FINANCIAL IMPLOSION: GLOBAL DERIVATIVES MARKET AT \$1,200 TRILLION DOLLARS ... 20 TIMES THE WORLD ECONOMY

Washington's Blog; Global Research

POSITIVE MONEY BULLETIN

Positive Money Team

EDITORIAL

THE IMPERATIVE OF A CONVENTION

Despite the crowings amongst the Westminster nomenclatura and their media friends of a 'decisive' result which would 'resolve the issue for a generation', the result of the Scottish referendum was highly provisional.

It all depends what happens in the rest of the country in the next two or three years. A few extra powers already promised to Holyrood, and given on a *pro tem* basis, will only compound the impression of our national administration as a chaotic patchwork of different authorities with different powers and different electoral systems and ... crucially ... all held firmly under Westminster's thumb.

This journal has little truck for Peter Hain, surely one of the most accomplished political chameleons of his generation, yet he was surely right when he said that the approach to constitutional reform of the Westminster establishment will be minimalist and gradualist whereas the only right response would be immediate and radical.

Comprehensive constitutional reform has been rumbling in the background for many years. Perhaps the House of Commons item on a "New Magna Carta" is a sign that an eruption (of sorts!) might be due.

Yet is this to be merely the product of 'inter-party consultations' by an establishment which has long been the problem rather than the solution? Are we going to get another botch drawn up on the back of a fag packet, or a back room job from some anonymous Whitehall parliamentary draftsmen? Will it be an affair organised by a single political party, as proposed by the Labour, and thus very likely end up as Labour having a conversation with itself?

The only way of avoiding another establishment stitch-up is for the insurgent forces to start our own convention. In so doing we must also start the process of putting in place a network which can energise the debate about how we (to quote King William) wish to be governed. **Those interested, get in touch.**

KEEP THE NOISE DOWN!

In his review of Naomi Klein's latest book, Gregor Bingham, admits what has long been obvious ... that we are engaged in a form of warfare with the powers that govern us. Apropos of the success of such powers-that-be in shocking and disorienting the population into submission he puts his finger on a tactical dilemma;-

"What I see is that we now have a choice between radical disruptive activism and/or incremental reforms. The problem with disruptive activism is the engagement of a further "shock" to the already-shocked populace, and the problem with incremental reform is that it creates a slow-moving target for the 1% to strategize against ... "

So which horn is to be grasped first? Perhaps the contraposed articles on a stopped eviction and the Stop TTIP day of action by 38 Degrees give a hint.

The first serves as an example of where direct action is useful and justifiable. The second serves as an intelligent alternative to the worn out rituals of street politics.

Demonstrations and occupations are now too numerous to be noteworthy. Often such events are organised more to assuage the inner needs of the organisers rather than communicate a message. Often they achieve little more than to bemuse and annoy rather than persuade. In short, the noise created by a certain type of political campaigning can often be an inverse function of its effect.

Instead, Thirty Eight Degrees chose to engage face-to face. Around the country it mobilised 10,000 people within the space of a few days.

Much work in informing, awakening and energising can thus be accomplished over the garden fence, on the doorstep, at work and down the pub. That way, we go behind the wainscots and under the floorboards! It does not have to be noisy, in-your-face shock therapy. It's sometimes best to work quietly and keep the noise down!

Frank Taylor

"A NEW MAGNA CARTA"

House of Commons; via Nathan Allonby

Parliament is launching a major consultation into the shape of our democracy today, through the Political and Constitutional Reform Select Committee.

Background

The most famous constitutional document in England's history, the Magna Carta, has its 800th Anniversary next year, but the Committee has been looking forwards by working on a major project with King's College London to develop several different visions of what a democratic settlement for the UK could look like. The King's College research lays out three different models – including one fully fleshed out, complete constitution – and sets out some of the arguments for and against codifying the constitution in this way.

Arguments for

The King's research points to the fact that the UK has a "sprawling mass" of common law, Acts of Parliament, and European treaty obligations, and a number of important but uncertain and unwritten "conventions" that govern administration, but the full picture is unclear and uncertain to electors in our democracy. They point to concerns about an "elective dictatorship", and argue that it has "become too easy for governments to implement political and constitutional reforms to suit their own political

convenience". A written constitution would entrench requirements for popular and parliamentary consent. The present unwritten constitution is "an anachronism riddled with references to our ancient past, unsuited to the social and political democracy of the 21st century and future aspirations of its people. It fails to give primacy to the sovereignty of the people and discourages popular participation in the political process."

Arguments against

Conversely, the case against a written constitution is that it is unnecessary, undesirable and un-British. The UK's unwritten constitution is evolutionary and flexible in nature, enabling practical problems to be resolved as they arise and individual reforms made. The research points to concerns that a written constitution would create more litigation in the courts and politicise the judiciary, requiring them to pass judgement on the constitutionality of government legislation (which currently happens only in some contexts, such as compatibility with the Human Rights Act), when the final word on legal matters should lie with elected politicians in Parliament, not unelected judges. There is the simple argument that there are so many practical problems in preparing and enacting a written constitution, there is little point in even considering it. There is no real popular support or demand and, especially given the massive amount of time and destabilising effect such a reform would entail, it is a very low priority even for those who support the idea.

The research the Select Committee commissioned from King's College London sets out three different models for a codified constitution for the UK:

Constitutional Code – a document that doesn't have legal force, but which would set out the existing principles of the constitution and the workings of government.

Constitutional Consolidation Act – a document which would consolidate existing constitutional laws in one place.

Written Constitution – a document of basic law by which the UK would be governed, setting out the relationship between the state and its citizens.

Each of these options is itself open to debate and variation. They are for you to consider. The Select Committee is initiating a national debate, and is deliberately not supporting a position for or against a codified constitution, believing it is for the people ultimately to decide that question.

Submit your views

The Select Committee will consult widely and asks anyone who is interested in the future of the UK's constitution to send in their views on the questions below. The consultation closes on 1 January 2015. The Committee will report on the responses from the public in time for them to be taken into account ahead of the general election. The Committee's report and the research are available at: www.parliament.uk/pcrc-constitution

Does the UK need a codified constitution?

If so, which of the three options offers the best way forward?

What changes would you like to be made to your favoured option if you have one?

THOUGHTS TOWARDS CONFEDERALISM

Frank Taylor

Scotland's problem is not unique to Scotland. The great burden of that axis of political, economic and military power which lies along that mile or so of road between Westminster and the City of London. lies heavily upon all of us.

Around 40 years ago, Jo Grimond, often under-rated as a radical thinker, and in a former era of SNP ascendancy, advocated replacing the UK by a Confederation of British States. Sadly, his pamphlet is no longer available, but if we were to look at such a radically decentralised confederal structure it the outline might be roughly as follows;-

1. A single Citizenship, currency and supreme court.
2. Separate parliaments in Edinburgh, London, Cardiff and Belfast conjoined only by an upper house, thus resolving the 'West Lothian' question.

3. Root and branch devolution from all of these centres to the counties, which would have a status similar to the Swiss cantons, and the town, parish and community councils which would have a status similar to the Swiss communes.

4. Each state would nominate to the Supreme Court, Royal Mint, Bank of England (perhaps better renamed the Bank of Great Britain), and a small group of co-ordinating ministries along Swiss lines, where it is sensible to keep services together and where co-ordination is needed. For example;-

The national insurance system.

Communications networks

Air traffic control

The university admissions system

Energy and resource networks and macro-policy

Monetary policy and the macroeconomic framework

5. Specific provision that sovereignty resides with the people, together with referendum on demand (as in Switzerland and now Iceland), and powers of recall.

6. Each state would hold a veto over foreign and defence policy. The UN veto could only be used with the express unanimity of all states.

7. There would be the opportunity for participation by the Crown Dependencies, and perhaps some form of associate status for the Irish republic and some smaller Caribbean states.

8. Each state would raise all of its own taxes. Indeed, as much as 80% of tax raising would be at county or lower level. Revenue for national programmes would be provided on a per capita basis through a mechanism similar to that of the EU and would likely constitute no more than a small percentage of GDP.

All this said. reform and devolution of political structures without the devolution of economic power and a currency which is wholly part of the Common Weal, can only ever be but a small step.

EVICTION STOPPED

Ilkeston Advertiser; via David Pidcock

A disabled woman from an Ilkeston village hailed an action group, members of which she has never met, as her 'saviours' after they stepped in amid moves to evict her from her home.

Some 30 members of the Response Midlands campaign and other affiliated groups — some of whom wore masks — gathered outside the home of Michelle Wheatley, 54, on Coronation Road in Stanley village as part of a peaceful protest as bailiffs arrived.

The group, who were all strangers before they met to stand up for Mrs Wheatley, heard via Facebook that the mother-of-four and grandmother-of-eight was to be evicted, and travelled from around the East Midlands, they say, to protect her legal rights. Dozens arrived at the house from 9.30am, and when bailiffs, police and a locksmith arrived separately at around midday, they took stock of the situation and left without attempting to enter the house.

Michelle and her husband Barry, 58, own the house and have a mortgage on the property. They were not present when the bailiffs arrived.

Forklift-truck driver Barry was at work while Michelle was attending an emergency appeal meeting to dispute the eviction threat.

The Advertiser understands the action relates to an alleged historic debt.

Michelle claims she has been fighting against eviction since 2005, with a recurring dispute over a debt that made her husband bankrupt.

"There is no debt anymore but they are still chasing it," she said. "It's not the mortgage, we're up to date with the mortgage. They've got it all wrong." She added: "These people are my saviours to step in like this, I can't imagine if they hadn't been there."

Michelle's son, Craig Wheatley, 29, said he was worried about the toll the threat of eviction was taking on his mum.

"With all the stress she's been under, I get her sobbing down the phone, terrified when the bailiffs are

coming round,” he said. “I’m worried she’s going to end up in an early box. She really is struggling to cope with it all.”

‘Paul’, the founder of Response and a member of the activism network Anonymous, said: “They (bailiffs and other authorities) do a risk assessment of the situation and if there are not enough officers to enforce the eviction they just leave.”

Trainee solicitor Paul started Response three months ago, connecting people on Facebook who are able to respond quickly to an eviction notice, and muster support to ensure people are not ‘unlawfully evicted’ from their homes. He added: “The police have claimed we’re activists but we’re just here in the interests of the people. They’ve claimed that because I’ve got a mask on my face I must be involved in something illegal. But we’re not protesting anything, we’re just making sure people are treated properly under legislation.”

A spokesperson for Derbyshire police confirmed that there was an incident at Coronation Road but did not confirm who made the call. “Someone who attended was concerned for their safety as a threat of damage was allegedly made by a member of the group,” they said. “The police don’t play any role in evictions as they are a civil matter but we sometimes attend to make sure there is no breach of the peace.”

Paul denied that any threats were made to anyone on the street.

“In all of the evictions we’ve attended not one of us has been violent,” he added. “We’re peaceful, intelligent people who just want to help.”

The name of the company or the organisation enforcing the eviction notice is not known.

STOP TTIP

38 Degrees

Thank you for joining with other 38 Degrees members across the country in the campaign to fight the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP). 38 Degrees members will be taking action on Saturday 30th August.

Together we can raise awareness of this dangerous deal, and put pressure on our government to fix or scrap TTIP. So far negotiations for the deal have been shrouded in secrecy. By joining with other 38 Degrees members to leaflet, raise signatures for a petition against the deal, and talk with your neighbours, you'll be forcing this deal into the spotlight. So if you haven't already, say hi to the other 38 Degrees members who have already committed to taking action in your constituency, and start making plans for where and what time you want to meet up. Thanks for being involved,

SUTTON’S THEORY OF ELITE ACTION

D Senti; WashingtonsBlog; via Critical Thinking

(A thought provoking item. All this said, there is an inevitability about the process of action and reaction governing the development of human ideas and ideologies. That such ideas develop by a rough process of triangulation goes back ... from my rusty memory ... to Aristotle. Hegel is often little more than a statement of the blindingly obvious couched ... again there is a good layer of rust on my recollections ... in some decidedly pretentious and obtuse language - Ed)

While we frequently write about the deeper currents underlying world events - we know nothing about Anthony Sutton. But reader and guest poster D. Senti has sent us a well-written piece summarizing Sutton’s theories ... and their possible application to the ISIS jihad in the Middle East.

Given that the first time we’ve heard Sutton’s theories is right now – when we read Mr. Senti’s post – count us as agnostic about the whole thing. However, this has enough of the “ring of truth” about it that we are amenable to considering the possibility.

Background

Antony Sutton is likely a familiar figure to those who peruse this site. For those who haven't had the privilege to hear of him, Sutton was a well-respected establishment scholar for a time. He was a research Fellow of the Hoover Institution at Stanford as well as a professor of economics. His career would have been unexceptional, were it not for two particular quirks: he chose to research the elite, and he was honest.

Beginning with his analysis of Western involvement in the creation and support of the Soviet Union, he minced no words in accusing the most powerful families, bankers, and corporations of assisting Communism, Nazism, Socialism, and their own power over that of America's self-interest. And more than that, he was exceedingly careful. He did not make accusations lightly, did not let his ideological views cloud his careful research methods, and was never afraid to say he didn't know the answers when he lacked the resources to support a claim. In some ways, he is a "founding father" of the modern anti-statist movement.

All of this, of course, made him persona non grata to the establishment, who admonished him frequently to back off lest his career suffer. He chose to leave the Hoover Institution in 1973, to continue his work unmolested, and published a number of books on the actions of elite families that sold quite well. His book on the Skull and Bones, which he considered his most important work, was a scathing indictment of the families at the heart and height of power; Sutton openly accused them of conspiracy, of playing the right and left against each other for their own gain, and of instigating war for the benefit of both their ambitions and the military-industrial complex.

Ideology

And what was the drive behind this? Was it blind power for power's sake? If Sutton and others can say definitively that these families and organizations do not act based upon a left or right-wing ideology, then how could it be anything beyond self-interest? Yet Sutton had an answer to this:

"Left" and "right" are artificial devices to bring about change, and the extremes of political left and political right are vital elements in a process of controlled change. The answer to this seeming political puzzle lies in Hegelian logic. Remember that both Marx and Hitler, the extremes of "left" and "right" presented as textbook enemies, evolved out of the same philosophical system: Hegelianism. The dialectical process did not originate with Marx as Marxists claim, but with Fichte and Hegel in late 18th and early 19th century Germany... This conflict of opposites is essential to bring about change. Today this process can be identified in the literature of the Trilateral Commission where "change" is promoted and "conflict management" is termed the means to bring about this change."

The elite ascribe to a brand of Hegelianism, where the dialectical process brings about an ideal synthesis out of conflict. Hegel himself had strong statist streaks to his philosophy and approach, and his philosophy could be considered as actualization through contradiction. It bears a striking similarity to the gnostic traditions of chaos bringing about perfection by manifesting opposing forces. As the Enlightenment cults borrowed heavily from Gnosticism, both in their belief in an "enlightened few" and in the universe as self-ascending toward some quasi-divine perfection, it's fitting that this dialectical process be the mentality of the elite.

Indeed, one could argue that this whole approach is a product of their occult views, instead of merely being adapted to it.

Those who aid this process – who move society toward its final actualization and unity – have a sort of "divine right" to rule by law of nature. This very line of thinking is the inspiration for the Communist Dictatorship of the Proletariat, and their "ends-justify-the-means" thinking for their cause. Sutton again:

"Furthermore, the Illuminati principle that the end justifies the means, a principle that Quigley scores as immoral and used by both The Group and The Order, is rooted in Hegel."

Moral absolutes, to them, do not exist, except insofar as an action aids the inevitable course of history. To the elites, the inevitable course of history is a final synthesis of all contradicting political ideas: freedom and tyranny, individualism and collectivism, agency and slavery, and so on. It is in their view neither of these things. The final society transcends these things.

What that means in short is simple. If you like any of the things on this list, the elites want them to go away and become merged with their contraries. And this process cannot be theoretical or abstract, no – all of these dialectical philosophers that Sutton mentions, from Hegel to Fichte to Marx to Engels –

held that the abstract was meaningless of itself and only the first step in the process. It is the thesis or the abstract, which must be followed by the antithesis or negation, and then from conflict be synthesized or concretized into something greater.

A Model

So each idea, and its contrary, must be manifested really and separately from its contrary, and then forced into conflict. There is no way to “transcend” the Western model without creating a nation that is the antithesis of the Western model. For representation its enemy must substitute dictatorship; for freedom the enemy must enslave; for a theistic system of rights the enemy must have an atheist principle of amoral action. This was the USSR. And it too needed to be opposed in other ways, which necessitated Nazism. The conflict between these two would create a form of purer collectivism and Statism. After this, the Western liberal democracy must confront the collectivist system, and the victor in that conflict subsume the elements of the loser into itself. One could perhaps convincingly argue that China is a manifestation of the synthesis.

This is not completed in any few number of steps, mind you. Anywhere that the elites can create antithesis and conflict, it believes it can “actualize” some element of human society, allowing it to manifest as the synthesis by which the problem is eventually solved. We see this very same approach being taken with Islam today. Everywhere that two groups of people can be brought to struggle against one another, the elites would argue for its merits. And by an astounding coincidence, these same people are positioned to profit immensely from it, both through financial and military systems. No doubt the Statist elements are incorporated into their final ideal vision will put them in positions of great power (especially since Statism is the only real consistent element of their proposed systems, both on the “left” and on the “right”).

They work both sides. They foment the conflict. But they are not seeking a total conflagration, which would undermine their work; only war and conflict on a manageable scale. The development of nuclear weapons makes World War-style conflict very dangerous, so their approach has become regionalized. Until nuclear disarmament can be accomplished, that is.

Sutton proposed this way of thinking as an explanation for the developments of modern history. The elites are not necessarily well-understood, according to him. There are people and groups and organizations whose motives and methods are not known, and perhaps there is even internal dissension between them. But their driving philosophy is clear: perfect the world through opposition and conflict. Promote their goals by a chain of influence, united by a small cadre with a core philosophy. They need not be presidents, premiers and prime ministers. They need only be considered their trusted advisors.

I too am very much inclined to this way of thinking. The operations of the elite are self-interested, but only in the greater sense. They have worked toward consistent goals over timescales that surpass many lifetimes, which is the one thing pure narcissism is incapable of doing. They are selfless in the cause of their own collective selfishness, in a word, which requires some deep belief in the rightness of their cause. Whether the philosophy merely justifies the actions or the actions are driven by the philosophy, I can't say.

Sutton's schema also allows for alternative views to be encompassed into our efforts. Any hope of opposing their efforts requires the broadest possible umbrella to envelope as many people who would be willing to join us. The best example that comes to my mind is, of course, 9/11. Under what I've labeled here “Sutton's Theory of Elite Action,” (or STEA) 9/11 would like Pearl Harbor before it most certainly be attributed to the actions of the elite. But it can be understood in two senses.

The traditional (anti-establishment) view is that people within our government actively assisted or outright ordered and carried out the attack, to excuse actions in the Middle East (for fun and profit, no doubt). This view is tenable under STEA, but the consequences are the same if you think their actions were more subtle. There is no doubt that we funded and supported terrorists in the Middle East. It was just as certain that these jihadists hated us, and that they would try to act against us if possible, and that we did virtually nothing to prevent terrorist action against the US. Any idiot with his eyes open could tell you that would end in tears.

And those tears are exactly what the elite wanted. And if word reached US intelligence agencies that terrorists were about to attack, the message would simply have to be lost in transmission, or downplayed, or ignored. It is the very same tactic used by FDR to get the US into WW2: the Japanese needed American oil no matter the cost; FDR cut off supply to Japan at any price; the Japanese were forced to attack to hopefully gain leverage; FDR ignored reports of an incoming attack. Why send fake Japanese planes to attack Pearl Harbor when a few low-visibility actions can make them do it for you? It's genius, albeit diabolical.

So it's enough for people to understand that the elite wanted a 9/11 and acted in such a way to make it happen. How they went about it is just squabbling over details.

Past and Future

The same picture is appearing today with ISIS. Those in power fomented conflict, created the conditions to strengthen jihadists, funded and armed these same people, and then departed for greener pastures. There are only two explanations here that make sense: either our leadership is so mind-numbingly incompetent that they need someone to dress them every morning, or they want this conflict.

Sutton's Theory of Elite Action could have tentative predictive power in this case. Sutton himself made some missteps, particularly regarding China (though he may just have been a few decades early in his predictions), so it's by no means certain that their intentions can be understood beforehand. But STEA would predict that this is an effort to create a synthesis out of the divisions in Islamic society. By maximizing the strength of the jihadist element in Islam and forcing them into direct conflict with the Muslims of a more moderate bent (in spite of the Koran's calls to violence, I might add), they believe they are providing the only true path for synthetic unity in the Middle East. No doubt this synthetic solution would then be positioned as an enemy against some other regional bloc.

The EU is a perfect example. Europe was sorely divided along political and ideological lines. Sutton's research shows beyond a shadow of a doubt that the three competing ideologies of the 1940s (American-style socialism under FDR, Nazism under Hitler, and Communism under Stalin) were all established and supported by the core banking families, as well as other American and British corporations. Sutton:

"World War II was the culmination of the dialectic process created in the 1920s and 1930s. The clash between "left" and "right," i.e., the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany, led to creation of a synthesis – notably the United Nations, and a start towards regional groupings in the Common Market, COMECON, NATO, UNESCO, Warsaw Pact, SEATO, CENTO, and then the Trilateral Commission. A start towards New World Order."

They built the Soviet factories for armament production, funded and stabilized the Reich, and propped up a fragile, newly-developing US political system. Only two theories here can fit the facts: pure sociopathic self-interest and the dialectical STEA. I believe the first is ruled out by multi-generational action along the same lines.

It is, of course, possible that this situation or others have simply grown beyond their control. That risk is the nature of the beast. But the funny thing about true believers in a cause is that they're predictable. ISIS is an organization run by men bent on restoring the Caliphate that crucifies their own jihadists for being too moderate and blows up Islamic holy sites. If ever there were a group fit for their dialectical purpose, it's ISIS. They are absolutely guaranteed to antagonize every Muslim who is not a part of their particular brand of belief, which is exactly what the elite would need to create an Islamic synthesis. They only lacked money and armaments, yet lo and behold! The US government armed them and then abandoned oil-rich Iraq, leaving a vacuum of power. Again, is this unparalleled incompetence or design? There are no other viable options. (And all this is without mentioning how Fed action, among others, created the Arab Spring which plays perfectly into the pre-end times Islamic traditions, which is too much to explain here.)

So STEA could perhaps make the following prediction: the Middle East is about to see the regional equivalent of World War II. And the timing could not be more fortuitous. The (alleged) actions of Iran have spooked enough countries into pursuing their own nuclear ambitions, which would render the Middle East too volatile for dialectical synthesis. If they were going to act, it had to be now.

If I had to summarize Sutton's Theory of Elite Action in a paragraph, I would explain it just so:

The powerful elite families, consisting of bankers, a few powerful businessmen, and second-level politicians, have an end goal of a unified Statist society. They operate through a chain of influence and a number of closed-door organizations to impose their ideas on society by controlling key positions of power. Using the dialectic method of Hegel, Marx, Fichte and Engels, they foment conflict by funding and arming antithetical organizations to create a synthetic unity, as seen in the EU. This process will continue – thesis, antithesis, synthesis – on greater scales until a one world Statist system is established, or they are stopped.

To many this may seem simple and even obvious. But the ideological framework provided by Sutton allows us to understand the actions of the elite with greater precision. I've posted this, above all, in hopes of facilitating discussion and opening up a wider, more welcoming umbrella for anti-Statists to gather under. The above has been proposed and extensively researched by Sutton (and others) to the degree that most honest parties should see its truth. If they don't, I think they must be either ill-informed

(and likely new to the cause) or believe our leaders to be spectacularly incompetent.

(All quotes are taken from Antony Sutton's "America's Secret Establishment: An Introduction to the Order of Skull and Bones")

DEBUNKING DEBUNKERS

Foster Gamble; Thrive

I love debunkers — the REAL ones. I am a rational skeptic and I know a dedicated and skillful debunker can save us all time and help keep us from being duped yet again in dangerous and impactful ways. The problem is finding and identifying the real ones in a murky sea of fake naysayers and hating trolls with a hidden and biased agenda that does not prioritize truth.

We are living in an unprecedented era where one person or a small team can use independent and alternative media to communicate key perspectives to millions of people worldwide — in a short amount of time. Given what we are dealing with in the way of planetary demise, this is a really good thing!

The flip side, however, is that someone with very little real expertise can undermine valuable inquiry and healthy skepticism. I met one man who said he was going to watch THRIVE, but then changed his mind when he saw that it "had been debunked." I asked if the debunking had made sense to him. "Oh I didn't actually read it. I just saw it had been debunked." My immediate reaction was a punch in the gut. How often are people throwing away or discrediting years of valuable fact-checked research on the grounds of a baseless attack?

Most importantly, why is that and how do we get good at sorting out the truth?

Lessons from the Trenches

If you are challenging the dominant paradigm as peddled in the corporate media and your influence is expanding, debunkers will enter your life. It goes with the territory. One of our seasoned advisors, a successful whistleblower who has survived one wringer after another, told us before THRIVE came out, "You're going to get it from all sides, and if you're not taking flak, you're probably not over the target yet."

I want to offer some of what we have learned about debunkers, detractors, haters and trolls in relation to THRIVE.

Who are they?

Why do they do what they do?

How can we recognize and deal with them effectively?

And why bother?

An accurate assessment of what's going on is critical if we want to create effective solutions. If we don't have a true understanding of the problem, we won't put our attention on the innovations that can best meet the challenges we face. So debunking the debunkers has a huge payoff. It helps us to sleuth out factual truth and create a safe environment from which to engage in meaningful public dialogue and transform our world into one that actually works for everyone.

Hogwash and Hooley, Baloney and Bull

I looked it up, and "bunk" is short for "bunkum." It's an old word from 19th century America that means "nonsense." Other dictionary synonyms are "baloney, rot, hogwash, applesauce, bull, and hooley." So when a group like snopes.com spends serious time and rigor separating the fabricated hogwash and hooley from facts and realities on the Internet, it's a valuable service. Wikipedia used to be helpful, but is now so co-opted on virtually every controversial issue, that its merit has been severely undermined for important topics that challenge major money or control

interests.

The Fed and ETs

I remember the first time I heard (from my son!) that the Federal Reserve was a private corporation and that no government agency could overrule their actions. I found it hard to believe and went on the Internet to look it up. At the time, there were very few sites addressing this issue, and many of them just discredited anyone questioning the reality or wisdom of the Fed's printing money out of nothing. I came away not knowing what to think. Fortunately, my son kept giving me more and more evidence. The same thing happened when I first heard about the military covering up their involvement with UFOs. The notion seemed far-fetched to me when I first heard about it, and by the time I made it through the first debunking sites, I would have been pretty skeptical that there was any real issue to discover there were it not for the dedication of a few individuals to wake me up.

Fast forward to 2014, where we now have over 36 million sites addressing the issue of the Federal Reserve, many of which are intelligent analyses and critiques of a corrupt system of counterfeit finance that has left the country and an alarming percentage of its citizens in debt slavery. It's an acknowledged fact that Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa (known as the BRICS countries) have now formed their own bank to bypass the stranglehold of the Federal Reserve and the World Bank, and people from all walks of life acknowledge the corruption of the system and the need to get out from under it.

As for UFOs and the military, while debunking sites abound, there are enough credible documents and confessions from high-level government, military and FAA insiders to inspire any sincere researcher to look further, and to recognize that the subject warrants serious inquiry and public dialogue.

What happened? What did it take to overcome a disinformation campaign and legitimize once-denied information and insight? My guess is that it took persistence, and a lot of people with a strong enough desire to get to the truth that simple mudslinging and cheap dismissals weren't enough to squelch their questioning...despite the discomfort.

Challenging the System

By the time we made THRIVE, Kimberly and I had both experienced the discomfort of asking socially-taboo questions and looking into controversial topics enough to recognize the power of disinformation campaigns. We suspected we would be the target of some likely disinformation and reputation-bashing when we released THRIVE. And of course, that turned out to be true.

THRIVE covers at least 14 topics that stretch the status quo. For most people, there is at least one theme that's challenging to consider. But in the nearly three years since its release, there is not a single fact in THRIVE that has been disproven. And yet the debunking of our film was rampant in its early days. Now, virtually everything and everyone who is effectively challenging the banking elite's agenda for global control will have sites or trolls actively debunking them and their message.

Who Are the Debunkers?

First, let me say again that there are skillful truth-seeking "debunking" sites whose priority seems to be accuracy and they seem to get it right almost all the time. And then there are hired hands who work for the government, for corporations, the intelligence agencies, the military and political parties. I have been assured of this by people formerly on the inside and here is a video clip that documents and verifies some of this. These cyber mercenaries are called "trolls" perhaps because their behavior resembles the mythical mini-beasts who live under bridges and hassle innocent passers-by.

What Are Some of Their Strategies?

When working for these types of groups, their job is to find anything that might undermine the

credibility and propaganda of their institutions and then attack the content — with either:

1. Disinformation.
2. Distraction.
3. Outright lies.
4. Trying to smear the credibility of the truth-teller.

If none of that is effective, the next tactic is to make it unpleasant and unsafe for anyone to make positive comments, effectively.

5. Scaring enthusiasts away from the site or thread altogether.

How Can We Identify Them?

1. Vicious attacks against the person who is providing the information rather than the facts themselves.
2. Name-calling and mud-slinging with no evidence.
3. Malicious disregard for the value of public debate and discussion, as if to question or bring up an alternative view is to be shunned.
4. No proposed solutions to the problem being discussed.
5. Lack of facts or rational logic to support their argument.

Some real examples from our experience:

*Notice the one eye in the THRIVE poster? It's proof that Gamble is an Illuminati corporate shill! Oh No! Not the Elite Minority! UFO's, Free energy, NWO, Crop Circles, Chariots of the gods. This Documentary has all the BS rolled into one. All it needs is antivaxers and 9/11 truthers to be complete!
Anybody buying this pile of crap is too stupid to deserve to exist. Eat s—t and die!*

And this from our cannabis healing blog from last week, that had over 100,000 views in the first 24 hours:

Thrive = Procter and gamble = elite = fluoridation = deceit. [sic]

6. Attacking someone for their references, with a guilt by association campaign.

This came up a lot for us. THRIVE was never intended to be a political movie, so we had no concern for the political affiliation or lack thereof of any of the people we interviewed. Debunkers on the Left would say:

“Did you know they interviewed Ed Griffin and he was a John Bircher?”

While people on the Right would say:

“Did you know they interviewed Deepak Chopra and he is a complete liberal?”

While still others would say:

“They interviewed David Icke and he talks about reptilian ETs.”

(So his decades of documented research about the banking families must be useless?)

What if instead we consider the fact that THRIVE transcends political party politics and offers solutions based on principles that empower people globally? Since when does a reliable resource for information and insight have to be someone with whom you agree 100%?

If we are going to create meaningful solutions, then we need to listen for truth and documented information even if it comes from someone with whom we have other differences of opinion. And why dismiss someone with a vengeance because they have a different worldview?

The vehemence is often a sign of the debunker's lack of legitimacy. Anyone serious about engaging in true discourse and finding real solutions can figure out a way to challenge respectfully and with evidence of a legitimate alternative perspective.

Another sign of intentionally misleading debunkers is their:

7. Tendency to operate anonymously.

If you go to the website or Facebook page (if they have one) of these type of commenters...

Their identity is often obviously contrived.

They have little or no biography.

Virtually no friends.

Their face is obscured in pictures. Often their names are straight from central casting like: Muertos, CraveHell666 or Arturobastard (seriously...these are genuine!)

Why Are They Spending Their Time This Way?

In addition to those who get paid to do this, there are, of course, scads of lonely, frustrated, abused, duped, dumbed-down, medicated people who just vent their unexpressed anger through their keyboard in the middle of the night. They hide in the shadows of anonymity and vent against any target, particularly if a person or project seems to be having some of the success and influence that they have not been able to achieve.

We have noticed that the level of self-responsibility seems correlated with the level of anonymity of the one commenting — how much needs to be disclosed to have a commenting account. It's lowest on YouTube, a little higher on Facebook, and highest of all on our own website.

How Can We Deal With Them Effectively?

Sometimes trolls and haters are best ignored. When they don't attract much attention or achieve their desired effect, they often give up or move on to where they might. Other times, I find they must be called out and confronted directly with facts and especially with pointed questions. Usually they leave rather than have to think, research or admit they were making stuff up.

"Muertos," the anonymous source behind the "THRIVE — Debunked" website, fit all the above criteria for being a hired troll. The conversations on his site began to expose and accuse him of this. Rather than issue a denial, he tried to deflect their accusations by instead inviting people on his site to take a poll of how many thought he was a troll. What? After a year, he announced the demise of the Thrive Movement, even though the film was still having over a million views a month and hundreds of solution groups were forming around the world in response to the coherence the film and website provided. In truth, it was his site that he closed down within days. Of course the remnants live on in search engines to confuse those who are uninformed about the nature of these distractions.

One site posted a scathing review of THRIVE that turned out to be based only on the trailer. The author hadn't even seen the movie. To their credit, when I addressed the irresponsibility of this act on their comment board, they watched the movie, invited me for an interview, apologized and publicly mended the breach.

Others discredited us for being one political party or another — truly it came from all sides equally because we are not politically affiliated. Others completely ignored the transition strategies that we outlined in the movie and on the website and accused us of being elitists who don't care about people because we do not believe increasing taxes is a sustainable solution.

Some have attacked me simply because one of my ancestors started a company that provided me with some inheritance. When challenged for being from a wealthy family, I have asked would-be debunkers, "If you won the lottery and suddenly became a millionaire, what would you do with the money to better our chances of thriving?" Some genuine inquirers have engaged the question creatively.

Another popular Internet radio host, who has acknowledged that he disseminates information for the government, launched into a completely false attack on me during a panel at a large conference. I was elsewhere giving my presentation, but someone who knows me was present and confronted him with facts while pointing out his divisive tone. To his credit, when I confronted him respectfully, but firmly, he apologized. I went on his show with the agreement I could address all the falsehoods. His listeners were very supportive and the incident was healed.

The lesson I have gained is that sometimes, when we have confronted the debunkers without malice or personal attack, but with clarity, we have often been able to raise the level of interaction.

We have been especially gratified and encouraged to see our own vast and diverse network responding intelligently, knowledgeably and, in most cases, respectfully, to mitigate or drive away cruel, uninformed attacks. At this point, there are very few trolls who spend much time commenting on our movie or movement in negative ways, because the facts have spoken for themselves, our reputations and integrity have held up to extreme scrutiny and our network is discerning and protective.

Finally

We each need to seek truth and live with integrity to be ultimately unassailable.

I learned from training and teaching the non-violent martial art of Aikido and from being a conflict resolutions facilitator in Silicon Valley that when confronted by an attacker, it is possible to respond non-violently by either DISENGAGING from the energy, or — if it is persistent and won't go away — by IMMOBILIZING it with exposure and truth.

Sometimes we must be pro-active and strategic to make sure the lie doesn't get perceived and repeated as truth. We can turn their own aggression back on the perpetrators — nonviolently — assuring that consequence clarifies their own choice of falsehood or truth, pain or love. This way we can model what we are after, while honoring the essential and courageous work that is called for to expose the true nature of the problems we face and cultivate the discerning open-mindedness that real solutions require.

THE SHOCK DOCTRINE: THE WAR ON ALL OF US

Gregor Bingham; Beams and Struts; via Critical Thinking

"I think for the first time in my life I can see how people just throw in the towel. I never understood that before. But it's hard. I guess I'm saying I can see the appeal of not bashing my head against a wall. But then you look at people who have made the decision to become cynical and disengaged. Really, just look at those people. Look where it leads, ha ha. They don't look relieved to me, they look self-loathing. I won't allow myself to go there."

—Naomi Klein, The Glasgow Herald

Introduction

The Shock Doctrine is a huge book. It's daunting. But a "developmental" urge inside my head said, There is shit going on out there and you need to know about it. Coercive things have revealed themselves in the world, so opaque, so raw, yet so fucked up. You should know: I grew up near Glasgow in the 70s and 80s, a place once infamously known as "No Mean City," so unlike my adopted home of Toronto. How things have changed.

The Shock Doctrine book coverThis response is not a book review. The Shock Doctrine is a brilliant journalistic work and should be read by everyone. There. That's my review. Instead, this is a conversation about the areas that the book doesn't have the space to cover. As a card-carrying Integralist, I love to attend to these other "things": reality in the four quadrants as best as I can see it. The Shock Doctrine lays out how the ruling elites of our time use systemic anti-personal, anti-social, and anti-cultural shock (coercion, assault, torture, murder, political propaganda, media manipulation, ownership of the courts and officers, and brazen and horrific injustice) as a way to destabilize all

quadrants, in many social spheres, across the world. This book is a solid, well-researched, and mandatory read, mandatory because what Klein might call a "war on all of us" is affecting our world completely. I also suggest that you read this book as a tactic: as the saying goes, "Keep your friends close, and your enemies closer." It may seem a bit melodramatic to say that there is a war against all of us, but there truly is one. And if you don't believe me, don't be a copperspot: read the book.

Klein's book provides sobering, unrelenting exposure to the "objective" reality of the current situation. However, she doesn't spend much time on the "subjective" experience of shock, that is to say that shock is a felt experience, mentally and physiologically. By the time you finish the first chapter, you may feel that subjective experience of shock in your mind and body, and the shock will continue to worm its way in. It's a bit like reading *The Road* by Cormac McCarthy, though the world that Klein describes is unfortunately not a work of fiction.

A Quick Quadrant Primer

The quadrants are a map that illustrates how we experience the world. This map splits the perspectives by which we view our 'experience' into four areas, quadrants. We already use quadrants, but we don't normally use them quite this way. We normally use them in grammatical perspectives: 1st Person, 2nd Person, 3rd Person, 3rd Person plural. That is to say, I, WE, IT, or IT'S.

So in Quadrant terms:

UL = Upper Left Quadrant = I = 1st person perspective: Individual/Subjective: My thoughts, feelings and beliefs. Experience and consciousness.

LL = Lower Left Quadrant = WE = 2nd person perspective: Collective/Subjective: Our rituals, shared sense of us, shared sense of community, traditions and norms. Culture and Relationships.

UR = Upper Right Quadrant = IT = 3rd person perspective: Individual/Objective: My body, my actions, that object, its actions. Body, behavior, objects, observable phenomena, actions. The things we do, or things objects do that can be observed.

LR = Lower Right Quadrant = ITS = 3rd person plural perspective: Collective/Objective: Systems, analysing, planning, designing, monitoring, procedures, regulations, infrastructure and nature.

The CIA develops the 'clean slate'

The Shock Doctrine opens with the story of a McGill University psychiatrist, Dr. Ewen Cameron, who in 1957 was awarded a large research grant through CIA intermediaries to conduct experiments on his patients in an attempt to create a "clean slate" in their minds. Cameron converted old horse stables behind his clinic into isolation rooms for his experiments. The program's purpose was to wipe out the developed cognitive awareness and memory of his patients, what Cameron called mind blanking, so that new behaviors could be installed. Under the guise of "new" treatments, the minds of these unsuspecting patients were overwhelmed by severe electroshock therapy, extreme sensory deprivation, chemically increased sleep duration (up to 65 days), and also intimidating isolation treatments, sometimes lasting 35 days at a time. Cameron stated that "the purpose of the experiments was to wear the patient down." The experiments resulted in permanent changes to the patients' ability to know where they were and who they were. What Cameron probably didn't realize was that his experiments marked the beginning (in the West, anyway) of scientifically establishing the best practices of torture — under the guise of understanding counter-torture techniques for downed US airmen. It is important to note that the survivors of this atrocity instigated a class-action lawsuit against the CIA in the 1980s, and they won. But the damage was done: the evidence of how best to torture was verified and incorporated into the Kubark, the CIA's Standard Operating Procedures manual for interrogation and torture. At this point in the book, we begin to see (in Quadrant terms) the process by which the UL/LL (the individuals internal sense of self, and the individuals internal sense of relationships to all others), can be manipulated by the UR's (observable actions, techniques and behaviours) nasty work, now codified into the LR (systems, administrations, protocols, doctrines) in the CIA's manual for torture.

Psychological warfare: making a clean slate of the masses

By overwhelming the human experience through shock, those in the elite began to have the tools and a keen understanding of how to fulfill their ambition to gather more power, by attacking nation states through the use of mass shock (military strikes, coups, economic sanctions, economic collapse, natural disasters, any event so extreme in nature that leaves an entire population disoriented and severely compromised in their normal activities and habits of living). These mass shocks are a

systematic nation-wide form of creating a "clean slate", replacing what was there with what the elite want to be there: more for them, less for us. Klein goes into extraordinary detail in the rest of the book, exposing how the systems and techniques of the shock doctrine have been applied in countries all over the world – Chile, Russia, Bolivia, Argentina, South Africa, Iraq and even the USA. Klein names the players, shows the connections, and exposes the collusion.

Interference. It's a word that literally means to strike another, with synonyms such as "meddle" and "tamper" along for the ride. The Shock Doctrine lays out the systematic national interference against humanity carried out by various people in power since the 1950s. But national interference is not new. It's simply evolved more since wars began. The common dichotomy seems to be the one that Martin Buber and lately Ian McGilchrist have focused on: the difference between two major human styles of relating, and their antipathy toward each other. These are the subjective (personal) I–Thou relationship and the objective (impersonal) I–It relationship. To put this more simply and more generally, in the I–Thou format one might connect to people easily on an interpersonal level, and in the I–It format one might be less skilled with humans relating, in some ways a little more 'autistic', less socially skilled, less personal, less emotionally attached to other human beings. McGilchrist's book *The Master and His Emissary* points to the eerily similar qualities of each hemisphere of the brain to each relating style and its ways of seeing the world. The left side is detailed, quick, and in the moment, while the right side sees the whole, the connections, and the hidden patterns. The left side Knows, the right side Believes. In addition, in the 1980s Jean Baudrillard developed arguments about the increasing power of the "object" over the "subject" in modern society, and the way in which protest and resistance were increasingly absorbed and turned into fuel by the symbolic "system" of capitalism: in Integral terms, the Right Quadrants (objective experience - quantifiable things, science, statistics, institutions, the letter of the law) subjugate and dismiss the Left Quadrants (subjective experience - feelings, beliefs, relationships, art, culture, the spirit of the law) . Simply put, one view sees people as individuals, the other as inanimate objects. One is happier with a clean slate, the other with a messy yet more human plate.

Readers of Harvard Professor Robert Kegan may note that this dominance of object over subject, in developmental terms, would essentially "stop" human development: no further learning or questioning occurs, as the system perceives that all problems have been solved. This is probably what Frances Fukuyama had in mind when he wrote *The End of History*. And it really nails how far a conflated and therefore simplistic ego will go in trying to understand and report on 'reality'. To see the quadrants in terms of both of these oppositional styles is to see the ongoing battle in our own heads, and in the heads of the elites.

The rise of the system of the individual

Vision without action is a daydream

Action without vision is a nightmare

–Japanese proverb

After the Great Depression, Franklin D. Roosevelt introduced The New Deal based on the specific economic principles of John Maynard Keynes, which introduced the welfare state and financial market regulation. As Klein states, "The market crash of 1929 had created an overwhelming consensus that laissez-faire had failed and that governments needed to intervene in the economy to redistribute wealth and regulate corporations."

Like any shadow, power and greed were merely suppressed during and after The New Deal. One man was working hard on another way to re-introduce laissez-faire capitalism. His name was Milton Friedman, and he was a crafty little bastard. He toiled away on his free-market policies in the 50s and 60s, and no one paid him much attention bar a few fervent supporters. He worked at the Chicago School of Economics, and his gang of players were known as The Chicago Boys. During those early years Friedman invented a closed economic system (in Integral terms, he omitted the LL, the space of relationship) by disengaging his system from the needs of the many (the 99%). Friedman believed in unfettered markets, deregulation, denationalization of crown corporations or any state run operation, no social programs, no socialized medicine. Roads, water, energy, hospitals, defense, everything would be owned by corporations – since in his mind corporations are more efficient. Efficient using humans as expendable resources and governments reduced to archaic and useless institutions. This made it much less complex and suited his ideology. In other words, a system that cleans the slate of all need for governments to care of their citizens. This is the exact thing that The New Deal was set up to prevent, but Friedman was out to dismantle it. He was successful, because along came Nixon.

Nixon and the United States government were beginning to see social democracy in Latin America

as a problem — even though these countries were considered "jewels of Keynesian economic success," but that isn't how Nixon felt about it. Instead, strategically that success was communicated to the rest of the world's citizens as the "rise of communism." Nixon and Kissinger cared only for US corporate interests in South America (Klein for example shows how ITT funneled \$2 million into the hands of an alternative right-wing political party in Chile), and this is when they got Friedman involved, in order to help re-engineer South American economic ideology in favor of US corporations. These countries were getting poorer and losing control of their economies, owing to US corporations siphoning off the wealth, these countries wanted a more holistic nationalized democratic economy. Nixon had a problem, and in Friedman he had a solution — a man who could clean the slate. As Klein puts it, "It was Nixon who would give the Chicago Boys and their professors something they had long dreamed of: a chance to prove that their capitalist utopia was more than a theory in a basement the Chilean coup — a shot at remaking a country from scratch. Democracy had been inhospitable to the Chicago Boys in Chile (under Allende); a dictatorship would prove an easier fit (Chile under Pinochet)."

Klein goes into detail about how Chile and its democratically elected President Salvador Allende, were targeted. The country was re-engineered with massive planning, co-opting a Chilean University Economics department and filling it with teachers and students trained at the Chicago School prior to the assassination of Allende. A corporate-backed totalitarian apparatus involving Pinochet and the Chilean military was built, targeting and torturing activists and the populace in a reign of terror. This is when the shock doctrine gets established as the ultimate power play in all quadrants to change the economic system from democratic to free market via dictatorship. In this way, the shock doctrine combines Ewen Cameron's techniques of individual shock with national economic and political shock to create the "clean slate." Friedman's economic system could only be engaged by using well-planned brutality and massive administration. The messiness of humanity is easier to order if you shock them into being supplicant and afraid. It is an efficient method, but obviously it's a theory in a vacuum, a closed system. It's an I-It relationship, where humans are object, a system of the individual. This is why it appeals so well to the ruling elites of our time: it turns the 'mass' into an 'it' with a single will, which must be subjugated for their own 'good', and they will do everything to keep it that way.

A Quadrant reading of the Shock Doctrine Order of Battle

UL: Destabilize sense of individual autonomy and economic potential, creating cataclysmic and sudden fear, fear that drops an individual's developmental altitude and Maslow level. Sense of meaning and purpose is replaced by security needs and fear of reprisal.

LL: Infiltrate economic commons ideals with free-market unfettered ideals by coercive means: assault, torture, and murder citizens, union organizers, leaders, politicians, activists, and elders opposed to unfettered Capitalist theories (the State's new ideology). Use less aggressive means in more democratic countries to divide and conquer the middle class, for example, converting a massive nationalized home and apartment rental market into private home ownership at bargain prices (UK in the mid 1980s), creating a "haves" and "have-nots", explicitly constructed civic polarity.

UR: Political manipulation of facts through media, acts of misinformation, deceit, propaganda, obstruction of facts. The acts and techniques in creating an utter smoke screen of their real purpose for national, corporate, and elite personal gain. All techniques have devised in advance.

LR: A massively planned (and over the decades, refined) economic, media, political and policing systems approach to all of the above using shock as the ripe field for action. A very nasty closed system used covertly to wrest the commons from the citizens of the world, for a new world order, without the people of the world really knowing what's being done to them.

The Shock Doctrine then takes apart what happened using this Order of Battle in Argentina, Bolivia, Poland, Russia, South Africa, Iraq, and the United States itself. Did you ever wonder why Nelson Mandela's vision never became an economic reality? In South Africa, the whites held onto total control of the banks, through background deals with the IMF and World Bank and saddled the new ANC government with loans, denationalization and austerity mandates. The ANC never gained access to the means to run their own economy. They were cheated. Ever wonder what really happened with Gorbachev? In Russia, free-market reforms were essentially strong-armed on the people of Russia by Milton Friedman and George W Bush. Jeffrey Sachs (a Friedman disciple), the IMF and the elites system, creating vast inequality, making millions of Russians unemployed, and allowing for the rise of crime and oligarchy. In the United States, the main proponents of the Iraq war and their cronies in the administration developed and invested in private companies to become security and construction consultancies and gave them tenders that would traditionally have gone to the nation of occupation's OWN citizenry. By comparison the Marshall Plan worked to great effect because the majority of reconstruction was purposefully put into the hands of the German people themselves, not 'contractors

for profit.' During the Bush/Cheney era, the US political administrators were creating personal profit directly from their own public legislation, now that's efficient corruption!

The most powerful sense I have of The Shock Doctrine is the relentless pursuit of free-market ideology and how brutally cruel and rank it is, how far it has infiltrated, and how we can feel its anti-LL focus. For those of us who have some rudimentary systems thinking capacity, a closed system, like Friedman's, is the most efficient system. An open system is much more complex and much more difficult to attend to. Thus Friedman's idea was based on false efficiency - without the LL (the complex human relational area), and of course was doomed to failure. Doomed because humanity may slumber when 'times are good', but historically humanity always rises against oppression, always. But what an enormous price has been paid because of our own ignorance, and what an incredible level of deceit the elite continue to engage against the majority of the human race. This has been the most strategically managed war in the history of the planet. Think about that for a moment. It is quite overwhelming. That's the "feel" of the shock doctrine.

The shock doctrine and the triune brain

How does the brain respond to propaganda? We can look at Fox News as an example of propaganda. News is objective and factual, like science, and on that basis people can make decisions based on "the facts." Propaganda is ideology disguised as fact, someone's opinion disguised as news. The most obvious recent propaganda of importance was the WMDs in Iraq. This was propaganda because it was not based on facts. Nevertheless, we were told that Iraq "had WMDs." But good critical thinking dissects the propaganda – for example look at these two statements: The tests are positive, you have cancer and we need to operate immediately OR The reports are inconclusive but I think you have cancer and we need to operate immediately. Propaganda plays on our fears and stokes our sympathetic nervous system, our fight, flight, and freeze response. Which Doctor do you want to give that scalpel to?

Depth psychologist Ginette Paris in her book Heartbreak conveys the triune nature of our brain in psychological and symbolic fashion, which is helpful in communicating what's going on in a mind under duress. In her book she describes the three main parts of the brain as actors on our personal inner stage. The reptilian brain, autonomous and reactive, is responsible for survival: fight, flight, freeze, fuck, and food. It's the crocodile in us that sheds no tears — it has no "emotional centre". The next brain sitting on top of the first is the limbic, or mammalian, brain. This is the social and emotional centre, as unconscious as the reptilian brain, and with the cognitive range of an average 18 month old. The limbic brain is therefore not logical and contains our fear-processing and memory equipment. These two particular systems are activated and traumatized by shock: think PTSD, death of a spouse, abuse, assault, etc. This area can be called the "puppy brain" because it cries for its mom and wags its tail with unconditional love. The puppy is highly emotionally and socially sensitive.

These are the two areas that the shock doctrine is actually attacking. This is why propaganda works on lots of people: the 'puppy' brain wants to fit in socially, be loved, and feel okay with others, and is also concerned about its security if everything is okay. What shock does is to enlarge the amygdala, a vital system in the puppy brain, with powerful consequences, making our triune brain go into overdrive with fear, stress, and anxiety. Unable to find peace or safety, we regress to simpler survival techniques and smaller worldviews – more puppy-like. This is the clean slate's aim, what the CIA developed and codified: we become slaves in our own mind. The third actor in our mind is the cortex, or the "wise human". This part's job is to calm the reactivity of the reptilian brain and to look after the puppy and care for it. This requires work. Most of you reading this know to which work I speak. It is extremely hard work, because the "wise human" is bombarded by the "puppy" and the "crocodile", and its job is to calm that cacophony, but when overwhelmed it cannot do so effectively. To be completely clear, we lose our objectivity when we're in shock. We cannot use our critical thinking skills and therefore cannot see when the wool is being pulled over our eyes, our options and solutions diminish with the effect of shock. Propaganda and the shock doctrine work on the "puppy" and the "crocodile", while we need to counteract that and engage our "wise human".

A call to arms

So where are we right now? What are the ramifications of the shock doctrine, and what can I make more coherent not only for myself, but for others? Time is running out. The planet is in an ecological death spiral, and the elite only care about themselves, not their legacy or responsibility. Considering the recent Occupy Integral dialogue, there is the prime question of waking up and growing up that informs the Integral perspective. I would suggest that to understand the "enemy of the people" (the dismissal of the LL by the system of the individual) is to understand the scale and scope of the powers that be, and

the consciousness, shadow, and worldview that creates this power. The shock doctrine's tools and strategies have been honed by a professional body that in some form will have to be "broken up" and "woken up," this will no doubt come as a shock to them too, and as I suspect the elite will fight wholeheartedly against it. What I see is that we now have a choice between radical disruptive activism and/or incremental reforms. The problem with disruptive activism is the engagement of a further "shock" to the already-shocked populace, and the problem with incremental reform is that it creates a slow-moving target for the 1% to strategize against, given that they have the reins of the lawmakers and capital flow in hand. Gradualism, as it's called, is not a strategy of war, unless the enemy is in a castle that can be surrounded and cut off from resupply. We do not have the luxury of infinite time. Climate change is a huge long-term economic, social, and political catastrophe waiting to happen. We're stuck with activism, so what should we be active in? Everything we can be. And so, during this time of activism there will be a "transcend and include" process that will evolve. Development of consciousness, our evolutionary process of adaptation, works amazingly well and intuitively with challenge IF we can apply the 'wise human' and not become a clean slate. Are you feeling that challenge yet?

We are indeed at war, we need to take the red pill and wake people up one by one, group by group, audience by audience, in the way our audience needs to hear it, as soon as possible, by as many of us as possible. Bring the 'wise human' back to them with care and attention, strategically, tactically, and with the sense of integrity of a larger purpose. This is in some ways the fight of our lives. But at this level of complexity there is much to attend to, and there's no model for attending to it. But...

As C.G. Jung said, Your vision will become clear only when you can look into your own heart. Who looks outside dreams, who looks inside awakes.

We can, if we're brave, see our preferences and blind spots, as well as those of others. The blind spot of Friedman et al. is their lack of capacity in the LL, their lack of empathy. Friedman's intellect and theories could not be matched and countered in the LR owing to the preponderance of people with similar mindsets in power. It remains that way. The groundswell of youth around the world that can see the lack of care and statesmanship of their elders will eventually counterbalance the power level, but only if there is a LR manifesto to embody real principles that contain all quadrants working interdependently. As a checklist, it would look something like this:

Upper Left: Are we allowing for individuality of meaning and expression? Uniqueness.

Lower Left: Are we allowing for the care of all humans? Interdependence.

Upper Right: Are we engaging in practices, behaviors, and actions that engage the capacity for these UL/LL necessities? Truly integrally objective about the subjective.

Lower Right: Are we building strong systems of government to enact these principles through participation at all levels of society in every corner of the world, creating the moral imperative to engage in life-serving systems for hundreds of years to come and building a psychologically and developmentally sustaining civilization?

Of course, keen observers may have noticed that these questions orient from my own LL perspective. In the discussion of economics, this is indeed where it also belongs. Economics is not a science but has been reimagined as such by Friedman and the elite. They have used the tools of shock. This book is a vivisection of their methods. It's an exposé of the system that has spawned Augusto Pinochet, Margaret Thatcher, Dick Cheney, Donald Rumsfeld, Karl Rove, and of course Fox News and all those other smart people in the room. These things are not mutually exclusive. These people have found a space in the psyche and jammed a wedge in to break down the development of the rest of us. Anger is always a good way into the warrior spirit, and I think we are all getting pretty angry. That's encouraging. Anger from an Integral crowd would be a blessing.

Engaged Activism

1. Get mindful. Meditate the hell out of your amygdala. Reduce your fear.
2. Get pumped. Face some dragons. See how limitless your pain threshold can be.
3. Get joy. The most unselfish purpose in the world will give you endorphins.
4. Get language. Stop being abstract, right now. Speak with your balls/ovaries. People listen.
5. Get wise. Tune-up your BS detector. Make it detect a closed system a mile off.
6. Get simple. Powerful ideas come from crazy ones simplified.
7. Speak out. The system of the individual abhors a moral compass.
8. Don't panic. Get a towel, and never throw it in. We are hitchhikers in our galaxy.
9. Help everyone do the same. Share what you know.

EU COMMISSION WANTS TO WIPE OUT CITIZENS' INVOLVEMENT IN TTIP AND CETA

Stop TTIP; via Critical Thinking

European Citizens' Initiative against TTIP rejected / Alliance announces resistance

The Stop-TTIP Alliance, initiator of a European Citizens' Initiative (ECI) against the TTIP and CETA international trade & investment agreements, today announced its opposition to the European Commission's decision to block the ECI.

"Now the battle really begins," said Michael Efler, contact person of the ECI, which currently represents almost 230 organizations from 21 EU countries. "The rejection of the ECI only confirms the Commission's strategy to exclude citizens and parliaments from the TTIP and CETA negotiations. Instead of paying attention to citizens, it is just lobbyists that are being listened to."

In its rejection of the ECI, the European Commission claims that the negotiating mandates on TTIP and CETA are not legal acts but internal preparatory acts between EU institutions and therefore not contestable via an ECI.

"The Commission's view that only acts with an effect on third parties are permissible for an ECI is obviously a legal error. The negotiating mandate of the Commission is a formal decision of the Council and therefore a legal act. If the Commission's legal opinion had any substance, then in plain English this would mean that Europe's population is excluded from participation in the development of any kind of international agreements – information that is as frightening as it is scandalous," according to Efler.

What's more, the Commission claims that it cannot make negative ratification proposals and therefore cannot comply with the ECI demand not to conclude the CETA and TTIP negotiations. "Contrariwise, this means that citizens can only applaud international negotiations carried out by the Commission, but not criticize them," said Efler.

Prior to the official submission of the ECI, the Stop-TTIP Alliance commissioned legal counsel, and based on its recommendation is now considering taking legal action against the Commission's decision, including through the European Court of Justice.

"Instead of responding to concerns about a trade policy devoid of people, the Commission has refused a healthy debate," said Efler. "From a citizen's perspective this looks very much like a despotic act alienating people throughout Europe. It is grist to the mill of the Eurosceptics."

Against this background the Alliance also calls upon the new President of the Commission, Jean-Claude Juncker, to correct this anti-democratic decision and to honour his promise to ensure democracy and transparency. "Apparently the Commission is afraid of this ECI, which has the potential to become the most successful citizens' initiative so far," said Efler. "If the Brussels bureaucracy thinks that this is how it can stop people's protests against TTIP and CETA, then it is mistaken. We will not allow the Commission to tie our hands."

The EU Commission's justification for rejection: <http://ec.europa.eu/citizens-initiative/public/initiatives/non-registered/details/2041>

Legal opinion by Prof. Dr. Bernhard Kempen: <http://stop-ttip.org/legal-opinion/>

Contact: Media Team Stop TTIP, press@stop-ttip.org, Tel.: 0049 (0)30 420 823 79, Mobile: +49 178/816 3017

I AM A LIBERTARIAN

Laurence M. Vance; LewRockwell.com

(This item demonstrates the best and the worst of the 'Libertarian' creed. The idea of being left to our own devices, of individualism, of non-violence, smallness, live-and-let-live and opposition to conformity and group-think is immediately attractive. That said, there arise two problems this credo cannot resolve. The first concerns a notion of unfettered economic liberty which will inevitably result in institutions of such scale as to become abusive and repressive. The second is the notion that all taxation is bad and that

there is therefore to be no public function whatever. Sean Gabb is a Libertarian who has recently advocated a divorce between Libertarians of this variety and corporatism. At least that gets us along the road to resolving the first conundrum - Ed)

I am a libertarian. I am not Democrat or Republican. I am not liberal or conservative. I am not left or right. I am not moderate or progressive. I am not a Libertarian. I am not a fusionist. I am not a constitutionalist.

I am a libertarian. I am not thin or thick. I am not brutalist or humanitarian. I am not holist or solipsist. I am not moralist or consequentialist. I am not open or closed. I am not a modal, cosmopolitan, cultural, regime, sophisticated, or Beltway libertarian. I do not have a bleeding heart. I am not a neo, second wave, or millennial libertarian. I am a plain old libertarian, one who needs no labels, issues no caveats, and makes no apologies.

I am a libertarian. Libertarianism is a political philosophy concerned with the permissible use of force or violence. It is not a political philosophy that says limited government is the best kind of government. It is not a political philosophy that is socially liberal and economically conservative. It is not a political philosophy that says government is less efficient than the private sector. It is not a political philosophy that says freedom can be achieved by promoting some government policies over others. It is not a political philosophy that is low-tax liberalism. Libertarianism is not the absence of racism, sexism, homophobia, xenophobia, nationalism, nativism, classism, authoritarianism, patriarchy, inequality, or hierarchy. Libertarianism is not diversity or activism. Libertarianism is not egalitarianism. Libertarianism is not toleration or respect. Libertarianism is not a social attitude, lifestyle, or aesthetic sensibility.

I am a libertarian. I subscribe to the non-aggression principle that says, in the words of Murray Rothbard: "The only proper role of violence is to defend person and property against violence, that any use of violence that goes beyond such just defense is itself aggressive, unjust, and criminal. Libertarianism, therefore, is a theory which states that everyone should be free of violent invasion, should be free to do as he sees fit except invade the person or property of another." I am concerned with actions; I am not concerned with thoughts: I am concerned only with the negative consequences of thoughts. I believe that the non-aggression principle extends to government. Libertarians should therefore oppose or otherwise seek to limit the domestic and foreign meddling and intervention of governments, which are the greatest violators of the non-aggression principle.

I am a libertarian. I believe in the golden rule. I believe in live and let live. I believe that a person should be free to do anything he wants, as long as his conduct is peaceful. I believe that vices are not crimes.

I am a libertarian. Our enemy is the state. Our enemy is not religion, corporations, institutions, foundations, or organizations. These only have power to do us harm because of their connection with the state. And since war is the health of the state, the state's military, wars, and foreign interventions must be opposed root and branch.

I am a libertarian. I believe in laissez faire. Anyone should be free to engage in any economic activity without license, permission, prohibition, or interference from the state. The government should not intervene in the economy in any way. Free trade agreements, educational vouchers, privatizing Social Security, etc., are not the least bit libertarian ideas.

I am a libertarian. The best government is no government. That government that governs least is the next best government. Government, as Voltaire said, at its best state is a necessary evil and at its worst state is an intolerable one. The best thing any government could do would be to simply leave us alone.

I am a libertarian. Taxation is government theft. The government doesn't have a claim to a certain percentage of one's income. The tax code doesn't need to be simplified, shortened, fairer, or less intrusive. The tax rates don't need to be made lower, flatter, fairer, equal, or less progressive. The income tax doesn't need more or larger deductions, loopholes, shelters, credits, or exemptions. The whole rotten system needs to be abolished. People have the right to keep what they earn and decide for themselves what to do with their money: spend it, waste it, squander it, donate it, bequeath it, hoard it, invest it, burn it, gamble it.

I am a libertarian. I am not a libertine. I am not a hedonist. I am not a moral relativist. I am not a devotee of some alternative lifestyle. I am not a revolutionary. I am not a nihilist. I neither wish to associate nor aggress against those who are. I believe in the absolute freedom of association and

discrimination.

I am a libertarian.

Laurence M. Vance [send him mail] writes from central Florida. He is the author of King James, His Bible, and Its Translators, The Revolution that Wasn't, The War on Drugs Is a War on Freedom, and Social Insecurity. His latest books are War, Christianity, and the State: Essays on the Follies of Christian Militarism and War, Empire, and the Military: Essays on the Follies of War and U.S. Foreign Policy. Visit his website.

MICROCHIPS WILL BE IMPLANTED INTO HEALTHY PEOPLE SOONER THAN YOU THINK

Dina Spector; Business Insider Australia

In March 2009, British researcher Mark Gasson had a chip injected under the skin of his hand. The chip, a slightly more advanced version of the tags used to track pets, turned Gasson into a walking swipe-card. With a wave of his wrist, he could open security doors at the University of Reading laboratory, where his experiment was being conducted, and he could unlock his cell phone just by cradling it.

A year later, Gasson infected his own implant with a computer virus, one that he could pass on to other computer systems if the building's networks were programmed to read his chip. As Gasson breezed around the the workplace, spreading the virus and corrupting computer systems, certain areas of the building became inaccessible to his colleagues.

At the time of the experiment, theoretical physicist and author of "The Future of the Mind" Michio Kaku told FOX News that demonstrating the ability to spread infection was an "important point" because "we're going to have more chips in our body and clothing."

Thousands already have implanted medical devices, including pacemakers, which are inserted into the chest to treat abnormal heart rhythms, and cochlear implants, which help deaf people to hear.

But the future, Gasson says, is going to focus on implantable technology for healthy people. Part of the reason is that we continually look for ways to make our lives easier. The question is whether we're willing accept both the unintended and unknown consequences that come with giving up partial control of our bodies to technology.

Human vs. Machine

Implantable microchips provide a more intimate connection with technology than that of any other portable electronic device, like a cell phone or iPod, because the tag becomes a direct part of us when it's inserted into our body. Implants "have the potential to change the very essence of what it is to be human," Gasson said at a 2012 TEDX Talk.

The susceptibility of human microchips to cyber attacks is one worry, but Gasson wanted to explore issues beyond common concerns related to privacy and security. That's why he conducted the experiment in two stages: A surgeon initially inserted a clean computer chip into his hand, and the computer virus was unleashed a little over a year later. During that time, Gasson and his team were particularly interested in studying the psychological implications of implanted devices. "There's an underlying feeling that [having an implantable device] is an alien phenomenon," said Gasson, a cybernetics expert. The only way to properly explore the psychological aspect was to have the device himself, he said.

What is an RFID implant?

RFID stands for radio frequency identification. The chip doesn't have its own battery, powered instead by a reader that pulls information out of the chip. The reader gets the chip's unique ID

number and then cross references it to a database. RFID chips are found in lots of things we use every day, including credit cards.

Similar, if not creepier, technology is currently at work in things like Disney World's MagicBand, which tracks a wearer's location within the park and connects to that person's accounts, according to a recent Medium post. These technologies have been useful not just for the company but for park guests — it makes their experience seamless.

These technologies are also being used for payment services: Some people use Google Wallet and Tap-To-Pay services to pay using their phones at stores and in cabs, instead of whipping out their wallet or carrying all their cards with them. The Hilton just recently announced a feature to replace keycards at its hotels. Guests will use an app to access their room.

As these technologies get more advanced and their uses get more varied, why would we be carrying a phone around when we could do all these things with a swipe of the hand?

Why an implant?

The chip implanted in Gasson's thumb, which is roughly the shape and size of a grain of rice, functions "like a tiny computer." It can store information like a small USB memory stick.

The chip appears as an extremely small, though visible, bump on the side of his finger. "It does freak people out quite a bit," Gasson said. "But it doesn't look grotesque." Unsurprisingly, Gasson says the chip did not immediately feel like part of his body. But the distinction faded over time as he used the chip more and more. "Unlike keys or a phone, you don't have to think about carrying this type of device, and then you seamlessly use it and forget about it." Gasson has no plans to remove the chip.

Gasson's research in human microchips parallels the work of a growing community of people, so-called biohackers, who view microchipping as the next form of human evolution. Hacking tends to have a negative connotation, but this new group of technology enthusiasts offers a different meaning. In their world, the goal of hacking is not to inflict harm, but to transform something from its original purpose into something more useful.

The human body has limitations, but biohackers are constantly thinking of how those limitations can be overcome — how life can be made better or more convenient (like removing the need to carry around keys all the time) through the use of technology.

And the desire for these technologies is there. The company Dangerous Things has developed the first DIY kit for implantable devices, which back in December raised more than \$US30,000 from its \$US8,000 Indiegogo goal. The package comes with everything you need to insert the chip yourself. The chip allows you to interact with other devices by waving your hand or entering a room.

The primary use is to be able to program a tag with a url or information you want to share. I use my implants to get into my house, I use it for access control solutions, to get into my back door every day after I get home. I use it get access to my car; I can unlock my car and get in. I use it to log into my computer. I also use it to share contact details with people.

Challenges Ahead

The Dangerous Things kit isn't the first commercially available RFID microchip — a company called VeriChip actually got FDA approval to market an implant back in 2004. The implant was designed to carry a unique ID number that hospitals could use to pull up a patient's medical records if he or she were unconscious. But the chip was discontinued in 2010 over privacy concerns.

The failure of VeriChip, later rebranded as PositiveID, highlights the legal issues of microchipping people. Since 2009, at least nine US states have either passed laws or proposed bills to prohibit the enforced implantation of chips. Some states, including California, have enacted an "age of consent" clause, which allows parents to override the right of children under a certain age to decide if they want to be implanted. This inevitably kicks off the discussion of whether it's ethically sound to microchip one's child at birth. Supporters love the idea because they say it would prevent

kidnappings. Critics worry that if a chip gave parents the ability to track their kids, then predators could, too.

But these ethical questions are not yet urgent. The technology is not yet useful or developed enough for everyone to have it, or even want it.

To start, there are several user-related misconceptions about RFID implants, namely the idea that these chips can be used to track one's location every second of the day. This is not yet possible, because today's RFID chips do not contain GPS trackers. Someone could track the computer systems that were accessed throughout the day (in the same way a credit card company can track purchases and where they were made), but the technology doesn't provide real-time location data.

Other people worry about chips being used to covertly access unauthorised systems. As with other smart cards, which are programmed to be read by specific systems, someone with an RFID implant can't just go about gaining entry to any old computer system. It takes a specialist reader to access a certain device.

"Anything that's useful is going to happen in the next 10 to 20 years," Gasson said, referring to a time in which we may start merging devices created by tech enthusiasts and medical-type technology to do things like store or download memories from the brain.

SURVEILLANCE CAMERAS WILL SOON BE READING OUR LIPS

MassPrivatel via Activist Post

A Jordanian scientist has created an automated lip-reading system that can decipher speech with an average success rate of 76 per cent. The findings, in conjunction with recent advances in the fields of computer vision, pattern recognition, and signal processing, suggest that computers will soon be able to read lips accurately enough to raise questions about privacy and security.

Researcher Ahmad Hassanat from Mu'tah University in Jordan says that automated lip-reading has improved enormously in recent years, but there are still challenges in making software that can accurately connect visemes with phonemes. He says human lip readers perform best when they have an idea about the context of a conversation and a good grasp of grammar, idioms and common turns of phrase. Making a computer program that can accurately recognise these will take time, Hassanat says.

Technology that can read lips has a broad range of potential uses in human-computer interaction (a discipline that helps design new input systems to make it easier for people to control their devices), speaker recognition, sign language, and video surveillance.

Hassanat proposes that lip-reading technology could be used to help protect data by creating a "visual password", whereby users speak a string of words into their device's camera to help verify their identity online. However, the idea of using lip-reading technology in surveillance "raises a whole set of privacy-related issues", Technology Review suggests. "For example, it may be that videos of conversations without sound are impossible to interpret now but may be easy to interpret in future. How might politicians, business leaders and popular figures fair under that kind of future analysis?"

Hassanat concedes that it will be many years yet before visual speech recognition software is able to interpret speech with significantly greater accuracy than at present.

<http://www.theweek.co.uk/technology/60421/lip-reading-computer-raises-privacy-fears>

DHS/police are using surveillance cameras & Stingray surveillance systems to spy on Americans everywhere:

Congress and the White House need to include surveillance technologies in their inquiries. The same money that funds MRAPs and night vision goggles also funds intelligence gathering at the local level. DHS's Homeland Security Grant Program directly funds fusion centers.

A DHS grant announcement emphasized that funding fusion centers and integrating them nationally is a high priority. And DHS Urban Area Security Initiative money funds events like Urban Shield, a 4 day long event that featured "preparedness" exercises as well as a marketplace of military and surveillance technology.

Another possible avenue for review is the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board (PCLOB). PCLOB asked for public comments on its proposed mid- and long-term agenda, which includes an examination of the "functional standards" used for Suspicious Activity Reporting (SAR)," a program

coordinated through fusion centers. EFF, along with others, submitted comments encouraging PCLOB to take a close look more generally at fusion centers. The comments emphasized that accountability for fusion centers, like all the programs reviewed in the Senate hearing, is a major problem:

The bidirectional flow of data in fusion centers, as well as interagency cooperation and jurisdictional blurriness, makes accountability and a clear understanding of the applicability of laws and regulations difficult... In the midst of this ambiguous and opaque environment, fusion centers have access to a staggering amount of data including the FBI's eGuardian database and a variety of other federal databases. They may even potentially have access to unminimized NSA data. And as data gathered under the problematic SAR standards is entered into these databases, the lines of responsibility for unconstitutional invasions of privacy and civil liberties become ever more unclear.

5 BIG BROTHER TECHNOLOGIES FOR TRACKING AND SURVEILLING CHILDREN

Terrence Newton; Activist Post

Without much of a mentionable public debate about the implementation of police state surveillance and tracking technologies in our society, we are quickly moving into an era where personal liberty and privacy do not exist.

For those of us who grew up without being monitored and tracked everywhere we went, watching the high-tech infrastructure of a super-funded police state emerge is both alarming and intolerable. For today's children, however, ubiquitous surveillance and zero-expectation of privacy is the standard in a culture dependent on smartphones, Wi-Fi, constant connectivity and intrusive government.

Ostensibly for safety purposes, we are seeing a host of child tracking and monitoring devices being rolled out for use by parents, schools and other public institutions. Here are some of the main technologies that are available and in use today to track, monitor, surveil, watch, record, listen, protect and spy on children.

1. Radio-frequency Identification (RFID) Tracking Devices

RFID technology transmits radio frequency signals from a chip embedded in something the child wears or carries with them, perhaps an ID badge worn on a lanyard, or a bracelet that fits on the wrist like a watch. The radio signal is received by an installed system that plots and records the location of the chip/student at any moment.

At present, this technology is being used in many school districts in the US and worldwide to track student movements on campus and on school buses. The Disney corporation recently invested billions in bringing this technology into their theme parks.

In 2012, high school Andrea Hernandez from Texas made national headlines for being the only student at her school to publicly refuse to wear an RFID badge when the school unveiled a pilot program requiring all students to be tagged at all times while at school. Her case went to court where she lost; however, the pilot program was eventually abandoned because it proved to be ineffective and costly.

2. Global Positioning System (GPS), Wi-Fi and Cell Tower Tracking Wristbands and Software Apps for Parents

To track and communicate with their children, parents can purchase colorful, fun-looking wristbands that can use GPS, cell phone, and Wi-Fi networks to send data to software applications on the parents' handheld devices and smartphones. The parents can watch on screen in real time the relative location of their child, sending audible warning tones or messages to the child's wristband if

they stray too far.

Some, like the visionaries at Cisco Systems, are working toward a future where the tracking signal from a child's wristband can alert parents, schools and even police if the child strays off course on his way home, perhaps making an unauthorized stop at a candy store. The wristband would also be able to turn on the television when the child is sensed approaching, or even emit a loud beeping alarm if the child is sensed putting a hand into an unauthorized cookie jar.

3. Software and Handheld Apps to Monitor and Record Online Activity and Phone Conversations

Today's increasing connectivity is giving children greater access to the World Wide Web, where mature and adult content is easily found. As a means of monitoring a child's online activity to ensure that they are not over-exposing themselves or growing up too fast on the Internet, many tracking and monitoring software and apps are available to parents and institutions. Parents can monitor any websites visited, who they talk to, and even their activity on social media sites like Facebook.

4. Biometrics – Fingerprint and Iris Scans

Biometrics uses scanned high-resolution images of distinct, measurable features of a person to use as an identity or method of access. In some cases schools are using digital fingerprinting and iris scans to provide security and convenience for students.

In the United Kingdom, other European nations and some areas in Asia, it is becoming commonplace for to fingerprint for admission into school. Some schools in the US use a fingerprint scanning system for payment in the school cafeteria, requiring kids to be finger-printed to buy lunch.

In 2013, a Florida public school came under fire for implementing a pilot program that scanned the irises of some school children before notifying their parents, causing a small outrage. School administrators said that the program was being tested to help track students to and from school so that school officials could tell worried parents why their kids were late getting home.

5. Visually Monitoring Children Through Surveillance Cameras and Webcams

Surveillance cameras are already a normal feature in many schools, and are seen as a requirement as protection from liability. Most laptop computers have a built-in video camera, and there are a number of available consumer grade baby monitoring cameras available. In some cases webcams are accessed by schools as a means to locate missing or stolen computers.

In 2010, a Philadelphia area public system was forced to settle 2 lawsuits for \$610,000 after student Blake Robbins claimed the district used a school-issued laptop computer to spy on him in his home, taking intimate photos of him in his bedroom.

evidence unearthed in the case showed that he was photographed 400 times in a two-week period, sometimes as he slept in his bedroom, according to his lawyer, Mark Haltzman. [Huffington Post]

The case was settled, and the FBI investigated the district to determine whether charges should be brought against the district, but they declined to prosecute anyone, stating that they had not found evidence that a crime was committed. Nevertheless, the technology is already deployed in some public schools with questionable oversight.

Conclusion

Is it healthy for children to be treated in this way? Should they be given the opportunity to consent to surveillance before being subjected to it? Is this truly necessary for safety, or this is just a manifestation of growing societal fear and paranoia?

Depending on your perspective, surveilling kids may or may not be a good thing, but no one

yet knows what the long-term effects will be of acclimating a generation of children to the idea of being constantly tracked and monitored in school, at play, at home and online. Furthermore, no one knows how these technologies will be abused by predators.

But perhaps most importantly, why have we not created a society that is safe for children?

Sources:

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/07/18/northside-microchip-tracking_n_3617481.html

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2259654/San-Antonio-student-Andrea-Hernandez-loses-court-battle-refusing-wear-ID-tag-GPS-tracker.html>

http://www.theguardian.com/technology/2014/jan/10/child-tracking-wristbands-dystopian-future-ces-2014?CMP=ema_565

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-2618645/No-lost-children-Smart-wristband-lets-parents-track-kids-using-GPS-makes-calls.html>

http://www.bigbrotherwatch.org.uk/files/reports/Biometrics_final.pdf

<http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/libertycentral/2010/jul/16/fingerprinted-child-school>

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Biometrics_in_schools

<http://www.activistpost.com/2012/10/student-rfid-chipping-conditions.html>

<http://entertainment.time.com/2014/01/02/disney-nsa-style-magic-bands-theme-park/>

<http://www.myfilip.com/about.aspx>

<http://www.rfidjournal.com/articles/view?10971/>

Terence Newton is a staff writer for WakingTimes.com, where this first appeared. He is interested primarily with issues related to science, the human mind, and human consciousness. Read more at

<http://www.activistpost.com/2014/08/5-big-brother-technologies-for-tracking.html#ukLjOcuFwpyvc&JG.99>

MIND CONTROL SCIENTISTS TURN OFF EMOTIONAL LINK TO MEMORIES

Nicholas West; Activist Post

It is becoming increasingly clear that advancements in genetics and neuroscience are leading toward direct methods of mind control . An array of hi-tech methods have been announced - magnetic manipulation via "neural dust," high-powered lasers , and using light beamed from outside the skull. As a result, scientists are making bold claims that they can alter the brain even to the extent of turning off consciousness altogether.

But it is memory research that might be among the most troubling. As I've previously stated in other articles, our memories help us form our identity: who we are relative to where we have been. Positive or negative lessons from the past can be integrated into our present decisions, thus enabling us to form sound strategies and behaviors that can aid us in our quest for personal evolution. But what if we never knew what memories were real or false? What if our entire narrative was changed by having our life's events restructured ? Or what if there were memories that were traumatic enough to be buried as a mechanism of sanity preservation, only to be brought back to us in a lab?

We've already witnessed research into the erasure of memories , the implantation of false memories, and triggering memories of fear when none previously existed. MIT researchers are now claiming to have found the specific brain switch that links emotions to memory. Once again, the temptation of helping those who have experienced trauma might open doors to very unethical applications.

I've highlighted and commented on some of the key areas in the MIT press release below which, to me, illustrate a clear potential for erasing many of the memories that we often associate with building strength of character, or could aid in our future development - morally, ethically, and spiritually. This research threatens to create a race of happy zombies devoid of natural emotion if a proper ethical framework is not established. In fact, much like the happy pills of Big Pharma, MIT admits that these

findings could lead not only to direct intervention via manipulation of brain cells through light, but a new class of drugs to treat Post Traumatic Stress Disorder.

However, notice the very first example: bullying. I'll admit that this can be stressful and perhaps traumatic for some, but where would one draw the line? Anyone who receives an insult or hurt feelings just takes a pill or laser blasts the memory away? It's also a path toward literally erasing history. How about victims of torture? Sure, who wants to remember that, but what if scientists could erase that memory, thus eliminating future testimony against those committing such atrocities?

Most memories have some kind of emotion associated with them: Recalling the week you just spent at the beach probably makes you feel happy, while reflecting on being bullied provokes more negative feelings. A new study from MIT neuroscientists reveals the brain circuit that controls how memories become linked with positive or negative emotions. Furthermore, the researchers found that they could reverse the emotional association of specific memories by manipulating brain cells with optogenetics — a technique that uses light to control neuron activity.

The findings, described in the Aug. 27 issue of *Nature*, demonstrated that a neuronal circuit connecting the hippocampus and the amygdala plays a critical role in associating emotion with memory. This circuit could offer a target for new drugs to help treat conditions such as post-traumatic stress disorder, the researchers say. "In the future, one may be able to develop methods that help people to remember positive memories more strongly than negative ones," says Susumu Tonegawa, the Picower Professor of Biology and Neuroscience, director of the RIKEN-MIT Center for Neural Circuit Genetics at MIT's Picower Institute for Learning and Memory, and senior author of the paper. The paper's lead authors are Roger Redondo, a Howard Hughes Medical Institute postdoc at MIT, and Joshua Kim, a graduate student in MIT's Department of Biology.

Shifting memories

Memories are made of many elements, which are stored in different parts of the brain. A memory's context, including information about the location where the event took place, is stored in cells of the hippocampus, while emotions linked to that memory are found in the amygdala.

Previous research has shown that many aspects of memory, including emotional associations, are malleable. Psychotherapists have taken advantage of this to help patients suffering from depression and post-traumatic stress disorder, but the neural circuitry underlying such malleability is not known.

In this study, the researchers set out to explore that malleability with an experimental technique they recently devised that allows them to tag neurons that encode a specific memory, or engram. To achieve this, they label hippocampal cells that are turned on during memory formation with a light-sensitive protein called channelrhodopsin. From that point on, any time those cells are activated with light, the mice recall the memory encoded by that group of cells.

Last year, Tonegawa's lab used this technique to implant, or "incept," false memories in mice by reactivating engrams while the mice were undergoing a different experience. In the new study, the researchers wanted to investigate how the context of a memory becomes linked to a particular emotion. First, they used their engram-labeling protocol to tag neurons associated with either a rewarding experience (for male mice, socializing with a female mouse) or an unpleasant experience (a mild electrical shock). In this first set of experiments, the researchers labeled memory cells in a part of the hippocampus called the dentate gyrus.

Two days later, the mice were placed into a large rectangular arena. For three minutes, the researchers recorded which half of the arena the mice naturally preferred. Then, for mice that had received the fear conditioning, the researchers stimulated the labeled cells in the dentate gyrus with light whenever the mice went into the preferred side. The mice soon began avoiding that area, showing that the reactivation of the fear memory had been successful.

The reward memory could also be reactivated (think social engineering - N.W.): For mice that were reward-conditioned, the researchers stimulated them with light whenever they went into the less-preferred side, and they soon began to spend more time there, recalling the pleasant memory.

A couple of days later, the researchers tried to reverse the mice's emotional responses. For male mice that had originally received the fear conditioning, they activated the memory cells involved in the fear memory with light for 12 minutes while the mice spent time with female mice. For mice that had initially received the reward conditioning, memory cells were activated while they received mild electric shocks (trauma-based mind control - N.W.).

Next, the researchers again put the mice in the large two-zone arena. This time, the mice that had originally been conditioned with fear and had avoided the side of the chamber where their hippocampal cells were activated by the laser now began to spend more time in that side when their hippocampal cells were activated, showing that a pleasant association had replaced the fearful one. This reversal also took place in mice that went from reward to fear conditioning.

Altered connections

The researchers then performed the same set of experiments but labeled memory cells in the basolateral amygdala, a region involved in processing emotions. This time, they could not induce a switch by reactivating those cells — the mice continued to behave as they had been conditioned when the memory cells were first labeled.

This suggests that emotional associations, also called valences, are encoded somewhere in the neural circuitry that connects the dentate gyrus to the amygdala, the researchers say. A fearful experience strengthens the connections between the hippocampal engram and fear-encoding cells in the amygdala, but that connection can be weakened later on as new connections are formed between the hippocampus and amygdala cells that encode positive associations.

“That plasticity of the connection between the hippocampus and the amygdala plays a crucial role in the switching of the valence of the memory,” Tonegawa says.

These results indicate that while dentate gyrus cells are neutral with respect to emotion, individual amygdala cells are precommitted to encode fear or reward memory. The researchers are now trying to discover molecular signatures of these two types of amygdala cells. They are also investigating whether reactivating pleasant memories has any effect on depression, in hopes of identifying new targets for drugs to treat depression and post-traumatic stress disorder.

David Anderson, a professor of biology at the California Institute of Technology, says the study makes an important contribution to neuroscientists’ fundamental understanding of the brain and also has potential implications for treating mental illness. (What is mental illness? We've heard increasing discussion about how conspiracy theories and independent thinking - Oppositional Defiant Disorder - might need treatment.)

“This is a tour de force of modern molecular-biology-based methods for analyzing processes, such as learning and memory, at the neural-circuitry level. It’s one of the most sophisticated studies of this type that I’ve seen,” he says.

The research was funded by the RIKEN Brain Science Institute, Howard Hughes Medical Institute, and the JPB Foundation.

Read more at <http://www.activistpost.com/2014/08/mind-control-scientists-turn-off.html#qe6uxr5Li8DmwDMX.99>

FINANCIAL IMPLOSION: GLOBAL DERIVATIVES MARKET AT \$1,200 TRILLION DOLLARS ... 20 TIMES THE WORLD ECONOMY

Washington's Blog; Global Research

Top Derivatives Expert Estimates Size of the Global Derivatives Market at \$1,200 Trillion Dollars ... 20 Times Larger than the Global Economy

Everyone paying attention knows that the size of the derivatives market dwarfs the global economy. But how big is it really?

For years, there have been rumors that there is over a quadrillion – one thousand trillion – dollars in notional value of outstanding derivatives. But no one really knew. Even though the Bank of International Settlements regularly publishes tables showing the amounts of different types of

derivatives, some of the categories are ambiguous, and so it has been hard to get a good handle on what's really out there.

For example, one blogger wrote last year:

Estimates of the notional value of the worldwide derivatives market go from \$600 trillion all the way up to \$1.5 quadrillion. Smart guys like bond trader Jeffrey Gundlach said last year that we've got a quadrillion dollar derivative overhang, the government hasn't done anything to fix the basic problems in our economy, and so we'll have another crash.

But I've now found an estimate from a top derivatives expert who confirms the claim. Specifically, Paul Wilmott – who has written numerous books on the subject – estimated the number last year at \$1.2 quadrillion. To put that in perspective, the world's annual gross domestic product is between \$50 trillion and \$60 trillion.

A Clear and Present Danger to the World Economy

The size of the derivatives market is a huge threat to the world economy.

One of the biggest risks to the world's financial health is the \$1.2 quadrillion derivatives market. It's complex, it's unregulated, and it ought to be of concern to world leaders

How big is the risk to the world economy from these derivatives? According to Wilmott, it's impossible to know unless you understand the details of the derivatives contracts. But since they're unregulated and likely to remain so, it is hard to gauge the risk. But Wilmott gives an example of an over-the-counter "customized" derivative that could be very risky indeed, and could also put its practitioners in a position of what he called "moral hazard."

Another kind of market conduct that makes markets volatile is what Wilmott calls positive and negative feedback loops. These relatively bland-sounding terms mask some really scary behavior for investors who are not clued into it. Wilmott argues that a positive feedback loop contributed to the 22.6% crash in the Dow back in October 1987.

Bloomberg reported in May:

Mark Mobius, executive chairman of Templeton Asset Management's emerging markets group, said another financial crisis is inevitable because the causes of the previous one haven't been resolved. "There is definitely going to be another financial crisis around the corner because we haven't solved any of the things that caused the previous crisis," Mobius said ... "Are the derivatives regulated? No. Are you still getting growth in derivatives? Yes."

The global financial crisis three years ago was caused in part by the proliferation of derivative products tied to U.S. home loans that ceased performing, triggering hundreds of billions of dollars in writedowns and leading to the collapse of Lehman Brothers Holdings Inc. in September 2008. Credit default swaps were largely responsible for bringing down Bear Stearns, AIG (and see this), WaMu and other mammoth corporations.

And unexpected changes in interest rates could cause a major bloodbath in interest rate derivatives. And, no, there have not been any reforms or attempts to rein in derivatives, and the Dodd-Frank financial legislation was really just a p.r. stunt which didn't really change anything.

But the big banks and their minions claim that the huge amounts of derivatives themselves is unimportant because these are only "notional" values, and – after netting – the notional values are deflated to much more modest numbers. As [Tyler] Durden – who has a solid background in derivatives – notes:

*At this point the economist PhD readers will scream: "this is total BS – after all you have bilateral netting which eliminates net bank exposure almost entirely." True: that is precisely what the OCC will say too. As the chart below shows, according to the chief regulator of the derivative space in Q2 netting benefits amounted to an almost record 90.8% of gross exposure, so while seemingly massive, those XXX trillion numbers are really quite, quite small... Right?
... Wrong. The problem with bilateral netting is that it is based on one massively flawed assumption,*

namely that in an orderly collapse all derivative contracts will be honored by the issuing bank (in this case the company that has sold the protection, and which the buyer of protection hopes will offset the protection it in turn has sold). The best example of how the flaw behind bilateral netting almost destroyed the system is AIG: the insurance company was hours away from making trillions of derivative contracts worthless if it were to implode, leaving all those who had bought protection from the firm worthless, a contingency only Goldman hedged by buying protection on AIG. And while the argument can further be extended that in bankruptcy a perfectly netted bankrupt entity would make someone else whole on claims they have written, this is not true, as the bankrupt estate will pursue 100 cent recovery on its claims even under Chapter 11, while claims the estate had written end up as General Unsecured Claims which as Lehman has demonstrated will collect 20 cents on the dollar if they are lucky.

The point of this detour being that if any of these four banks fails, the repercussions would be disastrous. And no, Frank Dodd's bank "resolution" provision would do absolutely nothing to prevent an epic systemic collapse.

POSTIVE MONEY BULLETIN

Ben Dyson; Postive Money Team

In May 2015 the UK will elect a new government. Politicians will debate the problems of rising household debt, unaffordable house prices, and the growing gap between the richest and everyone else. To fix those issues, we have to get democratic control over the power to create money. But only 1 out of 10 Members of Parliament even knows that 97% of our money is created by the same banks that caused the financial crisis.

We need to make sure that by May 2015, most Members of Parliament understand this crucial fact. Over the next year we'll be campaigning hard to ensure that MPs understand the need to change the way that money is created. Can you donate monthly to help us step up the pressure on MPs?

THE PROGRESS SO FAR:

In the last 3 months, we have commissioned and published the results of an official poll of MPs that shows how little MPs know about money creation within the Houses of Parliament. We've created a website to make it easy for you to write to your MP and educate them on the issue (over 1,000 people have emailed already). We've built a database to keep track of all this communication with MPs, so we know who supports the campaign and can target our efforts on the right people. And two weeks ago we put out a call for volunteer Political Coordinators - more than 80 people have volunteered so far!

But we want to do so much more over the next 8 months! Please give now to kick-start the next stage of our political campaign.

WHAT WE NEED TO DO NEXT:

We need to step up our efforts and impact in the run up to the May 2015 general election. To do this, we plan to:

Offer support and training to our Political Coordinators, to ensure they feel prepared when they visit their MP and can encourage others to do so.

Research current and prospective MPs, to find out who already understands the issues and may be willing to campaign for fundamental monetary reform.

Support local groups to plan and host events that they invite local MPs along to. This will provide opportunities for local groups to meet their MP face-to-face and have an extended conversation.

Analyse MPs' responses, so we can effectively counter objections and concerns, respond clearly, and win the debate.

Get MPs to sign up for a parliamentary debate on monetary reform closer to the election

Keep the pressure on after May 2015. The first six months after an election can be a critical time to approach new MPs, while they're still open to new ideas. We want to make sure we make the most of this time.

Without understanding money, the people that we elect can't possibly deal with big social and

economic issues that we're facing today. It's down to us to educate the 7 out of 10 MPs who still think that only the government is allowed to create money. That's why this campaign is so essential in the next 12 months.

JOIN 450 MEMBERS WHO KEEP POSITIVE MONEY ALIVE AND KICKING:

You'll be joining the 450 supporters who keep Positive Money going through regular donations of an average of £10 each month. All our success so far has been thanks to this support. Please join the 450 people and set up a monthly donation.

We can't do it without your help.

Thank you for all your support...

The professional polling results are shocking.

Seven out of ten MPs believe that only the government has the power to create money. In reality - as Positive Money members know - the government now only creates coins and notes, which make up just 3% of all the money in the economy. The other 97% of money exists as bank deposits – the electronic numbers in your bank account. This type of money is created by high-street banks – not by the government.

Only 1 in 10 MPs accurately understood that banks create new money every time they make a loan, and that money is destroyed whenever individuals or businesses repay loans.

In other words, close to 9 out of 10 MPs are unaware of the fact that the power to create money has shifted from the state to the same banks that caused the financial crisis.

CAN YOU EDUCATE YOUR MP?

MPs have no chance of understanding the house price bubble or the build up in personal debt unless they know these basic facts about money. So it's crucial that between now and the next general election, we get MPs to understand how banks create money and why it matters.

Please email your MP now with the poll results asking them if they understand how money is created. We've prepared a simple template so you can email them with just a few clicks.

**RUNNYMEDE GAZETTE EDITED BY;- FRANK TAYLOR, 2 CHURCH VIEW, ST GILES TERRACE.
CHETTON, BRIDGNORTH, SHROPSHIRE, WV16 6UG; Tel; (01746) 789326
frankinshropshire@hotmail.co.uk**