



How Access To Information Can Make Or Break The Elite Stranglehold

Access to Information Drove the Original American Revolution and the Final Phase now in Progress.

Elizabethan philosopher and scientist, Viscount Francis Bacon's (1561-1626) ideas are considered to be the early basis of modern science. Perhaps his most well-known comment, "*Knowledge is power,*" is truer today than when he said it 400 years ago. For almost all of that time, the power elite controlled the information and thereby controlled the people. I spoke before about the current political situation in the US as being the final phase of the American revolution. For the second time in US history the people found a way to overcome the control of information. This ability marked the start and promoted the success of the Revolution. Now, it is marking the final phase and guaranteeing the continuance of the Revolution. However, as Benjamin Franklin said when asked if in negotiations they had settled for a republic or a democracy, he replied a republic, if you can keep it. People now have access to

information, if they can keep it.

Over the 400 years, various attempts by the people to overthrow the power elite failed. The French Revolution, as Macron is learning, changed nothing. The degree of the failure is given by the fact that Giscard D'Estaing, became President because the Giscard family purchased the D'Estaing portion from an extinct noble family. The words 'de' or 'd'' in a French name is a sign of aristocratic heritage. Few were more arrogant and lorded it over the people than Charles de Gaulle. The same is true in England. Oliver Cromwell executed Charles I in 1649, but his son Charles II was returned to the throne just 11 years later in 1660. Marx never thought a revolution would occur in Russia. He was right, Putin is just another Tsar. Similarly, in China, the current President with his change of the rules to allow him a lifelong Presidency is just another Emperor.

People, especially people like John F Kennedy, acclaim the Magna Carta as a revolutionary document in the advance of freedom of the people. It wasn't. It was a small group of power elite who controlled most of the land telling the King he was not treating them properly. The people back on their estates were serfs, essentially slaves to the property owner. Most of those lands are still controlled by a handful of people. A [2010 story in the Daily Mail](#) says,

More than a third of Britain's land is still in the hands of a tiny group of aristocrats, according to the most extensive ownership survey in nearly 140 years.

The private ownership of land was the second leg of American exceptionalism. It is the only country in the world formed to break that lock on land. It is the only country in the world that has free speech as its first amendment. I grew up in England knowing that the only place in that country where you could criticize the government was at Hyde Park corner. As a teenager, I heard a joke about the Corner that resonates even more with me in today's environment.

A man is standing on his soap box promoting a revolution. He makes a string of promises prefaced by the words, "Come the revolution...".

Eventually, the promises become less significant and he says, *“Come the revolution we will all wear shirts and ties!”* A voice from the back of the crowd shouts out, *“But I don’t want to wear a shirt and tie.”* The speaker replies, *“Come the revolution you will do what you are bloody-well told.”*

The challenge for the American revolutionaries was to get their message out to the people without access to the newspapers. The British government controlled the newspapers because they were owned by the landed aristocrats. The power of the newspapers was well known at the time of the American Revolution. William Cowper’s poem *“Progress of error”* published in 1782 explains,

*How shall I speak of thee or thy power address,
Thou God of our idolatry, the Press?
By thee religion, liberty and laws
Exert their influence and advance their cause;
By thee worse plagues than Pharaoh’s land befell,
Diffused, make earth the vestibule of Hell;
Thou fountain, at which drink the good and wise;
Thou ever-bubbling spring of endless lies;
Like Eden’s dead probationary tree,
Knowledge of good and evil is from thee.*

The point is the power elite controlled the press, then and now. So, how did the American revolutionaries get around it and get important information to the people? They needed to buoy the spirits of the people and impart important information without arousing a reaction from the British. The answer is through Pamphlets. [Robert Parkinson](#) wrote,

“The pamphlets channeled and focused colonial resistance by framing dissent via appeals to history and political experience.”

I believe Benjamin Franklin is one of the most remarkable people who ever lived. His range of interests and expertise coupled with his ability to communicate with people at all levels and abilities is beyond equal. His major unique talent was to see events and anticipate their significance. He had a wider view but never with his eyes over the horizon as is the trait of fools. For example, as the first Postmaster General and familiar

with the Gulf Stream and its impact on sailing times. He ordered the captains of ships carrying the mail to Europe to take water temperature readings, so they could go with the Stream going east and avoid it going west. This took five days off sailing times. It is no surprise then that Franklin developed the pamphlet and proved its value in bypassing the authorities. In a 1923 presentation, [William Renwick](#) spoke about Franklin's early use of Pamphlets in the 1750s giving examples of his "*dexterity and ability as a pamphleteer.*" Twenty years later three significant pamphlets among many circulated in favor of the revolution were, Thomas Jefferson's, *A Summary View of the Rights of British Americans* (Williamsburg, 1774); Thomas Paine's, *Common Sense* (Philadelphia, 1776); and John Adams', *Thoughts on Government* (Philadelphia, 1776).

Since the American Revolution, the Press, with the direct support and control of the power elite, reasserted itself. We are now at the point explained by A. J. Liebling that "*Freedom of the Press is guaranteed only to those who own one.*" In the period since the Revolution, the Press has expanded into the Media, but all the controls and condemnations of Cowper's poem apply. The Press and the Media were now in control by determining who would win and who would lose. They decide who would win and who would lose. In archaic terms, they became the king-makers and the king-breakers. This means that anyone running for political office, especially the presidency, needed media support or a way of bypassing them.

There is no doubt that Hillary Clinton was totally convinced that the media would guarantee her election. It was a certainty with them on her side. She was so convinced that even when warning signs appeared she ignored them. In fact, the media didn't let her down. They did everything they could to get her elected, but it failed. Why?

The Trump election was unique in several ways. He was not a politician. He overcame an attitude explained 2000 years ago by graffiti at Pompei that said when talking about leaders, if we get rid of this bunch of scoundrels, we just get another group of scoundrels. It meant that throughout history about thirty percent of the people never vote. Trump apparently realized that politicians had become professionals only

interested in perpetuating their career. The result of this professionalism was a movement from the center as about 20% of the Democrats moved to the left and 20% of the Republicans to the right. This polarization is occurring in other countries such as the UK and France among others.

Trump benefitted from all these issues. He ignored the 20% on the left and right, correctly assessing they would never listen. He focussed on the 60% of the US in the middle, politically, and geographically. The swamp tried to deflect him by labeling him a populist. That charge tells you everything that is wrong in the swamp. Trump was doing the unthinkable, listening to the majority of the people and acting for them. Swamp-denzens know what is good for the people. It is impossible for this non-politician and the people to know what is good for them? Even [Mitch McConnell](#) expressed this view.

He brought a high percentage of those, approximately 30%, who never vote out to vote. However, he could never have done this without the ability to bypass the media and speak directly to the people. The modern equivalent of the Pamphlet was the Internet that allowed the final phase of the Revolution.

Trump could not have succeeded if the people did not have another access to information. The Internet, blogging, blog radio, eyewitness reports, and video clips brought information that provided a different perspective from that in the media. Through social media, people were able to discuss issues and hear viewpoints of fellow citizens as never before. It became a free market of ideas and expression. The professional politicians and media, collectively and correctly identified by Trump as the Swamp, considered most of Trump's actions and behavior 'Un-presidential.' However, his use of Twitter annoyed them more than anything else, because it bypassed their control of information.

Trump understood the power of Twitter but was likely unaware of Cowper's poem. Nonetheless, he echoed his words 236 years later. When asked to stop using Twitter he replied, I will stop using it when you stop telling lies. His charge of 'fake news' translates to Cowper's "*never-ending spring of endless lies.*"

A measure of the threat of the Internet is given by how totalitarian governments control it. The threat is evidenced by Obama's creation of net neutrality. The term is a typical meaningless phrase created by politicians to give an issue gravitas but is not threatening. Like all these liberal plans it is done using a 'save the people from capitalists' core. He claimed people were being exploited by Internet Providers (IP) and he was going to use the power of government to protect the poor, ignorant people. Trump kept another campaign promise by cancelling the program.

The recent Congressional hearings with [Mark Zuckerberg](#) were a façade of Democrats and Republicans blaming Facebook for bias so they could argue that government controls were necessary. In those hearings, both parties underscored their swamp membership. Only we, as professional politicians, know what needs to be done and it cannot include free and unfettered access to all information.

The battle over the internet and knowledge is the same as the battle over free speech. It is impossible to limit in any way because the minute you do, somebody is deciding what other people can say. Bacon was right, knowledge is power, but it is the sole property of the people and now they have it, they must never let go.



The U.S. Army Is Turning to Robot Soldiers For Automated Warfare

Technocrats will always choose a technological solution to any problem, in this case, how to kill the enemy. These weapons should be banned before they are fully armed and equipped with AI. The Army will spend over \$1 billion on robots in the next few years. □ TN Editor

From the spears hurled by Romans to the missiles launched by fighter pilots, the weapons humans use to kill each other have always been subject to improvement. Militaries seek to make each one ever-more lethal and, in doing so, better protect the soldier who wields it. But in the next evolution of combat, the U.S. Army is heading down a path that may lead humans off the battlefield entirely.

Over the next few years, the Pentagon is poised to spend almost \$1 billion for a range of robots designed to complement combat troops. Beyond scouting and explosives disposal, these new machines will sniff out hazardous chemicals or other agents, perform complex reconnaissance and even carry a soldier's gear.

"Within five years, I have no doubt there will be robots in every Army formation," said Bryan McVeigh, the Army's project manager for force

protection. He touted a record 800 robots fielded over the past 18 months. “We’re going from talking about robots to actually building and fielding programs,” he said. “This is an exciting time to be working on robots with the Army.”

But that’s just the beginning.

The Pentagon has split its robot platforms into light, medium and heavy categories. In April, the Army awarded a \$429.1 million contract to two Massachusetts companies, Endeavor Robotics of Chelmsford and Waltham-based QinetiQ North America, for small bots weighing fewer than 25 pounds. This spring, Endeavor also landed [two contracts](#) worth \$34 million from the Marine Corps for small and midsized robots.

In October, the Army awarded Endeavor \$158.5 million for a class of more than 1,200 medium robots, called the Man-Transportable Robotic System, Increment II, weighing less than 165 pounds. The MTRS robot, designed to detect explosives as well as chemical, biological, radioactive and nuclear threats, is scheduled to enter service by late summer 2019. The Army plans to determine its needs for a larger, heavier class of robot later this year.

“It’s a recognition that ground robots can do a lot more, and there’s a lot of capabilities that can and should be exploited,” said Sean Bielat, Endeavor’s chief executive officer. Specifically, he points to “the dull, the dirty and the dangerous” infantry tasks as those best suited to robotics.

During combat operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, the Defense Department amassed an inventory of more than 7,000 robots, with much of the hardware designed to neutralize improvised explosive devices (IEDs). Military brass were trying to quickly solve a vexing problem that was killing troops, but the acquisition strategy led to a motley assortment of devices that trade journal Defense News last year called “a [petting zoo](#) of various ground robots.”

This approach also meant that each “pet” was essentially a one-off device used for a single task. The Army’s current approach is to field more inter-operable robots with a common chassis, allowing different sensors and payloads to be attached, along with standardized controllers

for various platforms, said McVeigh, a retired Army colonel.

[Read full story here...](#)



Technocracy At Google: How Personal Data Enables Total Social Engineering

The unvarnished content of this story should spark panic across America. It probably won't, but it *should*.

I have written many times that Technocracy is far more advanced than anyone realizes. This is likened to going to a doctor for some minor health issue and being told that you have stage 4 cancer, that it has spread throughout your body and you have only 6 weeks to live. You didn't *feel* sick, but that is no measure of how sick you really are.

Technocracy at Google is running rampant. It has gained immense power to change behavior through access to personal data, and declares to use that data to engineer all of society and conform it to its own image.

Before proceeding, you must take 9 minutes to listen to ***Selfish Ledger***, an internal Google video, originally produced in 2016, that was leaked to The Verge:

This is Technocracy. It is not a political system, but a system of societal control in order to manage *all* resources and *all* consumption. It is *NOT* new. Eighty years ago in 1938, The Technocrat magazine defined it like this:

Technocracy is the science of social engineering, the scientific operation of the entire social mechanism to produce and distribute goods and services to the entire population...

What is unclear? This is *exactly* what Google is doing, and they are almost done doing it. While Google may be the mothership, don't forget that other giant data hoarding companies like Facebook are on exactly the same path.

When challenged about this video, Google responded to The Verge,

"We understand if this is disturbing — it is designed to be. This is a thought-experiment by the Design team from years ago that uses a technique known as 'speculative design' to explore uncomfortable ideas and concepts in order to provoke discussion and debate. It's not related to any current or future products."

This lame deflection is a flashback to how the Trilateral Commission responded to criticism from this writer and co-writer Antony C. Sutton in the late 1970s. Back then they were "just discussing options and policies" and had no intent of specifically implementing any one thing. Right. Now we are overrun with and nearly destroyed by the very globalization that they were discussing.

The former CEO of Google and Executive Chairman of its parent,

Alphabet is Eric Schmidt. Although he resigned from Alphabet in January 2018, he continues as a member of its board of directors. Most significantly, Schmidt is also a current member of the Trilateral Commission!

Selfish Ledger raises many rhetorical questions:

“User-centered design principles have dominated the world of computing for many decades, but what if we looked at things a little differently? What if the ledger could be given a volition or purpose rather than simply acting as a historical reference? What if we focused on creating a richer ledger by introducing more sources of information? What if we thought of ourselves not as the owners of this information, but as custodians, transient carriers, or caretakers?”

Don't think for one minute that Google's view of the world is shared beyond its own twisted culture, because it is not. However, considering the massive power over data that they have already accumulated, they are in a perfect position to cram it down our throat.

Americans largely rejected Technocracy in the 1940s, but back then, Technocrats had no 'upper hand' to overcome citizen resistance. Today's resurgence of Technocracy, with its overwhelming data domination, changes everything.

As this data domination grows by the hour, there will be a day when Technocracy declares itself the winner and then it will be too late.



How Facebook And Google Provide Massive Funding To Journalism Around The World

Google and Facebook have committed over \$500 million to various journalism programs around the world. There will be no discussion about what fake news is, but only that it disagrees with Technocracy and societal engineering. This gives these two companies almost total control in controlling public opinion and behavior. □ TN Editor

In March, Google announced with much fanfare [the launch of](#) the Google News Initiative, a \$300 million program aimed at “building a strong future for journalism,” as the company put it. That came on top of the previous Digital News Initiative, which was set up by Google in 2015 and included a \$170 million innovation fund aimed at the European media industry.

Facebook, too, has been funneling money into journalism projects, including the [News Integrity Initiative](#)—a \$14 million investment in a project run by City University of New York—and the Facebook Journalism Project, a [wide-ranging venture](#) the company says is designed

to help media companies develop new storytelling tools and ways of promoting news literacy.

Taken together, Facebook and Google have now committed more than half a billion dollars to various journalistic programs and media partnerships over the past three years, not including the money spent internally on developing media-focused products like Facebook's Instant Articles and Google's competing AMP mobile project. The result: These mega-platforms are now two of the largest funders of journalism in the world.

The irony is hard to miss. The dismantling of the traditional advertising model—largely at the hands of the social networks, which have siphoned away the majority of industry ad revenue—has left many media companies and journalistic institutions in desperate need of a lifeline. Google and Facebook, meanwhile, are happy to oblige, flush with cash from their ongoing dominance of the digital ad market.

The result is a somewhat dysfunctional alliance. People in the media business (including some on the receiving end of the cash) see the tech donations as guilt money, something journalism deserves because Google and Facebook wrecked their business. The tech giants, meanwhile, are desperate for some good PR and maybe even a few friends in a journalistic community that—especially now—can seem openly antagonistic.

Given that tangled backstory, it's no surprise the funding issue is contentious. Should media companies really be involved in rehabbing the images of two of the wealthiest companies on earth, especially when they are fundamentally competitors? Yet, given the financial state of journalism, wouldn't it be irresponsible not to take the funds?



The reality is that even if the money achieves some good, and even if

there are no strings attached (which both companies insist is the case), accepting the largesse of Facebook and Google inevitably pulls the media even further into their orbit. It may not have a direct effect on what someone writes about or how a topic is covered, but it will undoubtedly have a long-term effect on the media and journalism. Are the tradeoffs worth it?

Even some of the people who benefit from the money say they are torn between the desire for badly needed funding that can be put towards a positive purpose, and the sinking feeling that they are being drawn deeper into a relationship with a tech company that has a huge amount of power, and may ultimately use it in ways that are antithetical to journalism. In other words, they worry about being pawns in a PR game.

A former Google staffer who worked on the company's media programs says even he feels conflicted about the practice. While many of the funded projects are worthwhile, he says, the result is that "a bunch of well-meaning people with good intentions get the money, and slowly they get sucked into a corporate machine that doesn't have their best interests at heart."

University of Virginia media studies professor Siva Vaidhyanathan says both Facebook and Google may care about journalism and want it to be healthy, "but they want that to happen on their own terms, and they want that to happen within an ecosystem dominated by these two companies. The British Empire wanted trains in Kenya and India to run well, too. So their concerns are sincere, but the effect is more often than not a deeper immersion in and dependence on these platforms."

Vaidhyanathan sees an inherent conflict in accepting money from Facebook or Google because "these are two companies that directly compete with major publications for advertising revenues. So you're basically going into a partnership with a competitor—a competitor that has a significant competitive advantage in terms of price, in terms of scale, in terms of technological expertise. So is that a good business decision? Increasingly, journalistic institutions are feeding the beasts that are starving them."

According to [one estimate](#) by a media research firm, Google and Facebook will account for close to 85 percent of the global digital ad market this year and will take most of the growth in that market—meaning other players will be forced to shrink. That includes many of the traditional publishers and media outlets who now work with them.

[Read full story here...](#)



Facebook Partners with Globalist Atlantic Council To Interfere In Elections Around The World

The Atlantic Council has been a Trilateral Commission dominated think-tank since 1973. Its current board of directors is still riddled with members of the Commission, including Brent Scowcroft (Chairman Emeritus), Henry Kissinger, Paula Dobriansky and Joseph Nye. Facebook's alignment with the Council is right in line with the Trilateral Commission's goal of implementing Technocracy throughout the world. □

TN Editor

Facebook has partnered with the Atlantic Council, whose [members](#) include arch-globalists like Henry Kissinger and Dina Powell, to “protect free and fair elections around the world.”

Facebook [announced](#) earlier today that the Atlantic Council will provide it with “real-time insights and updates on emerging threats and disinformation campaigns from around the world.”

In other words, Facebook will trust a globalist think-tank to distinguish “disinformation” from the spin and sloganeering that characterize virtually all democratic elections.

Facebook says it will also rely on monitoring teams from the Atlantic Council during elections:

Facebook will also use the Atlantic Council’s Digital Research Unit Monitoring Missions during elections and other highly sensitive moments. This will allow us to focus on a particular geographic area — monitoring for misinformation and foreign interference and also working to help educate citizens as well as civil society.

The thought that a globalist think tank might be biased against certain politicians around the world, and that this might affect their opinion of what counts as “misinformation,” does not seem to have occurred to Facebook.

To cite just one example, the Atlantic Council has [branded](#) Hungary’s anti-globalist Prime Minister, Viktor Orbán, as a “far-right autocrat” who runs a “quasi-authoritarian regime that bears little semblance to the democracy that allowed its accession to the EU and NATO”.

The Council described Orbán’s recent [landslide](#) victory in the Hungarian elections as a “rallying cry for action” for “western democracies” to “protect and defend ... democratic values.”

[Read full story here...](#)