

A text dump of right wing videos on Ted K

Contents

Tucker Carlson	4
Tucker Carlson Today: Andrew Yang on leaving the Democratic Party, forming his own October 6, 2021	4
Tucker quotes Ted K for simple concept	19
Tucker Carlson – The Roseanne Barr Podcast #24	23
Tucker’s Franco admiration	33
Tucker views Ted K as prophetic	54
Rosanne’s experience hermitting	56
Tucker Carlson - Part Of The Problem	59
Count Dankula	83
Absolute Mad Lads - Ted Kaczynski	83
Uncle Ted Has Passed Away	101
Nick Fuentes	104
The Nick Fuentes twitter space that got him re-banned	104
Pessimism and Ted Kaczynski	112
”Israel did 9/11 and we love Hitler”	115
Sneako vs. The Serfs	129
How I Learned to Love the Unabomber	129
Sneako PRAISES The Unabomber in BIZARRE Hate-Filled Video	132
Preview	132
Video Begins	132
Styxhexenhammer	150
Ted Kaczynski, Expert on Leftists and Technology, Dead at 81	150
Keith Woods vs. JF Gariepy	151
The Life of Ted Kaczynski by JF	151
Transcript	151
Links used in the show	170
The Myth Of Right Populism by Keith	171
A Review of Ted K by JF	185
Transcript	185

Links used in the show	202
Why was Ted Kaczynski one of the most insightful thinkers by JF	203
The Philosophy of Ted Kaczynski by Keith	206
Kaczynski’s Arguments	210
Keith Woods Misunderstands Kaczynski by JF	234
Links used in the show	256
The Old Glory Club	259
Ted Kaczynski: A Political Obituary	259
The Old Glory Club discuss Ted Kaczynski	261
Mad at the Internet	277
Destiny and Null talk about Kiwifarms Drama	277
Highlights	277
Conversation starts	277
Livestream (June 13th, 2023)	312
Ted Kaczynski	343
Outro	345
Comments	358
The System’s Neatest Trick	359
Transcript	359
Audiobook	360
Outro	367
Comments	367
The Jolly Heretic	369
Kaczynski’s Co-Author Dr David Skrbina Tells Us About Technological Slavery	369
Joseph Bronski	399
A Critique of the Unabomber’s Ideology	399
References	404

Tucker Carlson

Tucker Carlson Today: Andrew Yang on leaving the Democratic Party, forming his own October 6, 2021

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=I_4mh0YZqnk

Tucker: Welcome to Tucker Carlson today. You probably hadn't heard of Andrew Yang 4 years ago, and then out of nowhere he announced for president of the United States and became remarkably popular. For a time, he didn't win. But he went on to run for mayor of New York City. He didn't win there either, but he also he made his splash in the process. And the one thing we learned. About Andrew Yang, as often as we disagreed with him was. This was one of the very few people running for office who was interesting, who has his own ideas, who's thinking about the world and what it ought to look like going forward he's put a lot of those thoughts in a new book, it's called Forward notes on the future of our democracy. We are happy to have Andrew Yang in our studio today. Andrew. Yang, thanks so much for coming on.

Yang: Oh, thanks for having me, Tucker, it's great to be.

Tucker: Here. So you just came off this. Kind of let me start the beginning this whirlwind where you announced for president and for the mayor of our biggest city. And so you just had this incredibly intense series of experiences. You're probably. Yeah. So how did so typically?

Yang: It's been a strange few years. Yes, I have.

Tucker: People announced for President United States after a long career of chicken dinners, you know, ascending the ladder in some sort of linear way, office to office, to office, to office. Joe Biden did this. You did not do this. Why did you decide you wanted to run for President? And what gave you the impression that you could win?

Yang: I worked in technology and entrepreneurship for over a decade, both as an executive and founder and then as the CEO of a nonprofit. I'd started venture for America, and that work took me to Michigan, Ohio, Alabama, Louisiana, and Missouri, and I was convinced that we were undergoing the greatest economic transformation in our country's history, and it was upending. The labor market and our political class really either didn't understand it or didn't want anything to do with it. So I decided to run for President because I wanted to advance what I saw as real solutions, like Universal basic income, that would help millions of Americans transition. It was an act of service on my part. I thought I could make a contribution.

Tucker: So what's interesting is you and you came on our show in the spring of 2019 to talk about that. And I there was a big overlap between your views on this and the views that we were espousing on the show at the time about, like, what do you do?

Yang: When the robots can freaking do. A lot of the work that people.

Tucker: That's exactly what exactly? Right. So then you run for President, you run for mayor, which is a different thing, cause you're running a city, right if you win.

Unknown: Yeah, yeah, totally.

Tucker: But that message, which was really about economics and the value of Labor. Versus the value of capital kind of receded like nobody really wanted to talk about that. I've noticed why?

Yang: Oh, it didn't fit the political narratives or the media narratives of the day. And and it certainly didn't seem very ideological. And that's one of the things that I learned, Tucker, is that I'm a business guy and economics guy, a technology guy. And so to me, it's straightforward. You have you lose 4 million manufacturing jobs to a combination of technology and and globalization that's going to devastate. Many communities, that's not ideological, that's just practical, right? That that's reality. But for whatever reason, please.

Tucker: And and that's an undisputed fact, right?

Yang: Yeah, it's undisputed fact. I mean you. You could try and parse out exactly why the 4 million manufacturing jobs were eliminated. You could say it was more globalization or more automation, but it's indisputable and and the ratio you know it is in some ways secondary. But it turns out that a lot of people weren't that deeply interested in facts and figures. Around economic. Which was a mild surprise to me. I kind of thought that was. What we were supposed to. Be talking about but we did animate a number of primary voters in Iowa and New Hampshire and around the country, and I'm really grateful to them because I think we've helped our country understand what's happening to us.

Tucker: There is no national conversation about this. Still with with respect and despite I think your best efforts, I don't agree with all of your solutions. But I love. The fact that you're trying to force that conversation on the country because it's a central one. Why do you think we keep evading that debate?

Yang: You're right that we're still not paying enough attention to this, but with COVID a lot of the arguments I was making essentially materialized in front of our eyes where you saw. Tyson Foods bringing robots and their their chicken processing plants. You saw Walmart bring in robot janitors and this human contact that people were arguing saying ohh, people love being around other people. Now obviously that arguments out the window because businesses will say not only does make business sense for us to automate your jobs, but it's also supposedly. You know better for for health. And when I was running early on Tucker, I had a very hard time convincing people that the robots are taking our jobs, that AI is going to to eliminate millions of

jobs. But now a majority of Americans agree with that argument. So we're still not talking about it enough, but more people are waking up to the fact that it's happening.

Tucker: So why are we allowing this? I mean, it sounds like by you're telling and I agree with this, that COVID accelerated trends already in progress, yes, particularly toward automation. Yep. And we all agree that that is going to hurt people. So why do we stand back passively and allow this to progress?

Yang: Right now we have a system where big companies are mostly concerned with their bottom line, and so if they can eliminate lots of jobs and save money by adopting automation. Right now, we're essentially cheerleading them, clapping, and saying great is going to be good for your stock price. And a lot of corporate leaders are in these unfortunate positions where they kind of have to dissemble about the impact on their workers. They'll say don't worry about it. We're going to train these workers for something else. And then it was like, OK, like, you know, I guess it'll be fine when really, if you sit with these leaders, they'll be like, yeah, maybe we'll be able to find something new for them to do. Maybe we. So when you ask why are we allowing it right now, we have a system of corporate incentives that lead very strongly towards trying to do things as efficiently as possible. And then the other side of the Ledger, I'm not sure what the incentive is.

Tucker: Give us a sense of the scale of this. So the problems that you described 2017, 1819 have gotten much worse, much more profound and. That way. If this continues, say for the next 10 years, how many unemployed, useless, directionless working age Americans are we looking at?

Yang: Here it's definitely in the millions and possibly even into the 10s of millions. And if you look at the composition of our labor market, most common jobs in the country are retail and sales. Truck driver. Information processor, food service and food prep, and a lot of these are the jobs that we're already seeing get eliminated. And by the way, now. We're going to be investing more and more and trying to make those jobs extraneous. So you're looking at easily millions of jobs, possibly more than 10 million.

Tucker: How volatile is a country that has 10 million unemployed young men?

Yang: It's extraordinarily volatile and one of the things that I say in my last book, the war on normal people aptly named, is. Is that if you have a group of people that don't have employment, particularly if they're men, antisocial behaviors surge, you see more gambling, more substance abuse, more crime, more self destruction, more mental illness, more mental illness for sure. So.

Tucker: We're seeing that now.

Yang: Yeah, we're living that very much so.

Tucker: So what's the solution?

Yang: Well, the solution first is going up to the problem and and this is one of the frustrations I had on the presidential trail is that if you argue that this case, somehow someone makes it ideological and again like they, there's nothing ideological about the fact that my friends are working on technology that's going to be able to do the work

of call center workers. They're 2 million call center workers right now. So we have to acknowledge the problem, and then we have to invest in trying to create.

Tucker: Right.

Yang: New touch points for in particular millions of men, to have other roles in the economy that are fulfilling will give them purpose, structure, meaning and also hopefully drive value. So one example would be for example, on an infrastructure bill, if you could employ hundreds of thousands of people rebuilding our crumbling highways or or or schools or railways. I mean, that's a good move. And then you should think in those terms over and over again, because if you look at the numbers, our labor force participation rate, which is the ratio of people that are in the labor market. Was at multi decade lows pre COVID has sunk further down and every 10th of a percentage point in the labor force participation rate translates to hundreds of thousands of unemployed people. But unemployed men. And then that results in higher crime, mental illness, substance abuse, depression and. On and on.

Tucker: Here's what I understand, so I know you're not allowed to question. Immigration in any way. But not all immigration is the same. So you're describing an economy where people who work with their minds have a much brighter future than people who work with their hands. I think we can agree on that. So if you're importing to the tune of over a million a year, people who at least this generation of those people will be working with their hands because their education levels, what the hell are they going to do? And why would you do that at exactly the moment that we're automating everything? I mean, I know it's hard to address this because people inject race into it. It's nothing to do with. Race. It has to do with labor. So, like what's the answer there is?

Yang: This whole rung of opportunities in the economy that. Americans don't want to do, and those jobs right now are being filled by immigrants, and you can see that up and down the agricultural industry for sure. Where I live in New York City, there are a lot of delivery jobs and and chef jobs and a bunch of other jobs that are being filled.

Tucker: Right.

Yang: By immigrants right now for. Sure. So there's this whole run. Opportunities now what's the right number? What's the right balance? I know I I think that you'd have to to do a lot more work to figure out whether, you know, we're getting it right.

Tucker: I don't hear anybody even thinking about the calculation. I don't hear a single person, I mean the. The objections that people have to immigration are mostly cultural. And you could argue with those are legitimate. I have those reservations, I'll be honest. But my main reservations are economic, so I don't hear many attacks on our immigration system from the right. From an economic perspective, what these people going to do? Will this make us richer or poorer? And I don't even hear this. Taking place at all on the Pro immigration side. So like why?

Yang: Well, I'm the son of immigrants myself, and my father got his PhD in physics from Berkeley and generated 69 US patents for GE and IBM. So there's a a class of

immigrants that I think are awesome for the country and hopefully we'll end up. Driving a ton. The value and I remember when I was talking about this on the democratic debate stage, and I said something to that effect and then someone said, hey, Andrew FYI, like you know, you're not your parents are the typical immigrants where where we're talking about. So I I think it is a question that we should again try and take ideology out of is that a modern country should have. Policies on immigration that are trying to enhance our overall well-being. There's a human rights perspective that I certainly appreciate a great deal because you know people want better lives and immigrants do end up adding economic value in most cases after a generation or two. But you have to have practical approaches that try and balance a number of concerns at the same time.

Tucker: Well, why wouldn't we so? Someone, says Andrew. Yang, your parents are not typical immigrants. First of all, who would dare say that to you? But. Leaving that aside. Why wouldn't we say, OK, if Andrew Yang's parents added 69 new patents, that's a good thing. So why wouldn't we try and figure out how to get more Andrew Yang's parents to come here?

Yang: I think we. Should you know one of the the things that the US has benefited from for generations is that we were a beacon for the rest of the country and we absorbed a lot of the human and intellectual capital that ended up driving a ton of value, not just in in terms of patents. But you know, like in every field you can think of and we're losing that really there are a lot of people around the world. Now that don't think that the US is the land.

Tucker: Of opportunity and as our immigration levels rise to there, I think this year will be the highest level. So even as we get more immigration, we're less thoughtful about how we sort that and less interested in its effect on us, which is to say, the people whose country it is. Like what?

Yang: Is that and and that's something. I'd love to help turn. Around where I do know people who in past. Years 100% would be trying to start their companies here in the US, and by the way, that would end up creating jobs and value and wealth and the rest of it, who are instead starting them in other parts of the. Because they they think they have a better combination of environment, competitiveness, support, access to talent, maybe they themselves are not American and it's hard for them to come here and set up shop here. I mean, there are a lot of reasons, but I have this.

Tucker: But I mean, this is important is an important question. I mean this is your world. You know, people who are literally going to Singapore or whatever rather than here, where are they going, by the way?

Yang: All that they're staying in China. They're staying in India. They're heading to Singapore and other parts of the world, Indonesia even like that. There are people who are making interesting choices.

Tucker: If someone has decided with someone with options, I'd rather go to Indonesia. Then San Francisco. You have to ask what is it? About San Francisco that they're avoiding intentionally avoiding. What is it?

Yang: Right now, and I was just to.

Tucker: Be honest, I won't tell anybody.

Yang: I mean the the people I'm thinking of for, for them it is, hey, can I actually get a visa? Can I get a visa for all the people that I want to get a visa for? Can I recruit talent? Who's going to want to stay there at A at a rate that makes sense for my business? Am I going to be able to grow? The business in a cost efficient way, San Francisco. Well, I think what you're driving at was a slightly different issue. Which is what's going on in San Francisco, where I was this past week. And you know that there are issues about around livability in San Francisco.

Tucker: I mean, it could be Marin County. It could be the South Bay. I mean, anywhere in the Bay Area. But that is that's our technology capital so. I mean, we have a much larger population than Indonesia, it's a much freer country. The standards of living in the United States are much higher still than Indonesia, much, much higher. So you just have to end with all these people. You would think that we would have the human capital, as you put it to. Staff a start. Up. But they're deciding they'd rather be in Indonesia. So like. What do we need to fix to change that?

Yang: We need to make it easier for folks who want to start businesses to come here first. It it starts with going to school here because a lot of these people used to come here for their degrees and get graduate degrees. And one thing I think is a no brainer is that if you come to study. Right here and get a degree or an advanced degree. Particularly we should be stapling a green card to your diploma right now. There are far too many people who come to this country again advanced degree like my parents did. But don't stay here like my parents. Did they go home and then five years later, we're competing with the company that they started. That doesn't make any sense to me. They should. Be starting the company right here in the US.

Tucker: Well, wait a second. Wait a second. So, but if there's like, I mean, you're saying that we don't have a very deep labor pool for sophisticated technology companies. I mean, we have a ton of people. We've issued more green cards we've ever issued ever. And yet we don't have enough people to help grow a company like what? What about our systems is broken.

Yang: We're not producing as many stem grads and engineers as certain other countries, and then the engineers we do produce typically of higher wage requirements and and and other things. And so even if you were to start a successful tech company in San Francisco in the Bay Area, your preference probably would be to also start a tech development. Wing or outpost in another part of the world so you can access that talk. But that's a preferable arrangement to that company being based someplace else in the first place.

Tucker: Yeah. So you're, I mean, you've just described something pretty scary. So you're saying the manual jobs are going away because of automation? And now the knowledge based jobs. Are going away because of Labor costs.

Yang: There is some truth to that for sure. Where we we don't have the full suite of talent to help a lot of companies reach scale and so a lot of companies as soon as

they do have that aspiration and do want to set up tech outposts in China, in India and other parts of the world to access that engineering talent. That's the truth.

Tucker: Does that worry you?

Yang: Yeah, I mean, again, I think that's better than that company being headquartered in China and India in the 1st place. But we have a lot of problems, Tucker. And you know, I think you and I like agree on the general picture that we're automating away millions of jobs and we're not being terribly honest about it. And a lot of Americans are looking up saying, like, what the heck happened to my? Middle class, livelihood or the town that I grew up in. I want my kids to grow up and all of a sudden my kids are looking up and saying the population is shrinking and the opportunities aren't here. I mean that that's the picture. And that picture is manifesting in different. Ways in different parts of the economy, it's not necessarily the case that things are great for a certain class of workers that you might imagine in terms of white collar, college educated workers that, I mean, they have their own set of issues. They're going to be much better off though, than the manual workers whose jobs were decimating.

Tucker: So you became really famous for a bunch of reasons during the presidential campaign, but mostly for you, BI. Universal basic income, the idea that the government is going to meet some threshold for you. Just give us and I know this is well practiced cause you've talked about this a. Ton, we have never talked about this. Give us your two-minute pitch for why Ubi is a good idea.

Yang: Universal basic income is a policy where everyone in a society, let's say the USA, gets a certain amount of money to meet your basic needs, no questions asked, and this is not an Andrew Yang idea. This is a Thomas Paine idea, a Milton Friedman idea, a Martin Luther King. I ran on a freedom dividend of \$1000 a month for every American. When you turn 18, which I thought would be a foundation in how people make more effective transitions. But if we are going through this historic transformation, which we are in my opinion, then we need to try and give people the ability to manage that transition and also participate. In the value that's being generated, because today you have trillion dollar companies like Amazon paying zero in taxes, and then we're all looking around wondering what the heck is going on. We should make as many Americans as possible, participants and shareholders in the value that's being generated in parts of the economy.

Tucker: Well, a couple of things really quick to the your point about Amazon not paying taxes is I think. Literally infuriating to people when they certainly it is to me when I when I hear that, why not just fix that problem first?

Yang: We should, you know, I was beating the drum about that on the presidential trail. And. And I remember you were right there. With me being like this is crazy.

Tucker: Amazon pays no.

Yang: Taxes. Yeah, that Amazon pays no taxes. You be like that. Makes zero sense to everybody.

Tucker: The highest market cap in the world that pays. No taxes.

Yang: Yeah, infuriating. I agree.

Tucker: It's so, So what? And we'll get you down. Just a second, but so when you. Said that, everyone goes. Yeah, that's exactly right. You know? But why? I mean that's. Fixable. We have a Congress which sets our tax policy. What kind of reaction did you get without naming names privately to that? Like why isn't there a groundswell of support among political leaders to just, I don't know, make Amazon pay taxes? Why is that hard?

Yang: Well, it's assigned to the dysfunction in DC right now where you're very, very obvious glaring problems like the fact that Amazon pays no taxes and then they can't come up with a a solution. I proposed a solution that, you know, some people might have issues with, which is a value added tax because I thought that Amazon could not gain its way out of that. It's essentially like a a tax to the point of so. Now but. In my mind, it's just a sign of how broken Congress is, Tucker.

Tucker: I mean I what do I know I'm not an expert in tax policy, but it might just be easier to pass an Amazon tax. Sure, Amazon pays 15% of its net in taxes. Like why not? I pay 50.

Yang: That would be that. That would be pretty popular. It's true. You might have a better shot at passing if it was. Just called the.

Tucker: Amazon tax. Yeah. OK, so to Ubi, especially when you throw in the disparity between how Amazon is treated by our tax code and how your average wage earner is treated. You definitely get my sympathy. Here's the problem that I have with Ubi. Just be interested in your. Response to it as a. As a human matter, when you give people something they didn't earn. It's not good for them. And all of us have experienced this in one way or another.

Yang: Sound like a parent Tucker now, I'm kidding. I'm.

Tucker: I am. A parent of four and I'm also. Someone who grew up around, you know, people with inherited money. And I can't think of a single instance where it was good for them, not one. So that's not, of course, on the other side, you don't UB, you don't think of Ubi is some trust fund, it's a small amount. It's 12 grand a year. Yeah. On the other hand, the principle remains. You went to Exeter, Phillips, Exeter, in Exeter, NH, which is a famous boarding school in which person world in a great school. Congrats. But you've been around inherited many people. So you know exactly. What I'm talking about why is that not a problem?

Yang: Well, to me, to me, the problems at the other end, Tucker, where if someone's trying to get ahead and we've blasted away their factory or automated away their job, then at this point they're sinking into the dirt with the town in in many ways, because we haven't left that much of A recourse. And in that circumstance. To me, 1000 bucks a month as a transition fund for them to. Get on their feet. Maybe move to the next town or start their own business, or pull together the funds with other people and work on something they've always wanted to work on. To me, that's something that our government can do that would be effective and would make sense and to your point about the fact that look, 1000 bucks a month isn't going to cause anyone to to run out and you know. Buy a portion or anything like that. No, like it's.

Tucker: No, not going to marry your secretary on 1000 bucks a month.

Yang: Yeah, that it. It's foundational. And also would make people feel like they had. Actual value. In terms of our, our citizenship really like right now, we're. Telling people they can vote. And then people are looking up being like ah, like for some reason my vote. Doesn't seem to be. Like like that. Same that. Same same. Umm. That that maybe, you know, I was brought up to to think that it had when I ran companies and I've run several companies. People can always tell whether you're investing in them. And so I would love to be able to look every American child in the eye and say your country loves you, values you, and we will invest in you and your future.

Tucker: How about improving the schools which suck? I mean, they're embarrassing. Schools are terrible, like they're a joke, and everyone knows that. That's why everyone in my world sends his kids to. To private school, I think you actually send kids public school, but but the point is and congratulations but. Most people I know send their kids to private schools, especially if they live in cities, because the schools are just so bad and we've really given up. Like, why wouldn't that be a good way to elevate? People who need.

Yang: It no, I love the idea of of trying to make our schools better. Part of this. Tucker is I'm an operator and entrepreneur and I have higher confidence in our ability to send people 1000 bucks a month and have them be able to do something positive and useful with it. Then for me to stand up and say I'm going to make everyone schools. Better because that's like a politician thing that politicians have been saying for years and years. And if I said it, I could believe it. I could want. Right. But I might not be able to deliver on that in a in a time frame where I'm going to. Be able to help you and your family. No, no, it's a it's a.

Tucker: Complicated. I think it's an entirely fair point.

Yang: But but but but. But I would be totally for trying to invest in our education in a way that would actually work and be impactful. And and we've been grasping at that one of the studies I saw that really had an impact on me was that and I I've I have two kids, nine and six, one of them special needs. That 2/3 of our kids educational outcomes occur outside of school, and that's number of words spoken to them when they're a baby. Stress levels in the household income of the neighborhood. And so these are variables that are outside of the school and the teachers know if you go to any teacher and say hey.

Tucker: Right.

Yang: What if I were to tell you that you can control approximately 1/3 of your students educational outcomes? They would be like, yeah, I think that's right because they've taught dozens or hundreds of kids, and they know that a lot of the stuff's happening outside of the school. So if you're a society and you wanted to help people learn.

Tucker: Right.

Yang: Would you focus on the 1/3 of the 2/3? Particularly when you think you could make a big difference of the 2/3 and the 1/3 you've been trying to make a difference for years, somewhat unsuccessfully. Not that I want to.

Tucker: Give up on it. I mean, we still need to try. No, I think I think it's a fair point. I mean, if if the moms in the neighborhood want a good school, you'll have a good school. And if it's just if the families are disorganized and people are totally distracted by just keeping everything together, you've got bad schools. I mean that. That's true.

Unknown: Well, so much.

Yang: Of it is what goes on at home with the family, and it's one reason I'm so grateful to my wife, Evelyn, who's been at home with our boys over this last number of years. You know, you could have the best school in the world, but if you know that the kids aren't getting what they need at home, you know you're not going to have the best outcome.

Tucker: So you just ran for mayor of New York? You've got to still be in shock from that. It's the biggest city in the country. It's one of the most ferocious political races that we have. Under the best circumstances, the city is kind of right on the edge of insanity. I mean that with love. As someone who loves New York on some level. But like what was that like?

Yang: It was a lot for sure, Tucker. I mean, the the city is in tough shape and has been for a number of months. The race was very intense. Put out what I thought was a a positive practical message. Got over 115,000 first place votes. Got more individual donors than any mayoral candidate in the history of New York City, which I'm very proud of. Came up short and still just hoping that the city gets back on its feet as quickly as possible.

Tucker: What do you think of ranked choice voting?

Yang: I am a huge rank choice voting fan and I will say to anyone listening to Israel like rank choice what? 95% of New Yorkers found it easy to use and 77% want to do it again. So if you get 4 out of five, New Yorkers want to do something again. It it's pretty good, but it it makes your votes more powerful because you can vote for more than one candidate in order of preference. And this way, no one can tell you, oh, you're going to waste your vote because you're like, well, I'll vote for whoever I want. And if my first choice. Candidate doesn't make it to the top. Then my vote will flow to the second choice candidate, or maybe.

Tucker: Even third New York City had a very tough time counting those ballots, I noticed.

Yang: Yeah, there's a process. And then there's the competence of the Board of Elections of of. New York City, you know. Like very excited about the merits and potential for rank choice, voting would not vouch for the the Board of Elections, so the.

Tucker: The moment for those of us who don't live in New York, that kind of filtered out. Of the city to the rest of the country with you came when you noted that

New York has a like an actual homeless problem. It's it's completely real. And here's here's what you said. This was your controversial statement.

Yang: I had that experience countless times on the trail, Don, where I would say, hey, I'm running for president to a truck driver, retail worker, waitress in a diner. And they would say, what party? And I say Democrat and they would flinch like I'd said, something really negative. Or I'd just like, I'd like turn another color or something like that. And there's something deeply wrong. When working class, Americans have the. That response to a major party that theoretically is supposed to be fighting for them, so you have to ask yourself, what has the Democratic Party been standing for in their minds and in their minds, the Democratic Party, unfortunately, has taken on this role of the coastal urban elites who are more concerned about policing various cultural issues than improving their way of life. That has been declining for years.

Tucker: OK, so sometimes you know as the host you want to ask a question, but the control in New York decides, no, we're going to go in. Another direction this. Is an illustration of. I'm just a puppet of my producers at Fox News HQ, so they ran us another sound bite. That's you from November of 2020, making the point that the Democratic Party. Was the party of the working man? A phrase is not even allowed anymore, and now it's something very, very different. So you said that, which is completely fair thing to say. That trend that you describe seems to have accelerated. To me it seems less the party of working people than it ever has been.

Yang: I was taken aback by just how negative a reaction the Democratic Party got among working class people. That again, it's supposed to be fighting for, and I think this is a fundamental problem that I've been. Essentially begging the Democratic Party to try and get its arms around or make progress on I I spent months in Iowa and Ohio to a lesser extent, and these are states where Democrats were very competitive recently. Ohh yeah. And and now they are much much less competitive. And it's in large part because of what I described in that clip where people don't associate the Democratic Party with real economic solutions that are going to make your life better. It's more around various cultural issues that aren't as core to people's way of life, in my opinion.

Tucker: So I'm 52, so I've seen all of this change and I've never been a Democrat, and I've always criticized them. Probably in some ways unfairly. Looking back on it, my views have changed dramatically. But when I think of the Democratic Party in. The fall of 2021, I think of a party that is run by and for a small group of affluent, unmarried, childless white liberals in the. City, who don't have economic concerns so they don't talk about economics, who are totally narcissistic, who only want to talk about themselves, either identities and whatever, you know, sexual interest. They have, like, completely disconnected from the concerns of anybody. And it's this group young, affluent. White liberals in Williamsburg. That's my mental picture. There's no group I personally dislike more. I'll just be. Honest with you? But it does seem like their concerns have a disproportionate effect on the policies of the party.

Yang: It's one reason I enjoyed spending time in Iowa and Ohio and and want to Orient the Democratic Party toward the problems in those environments because the problems you'll hear in those towns are very real and very different around farmers committing suicide and towns that are are drying up and. That's where I think our energies and attention should be. I think it's one drawback of the media driven nature of our narratives today is is 1 and the media tends to be as you know, centered in particular. Where areas and locations. Notice that but, but it it it's also a relative weakness over the fact that we have these two supposedly big tent parties. They're supposed to encapsulate all of these different people and points of view, and then certain points of view just end up being much louder, really more because of again, geography and mechanics. Than anything else. Like if you like it. If you're someone who's plugged into the media networks and have you know, very powerful social media. Tools in certain parts of the country. You're going to. Have more of.

Tucker: A megaphone. That's the second time you've mentioned social media as a driver of our. Political culture? Yep. So tell tell. I mean again this. Is a world that you're familiar with. You were in tech. How do you think social? Media affect our political conversation.

Yang: It's terrible, genuinely, and one one of the things that studies have shown. Is that negative and even untrue? Information spreads 6 times more powerfully and quickly on social media than fact. Fact is boring, you know, and and argument and invective are intoxicating, and so you have a lot of people who then respond to those incentives. And end up trying to make themselves more popular by attacking other people. There's a constant desire to tear other folks down, so there's this constant churn on social media that doesn't really lead any place terribly productive and and makes people more polarized, more negative, less solutions oriented.

Tucker: Sounds like it's wrecking the country to me.

Yang: As a parent, I'm very very concerned because you know, you and I are old enough to Tucker have grown up in a time before social media, and then we were seeing our kids on social media and. Empirically, it's it's not great for kids. In particular, you're seeing record levels of depression among teenage girls, and if you are literally just oppressing your kids, like, what are? What are we doing you? Know and then what?

Tucker: Well, kind of. We don't let Philip Morris sell Marlboros. To 8 year olds. I think there's a lot of evidence your kids would be better off smoking Marlboros than going on Facebook and Instagram. And I mean that. So why do we allow this? Like, why shouldn't we haul those people by their nose before Congress and shut their? Companies down I. Don't get it as long as we're gonna live in a fascist country, which clearly we do. We're putting people in prison for disagreeing. So why are? We letting Facebook and. Google Wreck our kids.

Yang: I think the problem is that our government is just decades behind the curve and so you have private companies doing what private companies do, which is they're going to maximize their own economic opportunities and in a way, you can't be mad at

them for that because again like that, that's where their incentives are. So the problem is we have legislators who have watched. All of this. Come up to a point where now that there are these world changing juggernauts. That are distorting our democracy or worse, and we don't have a handle on what we can do about it. So I think there's a a middle ground, Tucker, I think you probably would agree between shutting these companies down and letting them run amok, and we need to try and race to that middle ground as quickly as possible because we don't. Have unlimited time. No, we really don't.

Tucker: So, since you've been a candidate twice and been the subject of an awful lot of media coverage, how do you think social media affect political coverage?

Yang: Also not great. You know it. It ends up so. I came up. As a nobody presidential candidate, so grateful to everyone who supported me and who gave me a platform which includes you, Tucker and I use social media to try and get my message out, and it was effective. And that message, I'm proud to say, was positive 99% of the time. Unfortunately, I think that social media ends up distorting our political coverage because of the incentives I described earlier. Where you want to do something that's splashing and gets a lot of attention, which will push you toward the extremes. But also it makes journalists get absorbed in the news cycle of the day. That happens on Twitter, and I don't think that's good for our political discourse at all, I. Mean. If you look at the long. Term problems we have around the automation of jobs or climate change or or any of these big honking problems. It's not like something's gonna pop up on Twitter today that's going to be like the the, you know, the game changer in those long running challenges. So it's engendering this.

Unknown: You know, you don't think.

Tucker: I keep scrolling through my feed looking for the answer to life and it. Hasn't come up yet.

Yang: Yeah, it hasn't come up for any of us yet. So the the, so it it's enhancing kind of short termism in our political discourse when we need to think much, much bigger could.

Tucker: You be a candidate for office without. Reading Twitter all the time.

Yang: And that's a great question. I believe you could in certain instances, you know that. There are a. Lot of local candidates that are very successful who aren't on social media because they just get out there and talk to people now is, is that more feasible on a local scale than? National yeah, it is. But you. Know a lot of actions.

Tucker: Local, when you were running for president, how much time did you spend on social media? And be honest.

Unknown: I I spent.

Yang: A good deal of time on social media, in part because I was in a rental vehicle going from event to event in Iowa in New Hampshire. So what are you doing? You're on your phone being like, ohh, let me, like, send something out. Let me try and interrupt. It was just a way to do work, really. You know? And and the things you can do in your vehicle when you're going between events in New Hampshire.

Tucker: Right.

Yang: Or either call people or. You do social media, so I was. On a great.

Tucker: Do you think it was good for you?

Yang: Was it good for my mental?

Tucker: Did you get home and your wife said, you know, I think you're a better man for the time.

Unknown: Health like.

Tucker: You spent on Twitter? Ohh, it's.

Yang: I'm someone who's just trying to get stuff done. So like I it was a tool, but it it helped me Tucker understand just how much it's messing. A lot of people up because I'm a full grown adult with, you know, wife and kids. And it messed me up sometimes. So if I were to get rewound to the point when I was like 1819, and it seemed like what everyone else thought of, Maine was the most important thing in the. Held it would completely screw me up and I was a very shy, bookish kid when I was young. But at least when I went home I could close the door and I'd be alone. Today, dark kids are never alone. They closed the door and then all their classmates. Are with them on their phone.

Tucker: It's scary. It's not great. No, it's. You're a man of understate, but I.

Unknown: Noticed that I.

Tucker: I I like we don't meet many of them.

Yang: Well, I'm. I'm a man of positivity, like I'm all about solutions, you know, I'm. I'm trying to and and that is one thing I do want to push. Tucker is. That at this point a lot of us agree on the problems, right. And then the question is, what can we actually enact and do that we actually could do? It's one reason why I focused on cash so much, again, because I'm like more confident in our ability to send people cash than I am and. But they do a lot of. Other things and and it's it's one reason why in my new book I talk about some things we can do, including around tech to your.

Tucker: Point. So I I've always wondered. I always thought the most successful domestic program or certainly one of the United States, ever pulled. I'll admit it was by FDR. It was the civilian conservation program. The CCC Corps Civilian Conservation Corps, run by General MacArthur, who was the largest mobilization of Americans in peacetime in history. And they built the infrastructure of the national parks and and part of Washington, DC, The GW Parkway, which is the prettiest Rd. in this in the capital, was built by the CCC and they employed. Unemployed young men between 18 and 25, I think, and, you know, gave him an. Wage but gave them purpose and they rebuilt America. Yes. So I think that's a wonderful thing. I know libertarians disagree, but look at its effects and they build beautiful things. I agree. So why wouldn't we? I know the US government is terrible at everything.

Unknown: OK.

Tucker: But why not try something like that as opposed to just sending people checks?

Yang: I think this is a both and situation Tucker. I would love to create a 21st century of the Civilian Conservation Corps and employ people, for example, managing our forests, which right now unfortunately are becoming tinderboxes because of climate change and it's resulting in devastation in different parts of the country. Particularly out West, I think that we should be doing more to rebuild our country, literally. I mean we are falling apart, but there are our needs in education that we can be filling at a higher level. We should be going on a massive talent recruitment drive for any. The young person who wants to be able to lend a hand there should be absolutely no barrier between them. Them doing so and you know, just if you raise your hand, we should be able to put you to work doing something. Really positive and productive? I agree. So I want to play. We're going to try.

Tucker: Again, to play your sound bite from the mayoral race. And you basically make the point that if you live in New York City, you shouldn't have to live in fear of being attacked by the mentally ill homeless. Here's what you said.

Yang: The fact is mentally ill homeless men are changing the character of our neighborhoods. A woman my wife, Ellen is friends with, and her mom group in Hells Kitchen was punched in the face by a mentally ill man, sent a picture of her bruised face around the mom group spread like wildfire. This is happening in New York City, and we're not talking enough about it. Families are leaving. As a result, in East Harlem, the neighborhood has been changed Upper West Side. The neighborhood has been. Changed. We owe our people and our families better than this, and I'm frustrated by the political nature of these responses. I mean, we're not talking about housing affordability. We're talking about the hundreds of mentally ill people we all see around us every day on the streets and the subways. We need to get them off of our streets and our subways into a better environment. And when you ask what I'm going to do differently, I'm going to. Rebuild the stock of psych beds in our city. There will be no recovery until we resolve this. I will fix this in your.

Unknown: Thank you.

Tucker: Damn, that was good. I texted you right after. I was thrilled to see that. And again, I didn't think it was an ideological point. It's just like you're the one guy noting the obvious. If you live in New York, this is a huge part of your life. Why did nobody else say this?

Yang: I'm genuinely not sure because I saw this with my family and the families around us in our part of the city, and by the way, it's still very much a reality, you know, like my mother is afraid to walk out of a certain number of blocks in from her apartment.

Tucker: I know.

Yang: For the same reason. So there's a. Lot of work to be done again, you're. Right, I don't see. This as terribly ideological. I see this as.

Tucker: At all.

Yang: Like a a very core. Lived experience for unfortunately too many people in New York City right now and a lot.

Tucker: Of them are voting with their feet, and by the way, for the mentally ill homeless. I'm, I'm not sure. How we're serving their needs so. When you said. This people said Ohh Andrew Yang hates the homeless. Well, how are we serving people with severe psychiatric conditions by letting them live on the street? I don't understand.

Yang: I I completely agree. I I believe I LED with that in that statement and then for whatever reason, people ignored the fact that I wanted to help the. People who are. Struggling with mental illness into better situations, the streets. The place to to. Get well.

Tucker: When you said that, I think that was that was most animated. I saw you. I didn't watch every second of the campaign, but I paid attention because it's our biggest city. And it matters. And it was an interesting campaign. What kind of you were savaged for saying that by groups that have, you know, taking a vig from homeless policy? And from ideologues, they hated it. But, like, how did other people respond to that?

Yang: A number of people on the street came to me and said thank you, like, you know, thank you for saying what was on our minds. I did get that a number. Of times on the streets.

Tucker: In New York, are you going to stay in new?

Yang: Well, my kids are in school there and we.

Unknown: That's not.

Yang: Much of an endorsement, you know, we and we loved. Well, you didn't let me finish the sentence. I was like, you know, you know, my kids are at school there and we love it. And I have many friends and family there. So, you know, we'll we'll be there trying to make things better in our own way.

Unknown: Ohh sorry sorry sorry.

Tucker: You. I just can't overstate this went from national anonymity. A lot of friends, coworkers, but not a national presence. Yet to running for President, having this own your own kind of Internet cult. The Yang gang around you. Did you ever get to, like, paint your house or do anything?

Yang: Gosh, no, Tucker, that's.

Unknown: Like what I want, whatever would.

Tucker: It be like to have your own. You know group of of acolytes as you.

Yang: Did anyway, again, super grateful to everyone who supported.

Tucker: Of course.

Yang: My campaign to try and so that but.

Tucker quotes Ted K for simple concept

Tucker: That was that was your first moment in politics was as a presidential candidate. Then you ran again for mayor of our biggest city. So you're probably not going to recede into anonymity again. I wouldn't think, as James Carville once said to me, the thing about running for office is it's kind of like having sex. Once you do

it, you kind of want to do it again. So I think that's true. What are you running for next?

Yang: I am trying to bring our country back together and we can see that polarization is getting worse and worse because of the media and social media and political incentives. You and I talked about and I talked about in. My in my book forward. So I am starting a new popular inclusive movement that's going to welcome. Independents, Democrats and Republicans. Like to advance real electoral reform and solutions that are going to give rise hopefully to a middle ground in American politics and a greater diversity of points of view, because right now this duopoly is not working for any of us, it's not working for Democrats or Republicans or independents. And so this is my new project, the forward party not. Left or right but. 4 words. That's. A third party, it is a third party? Yes, though though it's it's starting out as a pack because you don't actually become a political party on day one. You have to do a bunch of stuff.

Tucker: Well, sure. I mean systems. Ted Kaczynski, I. I have to say, has written very convincingly on this, the Unabomber bad person. But a smart analysis, I think, of the way systems work and his argument is that large organizations over time morph into purely self preservation projects like a big a big system. In the end, protects itself, and that's kind of all it does. So our two party system is certainly in that category. There are so many barriers to starting a viable third party, it's it hasn't been done. Why can you do it?

Yang: I'd love to go into the history and background. A bit which you. Probably know better than I do, but. If you look at the Constitution, there's nothing about political parties to otherwise. And if you look at the writings of the founding fathers, they feared factionalism. That didn't fluctuate, which is exactly what we have with this duopoly. If they were to wake up and see what it was happening now, they would be shocked and.

Tucker: Right.

Yang: Pride and when you? Look at Americans around the country. 57% at this point want a third party. 60% think both parties are out of touch. If you were an entrepreneur, as I am if you arrived at a market and said, hey, there's this dysfunctional dropping in over half of people want a new alternative, you'd say, oh, let me create. A new alternative. The problem is what you've just described, Tucker is that it is now structurally nearly impossible to create a new alternative, so it's sort of an irresistible force and and and an immovable object.

Tucker: Yes, though I think it could be done. the IT seems to me the pressure is going to come. From the lifestyle liberals from the group in Williamsburg, I just because they're the ones who mean it the most. Their whole identity is wrapped up in this weird evangelical religion they have. And so I wonder, like the second. A third party is, you know, forces people to buy into, like, radical trans ideology or whatever. Like, you know, you can change your sex by saying so. That's insane. Of course it's not science. But like if. That's a tough place for you because you have to take a stand

on that issue. And the second you do. You alienate people like you can't kind of get around that, can you? It's an acid test.

Yang: The forward party stands for a group of principles. I think the vast majority of Americans will be excited about and that the 1st is open primaries and ranked choice voting to enable diverse points of view. So anyone who's sick of the duopoly, even if you aren't a huge Yang fan, you should be for the forward party. Just because we're going to actually change the process so that. New parties can emerge, so that's number. One number two is fact based governance. We really should just be trying to measure what's actually happening on the ground as opposed to who's winning the argument of the day.

Tucker: Don't we have to agree on?

Yang: What the facts are though ohh you know. And and that's one of the reasons I think the forward party is important is because anyone who's a member of the forward party will say look, we can try and agree on what the central facts are. So we can have disciplined conversations and arguments instead of just shouting at each other. Again, this wants to be that the middle ground for the. Affective in modern government, one of the big frustrations is what you just described. Tucker. Is that just stuff's not working very well and you can see when you're on your phone and you're banking, you're like, OK, my bank has their act together. And then when you when you interact with the government, sometimes it's a very different experience. And then when someone comes to the government and says, hey, we want. To do this. Stuff you're like, wait a minute. I'm not sure like you guys are actually up for. What you're saying you want to be up for so modernizing our government, making it more effect? Grace and tolerance, which is that we should be able to sit with anyone else no matter their point of view and have a reasonable discussion with them and not have people attack you for saying, oh, you sat with someone who, you know I disagree with on X&Y. How are we ever going to make progress as a country if we cannot sit? Would people we disagree with like? What kind of strange?

Unknown: I couldn't.

Tucker: Anymore. That's why I'm sitting with you and you with me. Yes, but you will take. You know, for the crime of sitting at a table with America's foremost white supremacist, you're going to take a lot of crap, obviously, for doing this. You clearly don't care, I guess.

Yang: Well, again, you have to send a message that we're never going to make progress if we're not willing to talk to each other, and that's what the Ford Party is going to be about. I ran for President as a Democrat. I'm now an independent. I will talk to anyone who wants to actually make our lives better and solve the problems are getting worse. We do not have unlimited time. This country is not doing well. You're a parent. I'm a parent. We have to try and make this. Country stronger and more whole for our next generation or we will have failed them. I just see myself as a parent trying to do the the right thing for my family, your family, every family in this country where you.

Unknown: In the bill.

Tucker: Of rights on the US Bill of Rights. As a lawyer.

Unknown: Yeah, we're no, we're no.

Tucker: I'm. I'm serious. I mean, does it have the meaning that it had when you were a kid, that your your freedom to say what you think is absolute? Your right to defend yourself is God-given and protect it, by the etcetera, etcetera, etcetera. You can just go down through through the whole list.

Yang: I am a huge. Believer in individual liberty and and freedom as enumerated in the Bill of Rights. I think right now we're getting bogged down because there's this new public square in social media that is run by private companies. A recent invention, and I do think applying the 1st amendment to what's happening on social media is a strange framework because the 1st Amendment says the government will not abridge your ability to to speak. And then we're treating Facebook like it's a government. And right now it obviously is not.

Tucker: That's right.

Yang: So you would need. To try and sit down in my view with government social media companies, nonprofits and media companies to try and. Hash out rules of the road. I think that's where you were driving with that. Question. I'm not sure if.

Unknown: That yes, I mean I I mean.

Tucker: The the whole American government is based on the Constitution, bill rights being the most famous component of that, of course. And I just, I rarely hear anybody seeking office say the point of this whole exercise is to preserve what makes America. Different, unique, really in the world and that's you know, this set of rights that we believe we were born with and. Government exists to. Protect well so.

Yang: Here's the thing, and and you and I do disagree on this. I I think that we agree on other things or aspects of it. Is that? I I want. To be a realist about what the government can and can't do for us and and I and one of the things I do think we're overstating and this is something I I disagree that you and I don't see eye. To eye on. Is that I think that we have these major problems coming, that we're going to need to come together and solve, whether it's social media, climate change. Like these things and that collective action in some cases might impinge upon what someone thinks of as like an individual freedom. For example, let's say, like, you know, posting something on social media that that that other people. You know, like find objectionable or or or hate. Hateful. This to me is something that we can come together and collectively solve for and not just have it say like everyone can do whatever they want. As long as. It's, you know, like in the communication. You know, I do think that there, there should be some rules of the road again.

Tucker: Or always have been. Yeah, they always have been.

Yang: Like like it's never been legal to, you know, like run into certain places and say certain things.

Tucker: But the strike zone has been pretty wide since Brandenburg versus Ohio in 1967. I mean, I think the Supreme Court pretty much. Did I don't think they did

say freedom of speech applies to virtually everything except imminent. Exhortations to violence. Yeah, and.

Yang: So so this is the. Point I was trying to make that that. Is that? Right now. There is a. Concern that the government's going to swelter our. Ability to say certain things right?

Tucker: There's a concern, yes, I would say there's a concern, yes.

Yang: And I think that right now we're in the midst of cacophony and chaos in the form of social media that's literally making our kids sad and depressed. Yes. And so if you look at these sets of problems, you say OK, like which problem am I most concerned about right now? And not to say that addressing the mental illness problem when necessarily like impinge upon ones individual expression like ideally it does not but. We're going to have to come together to solve some of these information and social media problems, and I think that, you know, the, the, the, that to me is my concern in some ways that the government doesn't have the innovation or perspective necessary to address our problems rather than the government's going to somehow. Suppress all of our freedoms, in part because I think that it's very difficult to suppress all of all of our freedoms, given the fact that communication so disaggregated at.

Tucker: Right not to segregate it.

Unknown: This point.

Yang: Maybe it's not disaggregated enough because we have such a small number of platforms, which I know is something that that some people feel very strongly about and and that's that's something that to me is a real issue that we have these like quasi monopolies, yeah.

Tucker: These Public Utilities.

Yang: Yeah, but they're private companies.

Tucker: Acting only in that right in their own interests. Andrew Yang, I think if you've made it to the end of this conversation, you may not agree with everything Andrew Yang just said, but you will agree that very few people running for office are thinking as broadly as he is and for that. We're grateful. Thanks. So.

Unknown: Thank you for joining.

Yang: Much doctor and Congrats on.

Tucker: The book. Thank you. Call us when you. Run again. I know you will name the show Tucker Carlson today. New episodes every Monday, Wednesday. And Friday we'll see. You every week night 8:00 PM on the Fox News Channel.

Tucker Carlson – The Roseanne Barr Podcast #24

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EomprKF1SSw>

Rosanne: Greetings, earthlings. Welcome to the Roseanne Barr podcast. I got a good one today. I got the guest of all guests, somebody I've been so excited to have on. He is a rare German, an American treasure. The one the only Tucker Carlson.

Tucker: Ladies and gentlemen, thank you, Rosanne.

Rosanne: Thank you for being here.

Tucker: Ohh man, I'm honored.

Intro Gingle: Oh, you see my patience is growing strong!

Rosanne: I'm so excited to ask you all these crazy things here.

Tucker: You can't get too crazy for me.

Rosanne: I know that's what's so great.

Tucker: Yeah, that's true.

Rosanne: First of all, on the crazy train there, well, how do you feel about Trump saying he would consider you for Vice President?

Tucker: Ohh gosh I don't know. I put that in the category of asteroid striking the earth. Good or bad? It's so far out the side outside of my control that I, you know, I'm. I'm flattered.

Unknown: Would you? ...

Rosanne: Yeah, it is. Battering isn't it?

Tucker: For sure. But I mean it's hard to, you know, I've never been in. Politics. I've never. Would you ever do it? Would I accept? Yeah, I just have to think about that. I mean, I spent my whole life looking at politicians and commenting on them and passing judgment on them. And I've never run for, you know, room mother. And so the idea of that is so far from anything I've ever done, it's kind of hard to even to imagine. I certainly support Trump. I'll tell you that. I mean. I've always agreed with Trump's policies. Always. And I lost friends over it. But and I've never really actively supported anybody cause it's not my job to actively support people I watch, you know, I like to watch. But I'm a *****. Yeah, but I became an active Trump supporter when they rated Mar-a-lago last summer. The summer of 2022. That, that, that's just that can't stand.

Rosanne: Well, that can't with something.

Tucker: And I.

Unknown: Agree with Trump.

Tucker: On a lot, but even if I disagree with Trump on a lot, I'd still be a Trump supporter because you cannot allow that. You cannot allow. The you know the regime, the President United States to use the Justice Department to knock the front runner out of the. Race. You can't do that, no. You can't do that, so it's bigger than Trump. It's bigger than Biden. It's a question of, you know, do you want to live in a free country with a? Functioning justice system, you know? And so I'm voting for Trump. And if they convict him, I will send him the Max.

Rosanne: That's exactly right.

Tucker: Donations and I will lead protests. That's how.

Rosanne: I feel that's how I feel.

Tucker: Because and by the way, if I thought that he had committed some real crime, I wouldn't feel that way. But he didn't. He and Biden are both found with classified documents at home, along with every other former high level federal official in. The street, but only Trump is indicted like tell. Me how that works. Ohh.

Rosanne: Shut up and and Biden is the one who did it illegally because he was never president when he did it.

Tucker: Course you did. Do you think Dick Cheney brought home any, like, classified Iraq war documents and show them to his wife in 2003? Yes, is the answer. And the FBI, didn't, you know, put bugs in his house? And didn't I mean, the whole look. I spent my life in Washington. I spent 35 years there from 1985 to 20 twenties, and my father ran a federal agency. So I know the classification system. Worked and still works, and it's a lie. It's a lie. It's completely there are over a billion classified documents. So how is that a democracy if you don't know what your government is doing and you have no right to know on the basis of totally fraudulent national security claims? It's not a democracy, right? It's an oligarchy. And so. And I believe in democracy.

Rosanne: Yeah, it's a complete lie.

Tucker: I think that the people. Owned this country. It's not owned by federal unionized bureaucrats or appointees, or the richest people. It's not just like the 27 billionaires get to own everything. I just don't agree with that.

Rosanne: I don't even.

Tucker: I hate it, actually, and they're not even good at it. That's the other thing. They're selfish and they're stupid and they're short sighted and they're totally lacking wisdom, so they're not even running the country. Well, even if they were, I would still be opposed to it because that's a betrayal of the.

Rosanne: Core promise of America? Yeah, that's feudalism complex.

Tucker: Really. But at least in feudalism, there was a symbiotic relationship between the Lord and the serfs. They each needed each other, right? The people around our country do not need labor. Yeah, labor has no value in America. The average person has no power, no economic power. And when you take away the promise of, like, free elections, you don't even have political power. Your vote doesn't even matter. No, that's really super dark. So I'm. I'm completely opposed to it. I reject the premise of the charges. Classified on what grounds? Ohh, they're nuclear secrets. Really. Which ones? They can't tell you. They're classifying a lot. Thousands of documents from the Kennedy assassination, which is now next week it'll be 60 years. January. I mean, rather November 22nd, 1963.

Rosanne: It's unbelievable.

Tucker: And we're now in November of 2023. On what grounds could they be hiding that? Well, obviously, to hide the CIA's complicity in the murder of the president. But there's no defensible grounds on which they can hide those documents. Don't lecture me about classification. I actually know a guy who was in charge of it and I whatever I know a lot about this subject. It's it's a lie and don't expect me to.

Rosanne: Can I know? What it is? Play along with it. What do you think of Hillary saying Trump's Hitler did that curdle your blood? Or like she did mine.

Tucker: She's she's, I think she. I've never taken her very seriously. I mean, I know I I know her also. I was in the newspaper in Arkansas in the early 90s, thirty years ago, so I know a lot about Hillary and I I don't think she's a good person. I think she would put you in a camp without thinking about. It if you were in the way, she.

Rosanne: Said it reeducation.

Tucker: For sure. And she means that, I mean, she's got a authoritarian sensibility. But I've I think she's not very bright and I think she's most. I mean, she's close to 80, but I think of her as like a child. And so I don't take her seriously enough to really be mad at her. But she'll say whatever, whatever she needs to say, Trump is Hitler.

Rosanne: I think she does so well, though is to project what she does on the Trump it's like she holds up the mirror and she's like Russia, Russia, Russia, and that's the one she was selling plutonium to Russia. She devised this whole thing with the fake dossier. To frame a sitting United States President, which is, isn't it treason when you're then you use a completely corrupt FISA court with fake FISA stuff to spy on a sitting to bring down the sitting president of the United States during war time? Isn't that some sort of misprint? Of treason, treason, or something like.

Tucker: That of course. I mean it's it's a betrayal. Of democratic principles of betrayal, the Constitution. It's illegal.

Rosanne: And then she's sitting up there going. Trump is Hitler. Hey, you look what you put us through for seven years, and that doesn't even begin to it doesn't even begin to talk about the physical damage done to Americans.

Tucker: This happened for a long time. But it's pretty revealing, though, cause most people couldn't do that. I mean, all of us lie, you know? But our lie is the average person. First of all, This is why polygraphs work.

Rosanne: I know that's. Yeah, that's.

Tucker: You know, polygraphs are not admissible in court, but does mean they don't work. Everybody uses polygraphs, CI uses polygraphs, military use polygraphs, big companies, polygraphs. Why? Because they work, they detect deception. And the reason they do is.

Rosanne: But don't work on sociopath.

Tucker: Exactly the reason they work is because normal people, even if they're liars, feel guilty when they lie and their palms sweat and their heart rate rises and their temperature rises. The average person, when he lies, tells a lie that's, you know, 15° off center. You know, I'm drinking Pellegrino, but actually it's Perrier or whatever. What they don't do is invert the lie you're drinking. Perrier. I'm not.

Rosanne: Right.

Tucker: Exactly that is so the average person can't understand it. It's bewildering. It throws you off balance. It's so aggressive and deeply, like, dishonest at the core level that you can't even relate to it, right? And so do you think well, holy.

Rosanne: I know.

Tucker: ****. Maybe it's true. Like.

Speaker 3: If you.

Tucker: Why would they say it if it wasn't true?

Rosanne: Because that's what a normal person does when you're accused. You go Oh my God. Did I do something?

Tucker: Totally. It's happened to me actually.

Rosanne: You you don't, you don't immediately go. I you did.

Tucker: You did exactly. See, right. So it does, I think, reveal moral disease and a worldview that's like, so different from mine. I can't even relate to it.

Rosanne: Do you think that it shows somebody who has like, you know how they talk about? Well, vampires don't cast a, there's no reflection in the mirror. It's a kind of a thing where there's no there there.

Tucker: Like this has occurred to me. Yeah, I mean, I mean, there's something is going on in the spiritual realm. I mean, I'm the last person to ask for details on that because I'm as far from a theologian as you can be. But I've run out of other.

Rosanne: Don't just say whatever.

Tucker: Explanations for it, well, I think.

Rosanne: That they don't see what they do.

Tucker: No. And there's like, there's just a lot going on that doesn't. Doesn't fit into the categories we were trained to understand the world with. You know, this isn't left versus right. This isn't. It's not just. And I know you often hear people say it's just about the money. Yeah, money plays a huge role in this, but.

Rosanne: They're different enough.

Tucker: It's deeper than that. Like, why would you? It's it's lying for its own sake. It's the worship of dishonesty. It's the hatred of the truth. Why would you hate the truth? Sometimes the truth is inconvenient. If you catch me cheating on my wife, I don't want you to tell the truth about it.

Rosanne: Right.

Tucker: Of course. I get it. Yeah. But I. Don't never even think to. You take pleasure in telling a lie for its own sake. I'm not angry when you tell the truth, as long as it doesn't expose my, you know, weaknesses or as. Long as I'm not hurt by it. They hate the truth because it's true.

Rosanne: Yeah, that's exactly.

Tucker: And 100% of the people punished in the last five years in the public conversation have been punished for telling the truth, not for lying. And they don't even pretend other. They don't call it lying anymore. They call it disinformation. Right. The thing about disinformation is it?

Rosanne: Yeah, that's what.

Tucker: Can be true, right? But it's still verboten. How does that work?

Rosanne: Because it's the Kingdom of lies. By thinking about all this, think about all these physicians that go. I can't in good conscience go along with this edict and they lost their they lost everything.

Tucker: It is a Kingdom of loss that. Is exactly right. Yes, yes.

Rosanne: Americans lost everything because they wasn't lost.

Tucker: Well, think about all the physicians who did go along with that. That's what I. Keep thinking, but worse.

Rosanne: Well, I just feel I feel like they're village of the dam and you know they there will come a time when they will answer when it's just like.

Tucker: I think that.

Rosanne: OK, you're going to the grocery store and you're going to get the evil life 10,000 people.

Tucker: I hope that's true. Just cause I believe in justice. I don't hope for anyone suffering, but I also think you can't just pretend that it didn't happen. We didn't. And as someone who didn't take the VAX and really felt under attack because of it, you know it sticks with me a little bit. As someone whose children were target.

Rosanne: I do not know. Me too.

Tucker: Did for vaccines like you can't go to school unless you take a vaccine and it was a big thing in my family and for a lot of people. And then to act like it didn't happen.

Rosanne: It was a big thing.

Tucker: Is it's too much? It's too much. There has to be people demand. I think nature demands certainly every world. Religion demands a moment where we say maybe we don't, you know, punish the wrongdoers. But we acknowledge that. They did wrong.

Rosanne: Yeah, and they do too. Yeah.

Tucker: And they acknowledge it. That's exactly right, that there's contrition and repentance like these are. Essential steps in the process of feeling.

Rosanne: Yes, like admittance to know you did something wrong.

Tucker: What's the 12? What's the first of the 12? Steps admitting it right. But that's like, what's the first step in in any of the Abrahamic face. The three Abrahamic faces. I'll admit that I sinned. Yeah, I'm not perfect. I'm not God, you are right. And so that is like a that's a core required. Impairment on all of us to retain our humanity is to admit when we do wrong.

Rosanne: Yes, exactly.

Tucker: And if you see people refusing?

Rosanne: Well, that's why they they don't believe in God. That's how you can tell, yeah.

Tucker: They definitely they think they are gods. Of course God doesn't apologize in job, which I just read, you know, God makes us deal with. The literal with the devil and afflicts this guy called Job and Joe. Was like hey. God like why did you do this? In? God's answer is basically I'm God I don't need. To explain. God's the only one. Who doesn't need to explain or apologize? He's the only. One and the people who run our society consider themselves gods, and that's why they're not explaining.

Rosanne: Boy, they do. Boy, they do. They don't think they have to. They don't think I.

Unknown: I have none.

Rosanne: I I think I was talking to somebody and they said to me, well, they think they're more than human.

Tucker: Ohh obviously.

Rosanne: Yeah, they, I I go. They're not even human because human. Care about their environment and their neighbors and humans care about, you know, other people's children and humans care about living things, but they don't do any of that. And he goes because they think. They're more than human. They think they're Royals. They think they're like Royals in a in a rarefied sphere of DNA or something above us. Like did they come from another planet?

Tucker: Oh, I noticed. That's why they want to live forever.

Rosanne: You know when you hear people talk, I can't either, but.

Tucker: I can't speculate on that.

Jake: This is the podcast to speculate on it though.

Rosanne: Well, because some people, some people say, you know.

Speaker 3: We're free.

Rosanne: A lot of religious people, they're into some deep rabbit holes of things and I don't know anything.

Tucker: Well, you can see where they are though. I mean, I speaking for myself, I have no idea what's going on. I don't know if. This is the Nephalem.

Rosanne: Right. I was gonna say I know that's. I don't know. Here we go. It's not. You've heard. You're fine, right? What I said no.

Tucker: I'm what? No, let's just say I said I don't know anything about that stuff, OK? I'm a very ordinary middle-aged man who spent his life following politics and theory.

Rosanne: Right.

Tucker: Actually. But I do know that whatever's going on is very deep. I've spent my whole life around politicians and seeing decisions get made. Interviewed people who run things and what's happening now is qualitatively different. So different that it's not in the same category at all. This is hurting people for the sake of hurting them. This is lying for the sake of lying. This is. As the devil hates holy water, they hate the truth. You tell the truth about anything. It almost doesn't matter what it's about. Doesn't have to be about the next election. It can just be about the about history. For example, right telling the truth about history. Why should that offend anybody?

Rosanne: Power for the sake. That's right. Oh, that really ***** him off.

Tucker: Periods where everyone's dead and we can't, of course, change the past. So there's nothing really at stake for us now, right? You would think people would welcome. Open minded historical inquiry to get closer to what actually happened in whatever period or in whatever event they hate that.

Rosanne: Yes, Sir.

Unknown: Yeah. Well, what?

Tucker: What are you watching? You're watching someone who hates the truth because it's true and there's no possible profit motive that is driving that. There's no political end that is driving that. They hate the truth because it's true. Now we're in the realm of theology.

Rosanne: Yeah, we are absolutely think so too.

Tucker: That's all that is. I mean, and I I can't possibly explain it, but that's.

Rosanne: What that is so have you heard about Antarctica? Cause I always say I in my act.

Tucker: Have I heard about it? It's.

Rosanne: A continent still, right? Yeah, but in my act, I go. I don't know which is true anymore. Are we being invaded by the Nephilim from outer space? Or is it true that the Nazis have a whole breakaway continent under the ice in Antarctica? Which. You haven't heard that one Tucker no.

Tucker: I don't go on the Internet very often so because I'm probably. It's like same reason no. Cruise used car lots cause I'd buy them all. I don't know. I don't have the self-control. I haven't heard that. I will say. However, I've done some reading recently on topics that not not forbidden or racial or religious. Pure history. Like what do we know about? Ancient civilizations. And the answer is like basically nothing. No. And the idea that.

Rosanne: Porcheria, did you read about tartaria? Oh, my God. Oh.

Tucker: No. So I'm I'm a neophyte here. This is like all new to me. I'll just start with the one thing that we do know which is what we don't know which is how the. And I don't understand how we could send men to the moon, but no one can come up with even a rough theory for how the pyramids are built. Or even what age they are cause we don't know that either actually.

Rosanne: Yeah. And they're under the water too. I didn't know that. Yeah, there's pyramids under the water.

Tucker: But why can I ask you this? Since you know much more than. But why is there such institutional resistance to acknowledging that we don't know certain things?

Rosanne: Because we do know. Ohh thought about that. Yeah hello.

Jake: That's interesting. Wait, explain that.

Speaker 3: A little that's really tough.

Rosanne: No, because everything, everything is the people at the tippy top, the owners of the world, the big club. What George Carlin says that you and me ain't in. We ain't in it.

Tucker: I've never been invited.

Rosanne: No, we're never going to be either. Please, God. But but they know everything. They they know the real they, you know, it's all in the Vatican library. So they know everything. It's all there like it was in Alexandria. She had Cleopatra had the history of the world in Alexandria. Remember the sacking of the libraries of Alexandria and clip it? Well, they took it all to Rome.

Jake: It also said how the pyramids were.

Speaker 3: Built and in that library.

Rosanne: Yeah, you know what it said they use frequency they used.

Tucker: Well, I have to say, like you would think that technology, if we can create AI, yeah, AI. But if we can have super computers capable of doing what our computers can currently do, you'd think someone be able to at least come up with a plausible theory. And the fact that we can't. It doesn't prove anything other than the limits to our knowledge are.

Rosanne: No, but I've heard physicists say that this was done by, you know, some sort of machinery, like the finest cutting machinery that used the highest frequency that cut the stone.

Tucker: And how are they moved with no wheels?

Rosanne: I can't remember magnets, magnets.

Jake: Slaves. Lots of slaves.

Tucker: Yeah, but I mean, I've seen well. Aliens in here, here in North America, there are certain archaeological ruins in the state of Missouri. They were not built by the descendants of the current American Indians. We know that that are one of them's a mile long. Yeah, a mile long.

Jake: I'm just throwing stuff up.

Tucker: In Missouri now, yeah. It's almost nothing like I've never heard any of this in school. It's all totally real. Look it up. It's on Wikipedia, which is the most CIA controlled information source in.

Rosanne: The world. What does it look like?

Tucker: It's it's a. It's a mound, it's. Tell, but you know 50 feet high or something. I'm guessing on that.

Jake: Oh, they're finding stuff all all over. We have Jimmy Corsetti coming on. He finds stuff all over.

Tucker: So there is a. Overwhelming numbers. There's proof that there were massive population centers in North America long before 1492. So what? What? The all I'm. Saying the only thing we know for certain.

Rosanne: Well, the Mormons have the Book of Mormon. They say that that was. The history of those people.

Tucker: Well, the 10 lost tribes of Israel came to the United States, and I've certainly spent a lot of my life making fun.

Rosanne: Right across the Bering Sea.

Tucker: Of that. But I'm gonna stop.

Rosanne: Yeah, but who knows what?

Tucker: Weeks. That's exactly right.

Rosanne: But I think that somebody or some group of somebodies, they know how stuff works and they got it all.

Tucker: But why is no one interested in that? I don't. Understand why this isn't like the most.

Rosanne: No people are interested, but there's no way they can find it because information.

Tucker: But if you're NBC News, like, why don't you do this like a nightly segment on, like, all the mysteries of history? Cause they're kind of.

Rosanne: Because they just wanna know about Kim Kardashian's ***. That's all they care.

Tucker: Talk about uninteresting.

Rosanne: Well, I. And I think.

Tucker: And I'm a man. I'm I think I have a license to assess that not that impressive. Like all the conversations about that, it's like not one of the wonders of the World it's.

Rosanne: Well, it is for me, Tucker, because I was born Assless in an asset based economy and my whole life.

Tucker: Yeah, you did well anyway. I have a.

Rosanne: Say if I had an S like that, I would have made something. Of myself.

Tucker: No, no, because I mean Dubai has no natural resources and it's one of the richest places in the world. Equatorial Guinea has massive oil reserves and it's Covered. So I actually think when you don't have the resources that you have to. Improvise. That's true. That's.

Jake: True talent is overrated. You read that. Book no. It's the. Basically whoever has to work harder. It's the I.

Tucker: There's. I think that's right, I think.

Jake: Not born talents *****.

Rosanne: I know true. True, but.

Jake: Can I ask a question real? Real quick to you, because you were talking a. Few minutes before about.

Rosanne: I know what Jake wants to do.

Unknown: Well, no, no this.

Jake: Is some different lying for lying sake and that it's not political and it's theological? Is it within the realm of possibility that this movement that we're fighting now is actually?

Tucker: What it would mean in the realm of possibility. Yeah, you.

Unknown: Have you thought?

Jake: Know cause there's another explanation. Yeah, it's.

Tucker: Well, it's the definition.

Jake: Filtration to destroy America.

Tucker: Of course, because it's not looking. Both what's not satanic is like the Sicilian mafia, right? You know, they pimp out women, they loan shark, they sell heroin, but they do it because they want to get a bigger. House in far? Rockaway, I get it. It's it's money. It's totally it's a it's a commercial transaction. It hurts people, it's bad, it's.

Jake: Money. It makes sense, yeah.

Tucker: Illegal, but it's explicable. Right, I understand that yes, you know. What we're seeing now is not explicable. It's not why would he? Billionaire, do you know you have a billion dollars? You. Can't spend at all, right? It's much deeper than that, right? And why would you hate things that are true that don't affect you, right? You can't stand to hear something that's just objectively true.

Jake: Which means you're.

Tucker: What is that? You're evil. The hatred of truth is the hallmark of darkness. Obviously, I agree.

Rosanne: Yes, it is absolutely well because they the only because I think it's a cyst. I think it's a very dark system that was created over. I don't know how many centuries but. You know, I think it goes back to. Really dark times and it's never disappeared. It's like they've been building and building for a really long time.

Tucker's Franco admiration

Tucker: Well, you do. See, I was saying this yesterday. I flew from Europe yesterday, so of course I had like 10 hours to read, which is usually bad. But I was thinking yesterday that there are certain periods in history where people become in. I was thinking the Spanish Civil War. I was flying from Spain, but I was also with the French Revolution. I was thinking about the destruction of the temple in 70 AD in Jerusalem.

Rosanne: 2 temples.

Tucker: And yeah, two devils. But that was the last one that was destroyed by the Romans during the revolt and the pointless the there are these weird explosions of. Irrational hatred, rage, violence, where no one's actually winning, like they're killing for the sake of. Killing. Hmm. Yes. And you see these throughout history and like, what is that? Yeah, no one's actually benefiting from this. Mm-hmm. Killing people, making them suffer, humiliating them, torturing them, burning things down that you could steal. But you burn them anyway.

Rosanne: The sake of killing.

Tucker: Yeah, you saw this in our cities a couple of years ago. Like, what is that?

Rosanne: Yes, Terry.

Tucker: It but it's. Not rational like a terrorist like ETA. The you know best. Separatist group like they killed policemen so they could get a little closer to the goal, which was separating from Spain's. I get it, it makes sense, right?

Jake: Makes sense?

Tucker: But murdering people just to murder them, burning their stuff when you could steal it, that's again a spiritual phenomenon.

Rosanne: Yes, well, they go on TikTok. It's like the Andy Warhol thing, 15 seconds of fame, I'm sure he said 15 minutes. But for the 15 seconds of TikTok fame, that's what they're doing it for. A lot of them.

Tucker: Yes, but they're, like, seized by some spirit of destructiveness. Like that's it. And that's.

Rosanne: Well, it's a demon spirit, Monica.

Tucker: Always been here. It's ohh and it emerges. Is and we actually we lie to ourselves and imagine we got our total in our control. Everything can be explained rationally. That's why I hate this whole they're in it. For the money if.

Rosanne: Yeah. No, they're not.

Tucker: You think that's all it's about? You're gonna miss what's actually happened. Well.

Rosanne: We're going to miss what it's really about.

Jake: You both got fired when you had the. #1 television shows you guys were. Both racking money in. Well, I'm just bringing up now. Because it's obviously not about the money, it's about the money. Both you. Still have your job? That's.

Tucker: A good point. It's it's it's they don't.

Rosanne: Yeah, that's what gets me too.

Jake: Like what you were saying and what you were doing. And it's something that said we had to take them off. **** it. **** our stockholders. We're gonna do it. Anyway, that's weird.

Rosanne: Well, I overheard in my writers room one of the writers who was a, you know. In the. Democrat thing, well, they all were, but. She said. I'm just afraid this show is humanizing Trump voters, yeah.

Tucker: Humanizing human beings wouldn't want to do that.

Rosanne: Yeah. I mean think about that.

Tucker: People can't hear themselves.

Rosanne: No they can't.

Tucker: I would never even think that about Biden voters. I think they're. Human beings, I. Think and I know some of them and not a ton at this point, but I do.

Rosanne: Course they are.

Tucker: Know still some and they're.

Rosanne: I have all in my family. You know, it's like that's why I wanted to do the show I did to show a Hillary hater and.

Tucker: Yeah, that's right.

Rosanne: Family and they still loved each other cause I knew this terrible division. They were pushing, and then they blame Trump for them. It's like the rape victim and they humiliate her was that's why I said I said they treat Trump like a woman in the press because it's a rape victim that they.

Tucker: That's right.

Speaker 3: I know the honor killing.

Rosanne: They harass, set up, frame. And then refused to let them. He doesn't even get a jury in that Letitia James trial. So that's like, it's a witch burning it. It's not. He says, witch hunt. But it's a witch burning. And, you know he's not allowed. He's got under gag order to say this is *****, which everybody knows it is. There's

not even, you know, it's not even a law. Is this law fair? Gone mad, which the whole Democrat party this law fair gone mad? Lawyers that can't get a job anywhere else but for corporations, for corporations and it gets.

Tucker: Whatever it takes.

Rosanne: Maybe because there's nothing less democratic than a corporation, for God's sake.

Jake: Right.

Tucker: I I have noticed that. I would never work for one again I'll tell you that, never under any circumstance.

Advert Begins

Rosanne: Do you trust anything that's being parroted out of the mouth of so-called experts on the TV.

Jake: No. When I hear trust, the experts, I know they're lying.

Rosanne: After the last three years, I I just don't trust anybody. That's why I'm I'm very excited to introduce you guys to the Wellness company.

Jake: Me either.

Rosanne: And specifically their medical emergency kit says 90% of UH pharmaceuticals are produced overseas, like in China. Scary is that. Yeah. Cause, yeah.

Jake: Go to war with them. You're not getting your meds. You're not getting your meds. If we go to war with China, that's fine.

Rosanne: Right.

Jake: Yeah, there'll be a shortage. They're already reporting a shortage of like antibiotics. 95% of pharmacies are reporting that there's a shortage, right?

Rosanne: Now anyway, it's a scary time. We need to be prepared. The kit is has it has eight potentially life saving medication so you can feel safer. It comes with meds like.

Jake: Amoxicillin is 1.

Rosanne: Celine, you read those, Jake? Oh yeah, that's the big one. Zoom pack.

Jake: That's the horse pace Z pack, and it also has a 22 page guidebook, which is basically like having a doctor on call. You don't have, you don't have to go on Web MD and see you have cancer. If they scare the **** out of you, that's just.

Rosanne: Yeah, but it's everything from tick bites to COVID natural disasters to supply chain shortages. Because that's a big one. Supply chain shortages, everything's covered. Go to TWC dot health.

Jake: Yeah, yeah, they got it. Forward slash RB. And use the code RB and you'll save 10% at checkout. That's TWC dot health forward slash RB and use the promo code RB for 10% off.

Rosanne: And the kits are only available in the USA, right?

Jake: Yeah, this is this.

Rosanne: Which is cool. That's cool.

Jake: Yeah, that's how you know it's medically backed cause if it was like global, that'd be a little bit suspicious. So yeah, it's Doctor McCullough. I've looked into it. It's. I mean, it's it's a legit company, you know, don't take medical. Advice from us, obviously.

Rosanne: How many of them things do I have?

Jake: We just got we. Just got three, one for the family for you and the two family members we.

Rosanne: I gotta get one of those for everybody for Christmas.

Jake: Yeah, that would be a great and a.

Rosanne: Christmas present. That's what I'm doing. So write me down and get me that.

Jake: I will and liberal are liberal your liberal children.

Rosanne: How? Hell, I'll even give them one.

Jake: They would love they love ivermectin. They're huge fans.

Rosanne: I know now that which fans after Joe. Rogan came out with it.

Jake: No, that's. That was when it was horse paced, but yeah. Anyway, so yeah, TWC dot health forward slash RB use promo code RB for 10%.

Advert Ends

Rosanne: No, I'd rather be on the street.

Tucker: I'd rather be poor. Yeah, I've been poor. It's not. Not preferable, but better than working for those people. Yeah, yeah, yeah. Let's just yeah.

Rosanne: You still remember I sent you that video when you got fired about it was you, and there was a guy with your hat head, but he was tapped, dancing and he was getting thrown out. And then he starts flying, remember that? Do you feel like you're flying?

Tucker: I do remember. Well, I was. I mean, I was not surprised. I mean, I of course I was surprised. I didn't expect to get, you know, my show cancelled Monday morning, but I wasn't. If I took three steps back, I was not surprised at. All I mean. First of all, televisions like that, people get fired. There are all kinds of lines that no one will explain explicitly. I'm a very literal person, so I would. Totally happy if you know. I'm knowledge that just I would always say just write it down for me. Ohh, I can't say just. Can you just send me a text? I've got a bad memory, yeah.

Rosanne: That's what I say too.

Tucker: Ohh, I can't. I can't be conservative on a conservative TV channel, just write that down for me. If you would just so. I can have. It as a reference point.

Unknown: Well, you know the lines.

Tucker: Not I really don't cause I'm kind of stupid, so if you could just. So I knew on a gut like I knew they were very nice to me. I should say that and be clear about it. They were very nice to me the entire time I was there, but I could feel that they strongly disagreed in the war in Ukraine, stuff.

Jake: Do you think that's what it? Was I mean?

Tucker: I I don't know. I'm just speculating.

Rosanne: One of many.

Tucker: But they they. Really didn't like that at all. The January 6 stuff, they really didn't like. We had a bunch. We will quit over that.

Rosanne: Well, they hated.

Jake: That I think that was.

Tucker: And and mostly I would say mediocre you. Know like Chris Wallace should not be on television, or Jonah Goldberg. Or so. You know what I mean? These are people who, obviously the audience hated and shouldn't have been in the 1st place, but they were so outraged because I said. You know, it seems like there are probably a lot of feds in the crowd on January 6, and now it turns out, of course, there were, like, way more even than I imagined. The whole thing was a complete setup. The whole thing was a lie, and it was used to put people.

Rosanne: No, yeah, busloads.

Jake: It work.

Tucker: In prison for expressing. Their constitution protected buttons.

Rosanne: 1A a three time Purple Heart winner.

Speaker 3: Ohh I know. Ohh and.

Rosanne: I have no shame.

Tucker: No, absolutely not. And by the way, what does it say about them? Like, I would never put someone. Prison, even if you had, like, a real crime, unless I really had to. I don't want to put people in prison. Yeah, I guess I'm the liberal. Yeah, I I've. I've visited. I was in a prison last week. They're very depressing. I saw Julian Assange in London. Wouldn't put people in prison. No, except for a very good reason. And.

Rosanne: I wanted to ask you about the.

Tucker: They talked about it in prison.

Rosanne: The truth is talk about the truth being illegal. Look at who's paid for it. With dozens of people.

Tucker: Well, Assange has never been accused of lying. Or of fraud. Or of making money in some criminal scheme, Assange has been accused of. Telling the truth. Period. Yeah. And they are torturing him to. Death in front. Of all of us, no one's doing anything. Got it. And that Mike Pompeo was very, very sinister person, the worst and I always thought that, and I've told Trump that never should have allowed him to run CIA or state. But Mike Pompeo tried to have him murdered.

Rosanne: Isn't he?

Tucker: And that's a criminal act. He's not even charged with a crime in the United States. And Mike Pompeo was CIA director. Just came. Out Pompeo didn't deny it.

Jake: I never heard.

Rosanne: This I saw.

Tucker: Yes. Ohh absolutely.

Jake: It Oh my God.

Tucker: He tried to have Julian Assange murdered poisoned in the Ecuadorian embassy in London, and that's a fact. OK, and it's been established and OK, yes. Why is Mike Pompeo not in prison? You're not allowed to murder people extrajudicially.

Rosanne: Right.

Tucker: Especially they haven't even been charged in the United States, which he had not been. So Mike Pompeo runs around these stupid Republican donor events. And you're like a world expert on whatever. And he's a criminal, and he should be in jail. Like, if if Julian Assange is. In jail? How about? The attempted murderer. Right. How about what am I?

Rosanne: Missing. How about the people that?

Unknown: Makes sense?

Rosanne: Put Julian Assange in jail. They should be in jail.

Tucker: 100% first, they accuse him falsely of rape, rape. So you know that just shuts people down. He's a *****. It's like Kitty *****. It's like, I don't even want to know more. You're bad, right? But then it starts out. There was not enough evidence to charge him. He didn't commit rape. That was a. Right. He's never been accused of doing anything. He's by the way. He spent 4 1/2 years in prison. In the UK at Belmarsh prison, which is where, it's where all the murderers in London go, and he's never been charged with a crime. Wow. In the United Kingdom to this day, he's not charged with a crime. He's being held at the request of the US government.

Rosanne: For God.

Tucker: And he's just sitting there and they're they're torturing to death. I mean, he's of course dying as you are when you've spent a total of, what, 13 years now in incarceration, so.

Rosanne: I wanted Trump to pardon him and I was really disappointed.

Tucker: Yeah, I was. I was disappointed I and I think you know Trump, I would say one I think very fair criticism of Trump. He does tend to run himself with some of the most mediocre people.

Rosanne: Yeah, I don't think he can find better.

Tucker: And then. Maybe right? But I have to say Mike Pompeo and I saw it up close and I saw it intimately close is a liar and a flatterer. Beware the flatterers. You know, if someone comes up to you and says I don't like you, ***** you and here's why I. Can deal. With that, yeah, if someone's like, you know, I really think you may be the reincarnation of the Godhead. I think. I think you're Buddha. Actually, I'm just being that person is my enemy. That person is trying to subvert me. Yeah. Is trying to suborn me. There's something very.

Rosanne: I can too. Yeah. Yes, that's right. That I learned that, yes.

Tucker: Feline and dangerous about that. And that's who he is. He's a liar and he's the reason that he, I I'm not speculating. He is the reason that Trump didn't release the JFK files which implicate the CIA in the murder of an American president and and others.

Rosanne: Right.

Tucker: And others, yeah. Yeah. Well, true anyway. Yes.

Rosanne: But yeah, Trump, I that's why I. Well, I'll tell you that later. But now, now you're going where I want to go. And I'm already there too. But yeah, I. I wish he had done that. I think that all of us wanted him to.

Tucker: And I think he knows that he made a mistake and I. And I think 1.

Rosanne: Of the I want him to say if I'm reelected, I will pardon Julian Assange.

Tucker: Assange, and also because one man's life is as valuable as any other man's life. I mean, we're all created by God.

Rosanne: The guy put his whole life on through exposed to America, the war crimes that were committing.

Tucker: It's it's totally right. Completely right. And but that's not why they're holding, they're holding. Because so there was the Afghanistan and Iraq files, including that famous video of the reporters getting killed. So that was bad. It was when he released details about the CIA. Sorry about the CIA's.

Speaker 3: MM.

Tucker: A spying program they had, including on Americans. That's when Pompeo was like, we're gonna. Kill him now, yeah.

Rosanne: OK. Yeah.

Tucker: So the CIA doesn't have any oversight.

Rosanne: And also it it's also about the hacking of the DNC, DNC. That's why I think they.

Jake: That's what I think it. Is because he named Seth, he said. Someone named Seth gave.

Tucker: Him the yeah. So I. Asked him directly about that in prison, I asked him about Seth Rich. And he said, I'm not gonna. And he and I mean that's true. He did not budge on. I'm. Not gonna reveal my sources, but.

Rosanne: That's great for him.

Jake: Yeah, it was.

Tucker: But it's pretty clear that those files were not hacked by Russia. No, there's no evidence they were hacked.

Jake: That was.

Tucker: A leak right that they were downloaded from within the building. I think Bill Binney, I think from NSA, former NSA officer pretty much demonstrated that and they lied about that and we went up at war with Russia as a result.

Rosanne: Right.

Tucker: Of that lie. So like. That's a pivotal moment, but I completely missed it by the. Right. You know at the time Sean Hannity was all over it and I was like, I don't know what that's about. I'm not getting involved in that conspiracy stuff or whatever. And then a couple years later, I happen to know some of the people involved in that. Personally, just because I lived there and. I knew two people involved and one who worked at DNC and another who worked on MPD, the Metropolitan

Police Department, and both them are. Like dude? That's come on now and I. Was like, really, yeah.

Jake: I thought it was obvious.

Rosanne: I thought it was.

Tucker: So I didn't. I was so stupid cause I lived there, you know, it was like.

Speaker 3: Yeah, well.

Tucker: If you're surrounded, it's like if you ever known some with an alcoholic spouse. Yeah, and they get divorced. Then all the friends are like, you know, your wife is a really bad drunk. And he's like, I know she liked to drink, but she was an alcoholic. Really. Way too close to it. And I just couldn't see it. And I Trump's arrival and the not wasn't Trump was the reaction to Trump, really from my neighbors. And everyone knew him. And I was like something's wrong here. You can't even answer simple questions about why we're doing certain things. Why NATO. Exists or whatever. Yeah, that was the first tip off, but it took me several years to realize just how screwed up all this stuff was. Yeah, because I knew everyone. Involved, I mean. Like, do you spend a lifetime somewhere in a small town like DC? You know everybody. And I'm like, I can't believe so. And so was involved in some like that and then. A lot of that stuff is true. I mean it too, and I'm not speculating at all and I'm trying to be responsible and not overstate all whatever. But you'll say it, but I'm just telling you, I guess what I'm saying is, the more you know about.

Rosanne: Yeah, I know, I know.

Tucker: It. Yeah, the truer it, obviously. Is. Well, that's.

Rosanne: Yeah, red in our face. Yeah. It's not like, you know where the Emperor goes down the street naked on the horse and the people.

Tucker: It's right in your face.

Rosanne: They're like, hey, you're naked or somebody says some crazy old Jewish lady naked, and they try to lock her up. But it's even worse because it's like he's not.

Tucker: We rate.

Rosanne: Just naked, waving his penis in everyone's face in the parades. Which? We're doing. He's rubbing his **** right on our nose because he's, like, do something about you don't like it? What you mean?

Tucker: That's totally true.

Rosanne: You don't like it?

Tucker: We're getting tea bagged, there's no doubt.

Jake: About it, absolutely.

Speaker 3: Yeah, that's the answer, Sir.

Tucker: It's funny. I was in my late 40s. Sorry. That's so vulgar. I'm so. Bored. I love it.

Jake: Vulgar, so my podcast.

Tucker: I know, but I I spent my whole life, you know, hearing the baby boomers talk about the Kennedy assassination. And I'm just like, come on. We had a Warren Commission. There was this guy called Harvey Oswald, the Marine. He defected to

the Soviet Union. It's obvious like he hated Kennedy because he was a cold warrior. It all made sense to me, I was literally in my late 40s. Before I was like, wait a second. This doesn't the. Lone gunman kills the lone gunman.

Rosanne: On TV.

Tucker: On TV, like. Wait, what are? The odds of that anyway? 2. Lone gunmen? Really. And anyway, so then it culminated last year when I spoke to someone at the age of 53 who had seen the. The classified files that were not being released and I spoke to someone directly. I'm not speculating and someone who I know for a fact saw them and who told me directly on the phone. Yes, they implicate the CIA. Wow. James Jesus Angleton. That's. I mean, C is a big operation. That's not everyone in the CIA but the Operations Directorate run by this guy called Angleton.

Jake: Ohh wow.

Tucker: Very famous guy. Yeah, they had absolute knowledge of this and participated in it. And I was like, my head exploded. I was like, I cannot believe all the crazy people were. Well, wait, so that's so it was so obvious to everybody else, but because I lived there. I knew of course I applied to the CIA in college and.

Rosanne: Oh my God.

Tucker: I know it's like crazy.

Jake: You would have been good.

Tucker: In 1990. One and they didn't let me in. Thank heaven I would have been terrible at it. But it's. Just it was such. A far distance for me to go mentally. To realize all this stuff, I just can't even tell you. And I finally left. I had to leave the city, I.

Rosanne: Was like I can't live here anymore because you you just have that naivety of the good, happy America where you know, we all do it. We can't be stopped enough.

Tucker: Especially, you know. The people, it's like I know these people I've known Mike Pompeo since he was a congressman from Kansas and I. Never. I was like. Yeah, he's like your average Republican guy. Didn't like, he's not evil. He's kind of like Joe Ville. He's pretty smart, actually. Went to West Point like. I never thought about. But it's like, no, this is really dark. Nobody overseas the CIA, its budget is not publicly disclosed, right? CIA owns companies and it kills people. Yeah. That's all fact. I mean, that's not I'm not speculating at all. And I don't mean in 19, I'm not talking about overthrowing most of that right in 53, I'm talking about 2023 seventy years ago. Right now it's more powerful than it's ever been.

Speaker 3: Good mocking birthday.

Tucker: And I mean I. I only get too personal, but like I know a lot of people work CIA, and I know four different cases where I personally was involved or right next to someone who was where CIA officers bought or sold multi \$1,000,000 houses including. You know what I'm currently involved with and you sort of ask like, how would a CIA officer be able to afford a \$4 million house or a \$10 million? What you're you're a federal employee. Like, where's this money coming from?

Speaker 3: Yeah. Mm-hmm.

Tucker: Me, I probably shouldn't be talking about this.

Rosanne: No, that's like like, it's like shot in Hawaii. No, it's like that in Hawaii. I'm like, wow, you must have made it big, you know, because I'm nose. What'd you do? Oh, well, we work for, you know, we're military contractors. Why, you got a house 10 times bigger than?

Tucker: But it's like. It's crazy. I never even thought about it.

Rosanne: OK. And you were, what's? Something like selling toothbrushes? I don't know. Something.

Jake: Yes, 10% for the big guy is what it.

Tucker: Is I I I just saw.

Rosanne: It's all a scam, isn't it?

Tucker: That the other in the little town I want again. I don't wanna get. Too, we don't wanna.

Speaker 3: Want to?

Tucker: Get much, but I've seen that a lot. In fact, the House that I lived in in high school in Georgetown, my father bought from the officer in Georgetown, and my father paid him in cash. In actual bills, \$100,000 in bills. And this guy didn't live there. He lived in Ireland, but he did a CIA operations officer for his whole life. You know, second one word, OSC. I, my whole neighbor, was full of people like this. And he owned this. 3047 1/2 N St. Northwest DC That's where I lived. And that was bought from Mr. Taddy, who was a CIA officer. And it's like, how did I said to my dad, like you paid him in bills. He went to the bank, I got bills. How did the guy he goes, I don't know. It was some houses I owned, but he wound up with it. It's like, is that a federal government works. I work for a company. They had lots of assets. I didn't wind up owning those assets. Like what? Who's doing the accounting here?

Unknown: Like what?

Rosanne: Is you know what? It's such a scam. Here's the scam of it. That's why they get the left and the right. Going on it because they social. I got to say this right, they socialize. Risk and then privatize the profits. It's the greatest frigging scam you could come up with. It's a Stalin Hitler pact. More that ****.

Tucker: It is in Washington, DC, is the beneficiary. Yeah. Nothing is made in Washington. There's no innovation. There's no manufacturing. There's no banking even really. There's no finance sector. There's really nothing. There's no arts. There's no television other than, like cable news. Just. Block the only business in Washington is government. OK, that makes sense. It's the capital city, but it's also the richest city in the United States and the counties around it. The richest counties? Mm-hmm. Like 8. Out of 10, I think yeah. Or color. DC ring DC it's all for.

Rosanne: Them like Trump said.

Tucker: That's corruption. If that was taking place in Africa, you'd be like, well.

Jake: That's corrupt. Yeah, it's like the.

Rosanne: Cartel. Well, remember when Trump won because he said this, we will be replacing this government that serves only to enrich itself, has nothing to do with you. Everyone loves that because it's true.

Tucker: That's it's so.

Rosanne: It is. They don't even see the homeless people on the street and they're still fighting over who's going to go. They don't even close the border in this country, but they're closing it in Ukraine. It's crazy. They do on their way into their mansion.

Tucker: They step over the bodies of fentanyl addicts as well send more money.

Jake: There's no bodies now. They cleaned it up for cleaning now.

Tucker: Yeah, San Francisco did.

Rosanne: You're seeing me.

Tucker: It's not anything that's offended me more. It's like. It's what you're saying is you could have solved this problem for.

Speaker 3: Yeah, yeah.

Tucker: The people who live there.

Rosanne: Well, I want to know where he put them. I want to know where he put those homeless people. Yeah, he might have sent an up sending up to.

Speaker 3: Oh, come.

Rosanne: Aunt Nancy's vineyard. Maybe they're up there.

Tucker: Totally possible. Or else there's gonna be like, it's possible that the price of kidneys is gonna go way down. Yeah.

Rosanne: See, that's what I think. Damn it. That's what I thought, you know.

Tucker: The market for kidneys is flooded and a lot of kidneys, all of.

Unknown: A sudden.

Rosanne: I think that is, you know what I say. You know, I'm horrible. No, I'm lay darker because I said, well, you know what they're doing is they're grinding that up with the Planned Parenthood feed us meat and sell it to Bill Gates for his new meat.

Tucker: Right, it's dark.

Jake: I love it as well as the right podcast.

Speaker 3: Right.

Rosanne: I swear they are. They're going to be selling at McDonald's. The new fetus burgers I tell you.

Tucker: That that may be right. That may be right. I've got bad eating habits, but. I I'm not eating there.

Rosanne: It's going to be fetus burgers, wall to wall. That's what it is mixed in with bugs. Talk about smoking. How much do you love smoking?

Tucker: I I wouldn't put.

Rosanne: Craig, daughter. Ohh. It's disgusting. How can they?

Unknown: We do too.

Tucker: More than.

Rosanne: You don't now.

Jake: When's the last time you smoke?

Tucker: And I smoked a cigarette this summer because the guy I know owns a cigarette.

Jake: Might have.

Tucker: Company called Hestia. Very stylish little cigarettes and. And so he came. Whatever he sent me a couple cases of cigarettes and I put them in our studio because I think people should be able to smoke if they want. You could always smoke indoors. My house and.

Advert Begins

Rosanne: Buck what did you think of Kim Kardashian being named Man of the Year?

Unknown: Who's book?

Rosanne: Oh, buck. Buck has my other son, my youngest child.

Unknown: Kim Kardashian was not man of the. Year yes, she was.

Speaker 3: Jayden not.

Jake: No, Kim says this for the Twitter show. She was named Man of the. Year. That's true.

Speaker 3: What year?

Jake: This year in GQ, holy smoke. Gets by this kid.

Rosanne: OK. But I was thinking I should do. If she's man of the year, then I could sell this product, which is called manscaping, because I could talk about I could be man of the year.

Unknown: Right. I know this product.

Rosanne: Like Kim and talked about shaving my balls and stuff.

Jake: Yeah. Or your face. I. Know you shave your face a lot.

Rosanne: Oh my God, I got the smoother shave off my last couple of days, but it wasn't this.

Jake: No, as I say you, I I haven't used.

Rosanne: Let me use this on my face. Maybe I should, huh?

Jake: That's for your balls. That's for your after *****. But I'm saying you could try this for on your face for real. That they sent you the product to. Test so you can shave your face.

Unknown: I'll try it. You want to use it you.

Rosanne: Are you OK? Put this first.

Jake: Want to shave your? Beard. Right now, what you're promoting is this performance package. Five point O that's in the case that has the Lawnmower 5.0, which is the razor.

Rosanne: Yeah, yeah.

Jake: It should hold. That's the one box holding. So show that to the camera so. With this kit, this is a Christmas gift for the man in your. Life or yourself? If you're a lady with balls. So that's the lawnmower, 5 point. Oh yeah, I'm saying try it on. Your beard right now.

Rosanne: No, because I already shave.

Jake: Oh, the weed whacker 2.0 in your other hand is the nose and hair trim.

Rosanne: Wait till tomorrow for my alarm.

Jake: Yeah. And then it comes with two liquid formations that you're. Showing but those are for for helping. Aftershave with your balls or your face. It also comes with that.

Rosanne: Ohh, the hair, nose hair and your hair is a women. Women are not women, but women think you're not well groomed with nose and ear hair, but yeah.

Speaker 3: Let Jake finish.

Jake: It also comes with that. Yeah, I always knew my nose and hair. That's more important than your balls to. Be honest. Some girls like hairy balls.

Rosanne: It it was. Yeah. For the first day.

Jake: Yeah, there are girls that like hairy balls. There's. No girls that likes hairy ears and nose.

Rosanne: That's correct.

Jake: So that's the important. It also comes. With that toiletry bag that you put. Over there you can grab it.

Rosanne: Oh yeah.

Jake: It comes with moisture wicking boxers. Unfortunately I tried those out so I didn't want you to have to try those out because they're I'm. Wearing them right now. In the back.

Rosanne: To adjust to adjustments for the.

Jake: Yeah. And they protect your skin so you can put. These right on. Your balls or. Your face, but it will not cut you. That's the most important thing about.

Rosanne: This product? Ohh yeah, you don't want to cut your balls you. Don't want a. Product that you know or you cut your balls by using it. I think that's not a plus in the product. Do you hell? I think it blurred, it works.

Speaker 3: Yeah, yeah.

Jake: Ma, you want it? Yeah, it's really. Good. You don't you keep that.

Unknown: Yeah, I don't really want to use it.

Jake: Yeah, never mind. That's all yours. So anyway, Mom, please read this, and then we. Can get back to Tucker.

Rosanne: Get 20% off and free shipping with the code Roseanne at manscape.com. That's 20% off with freeshipping@manscape.com and use the code Roseanne gift him manscape. Manscaped and unwrap your favorite present this year.

Jake: Yeah, that Manscape performance pack. So you. Could buy this. For Buck or anyone in your family, or if you're. A man watching yourself.

Rosanne: I think it's a good gift to give your adult sons because you know it's a good message to tell your sons that they have to have nice hygiene to care about their, you know, presentation. They're always talking about. Women have to get waxed, blah, blah. Well, you could shave your balls back a bit.

Jake: That's true. Anyway, let's get back to Tucker.

Advert Ends

Tucker: So I smoked one. I tried to smoke it and I quit when I was 45. I'm now 54. So nine years ago. And I didn't like it.

Jake: It's disgusting.

Rosanne: Well, and that's.

Tucker: It was sad and I was like, oh, I'll probably get hooked again. But you can't smoke anywhere, so I figured I'm not gonna get it. I said I was sitting alone in my barn and I was like, on fire. One of these puppies up and I smoke cigars and I. You know, I I chew tobacco, actually, secretly Zin quite a bit. He's so good. And then I use Zin. Yeah. Ice dip. Copenhagen. My whole, you know, since 1983. Forty years. I've I really enjoyed it, but I I lost the tape. It was like sucking it in. I didn't like.

Jake: He loved this. He loved the sand.

Rosanne: There's nothing like it.

Jake: It they're different now. It's just like McDonald's isn't this?

Rosanne: Well, you gotta you can't just do it once, honey. You gotta keep turning it over. By the fifth one.

Tucker: No, I know, I know, I. Should have. I should have done.

Jake: You guys can go.

Tucker: The best cigarette I ever had. I smoked camel regulars. The little ones my Wife. And then I switched at the end at the very end of last year, I smoked American Spirit Blues. Right, I.

Rosanne: That's what everyone smokes.

Tucker: Yeah, man, I take the filter off those things. I don't like filters. I never liked them and I take the filter off that thing and it was the strongest cigarette I've ever smoked in my life, ever stronger than a camel. Lucky strike, Pell mount, anything. Chesterfield, I mean, like that stronger than any of the French cigarettes. Well, that's a that's a strong.

Rosanne: Well, those are some good. Yes it is.

Tucker: Right. Well, that does you, you know, you you read about when there are. There's a spate of OD's, you know, in a big city there's always some batch of heroin or fentanyl comes in that's like especially pure and all the junkies line up for it. Now they hear that someone. Died of it. And I'll go. Buy it? Sell. That's the.

Speaker 3: No, that's.

Tucker: Market. It's the market exactly and.

Unknown: I'm not so fat.

Tucker: That's what Americans fear blue with no filter. I don't like to catch that.

Jake: What was? Uh, I wanted to ask about the Spain trip.

Rosanne: No, go ahead.

Jake: I know we're running.

Rosanne: No, like I had to do my cigarette stray first. My first cigarette I got to tell you, I tell you about my dad kind of *****.

Tucker: Yeah. Was he a smoker?

Rosanne: Ohh hell yeah. Ohh Gold 5 packs a day. No, no filter. Yeah, one like this all day. So he thought it was real funny. I was three. He he got. He taught me to smoke when I was.

Tucker: Ohh gold. Filter tipped or not?

Rosanne: Three years old.

Tucker: Ohh that's so great.

Rosanne: I'm not feeling so.

Tucker: Teach. Teach your children, I always say.

Rosanne: Good. And I did. I did it, and he'd have his friends. And he'd go come. Crazy. And so I'll do it. They'd all laugh, you know. But I knew how to do it. Really. Yeah.

Tucker: It's such an expression. Don't don't even get me going. But I I think, I mean, obviously smoking long term is bad for you physically. Of course it's not bad for you spiritually. Dietrich Bonhoffer in his letters and papers.

Rosanne: It's so good.

Tucker: Prison, which I totally recommend, isn't a flossenburg prison in Germany. He's been implicated in the Hitler assassination plot, and he's going to be hanged, which he was right in at the end of the war, 1945. But he has. There's this collection of letters to his sister. He was. Married and in it he keep. You know, he's talking about God and God is sustaining him and he thinks he did the right thing, even though he killed but every letter is. Like, please send more tobacco almost out of cigarettes. See. It's still the same thing. I mean, there's no smoking is bad for you, but it is not a sin against your spirit at all.

Rosanne: At all.

Tucker: And I do think that having done drugs. I'll admit it. A lot of drug use is. It changes who you are actually, and it makes it harder to have meaningful relations with people. So the fact that we hate cigarettes but encourage everyone to smoke weed, that's like 40% THC is completely changing your brain.

Rosanne: Right. What about? How can you?

Jake: Or prescription.

Tucker: Drugs. What? Or or SSRI's or whatever?

Rosanne: Well, that's how I was going to ask because you said your writing process and I'm like, dude, how can you write if you're not smoking? Because that's why I started again.

Tucker: Freaking crazy. Well, it was. It was difficult and I put the Zin. I have to say which is just concentrated nicotine really helped. But you know I missed it and.

Rosanne: Did it affect you?

Tucker: And I'll tell you what, I don't take anything else. I mean, I don't even take Advil.

Rosanne: Did it affect your writing that you couldn't smoke?

Tucker: Well, if I make totally honest, I've only gone off nicotine once in my life since I was a child. I started when I was 13 and I'm you know, so I've smoked or used nickname for 41 years and I've only gone off for one. How long was it? Only three. Or four months. To work for me like that, no? Yeah, I gained like roughly about 40 lbs and became crazy and. Started I I I think I like to think I get along with everyone I work with and I never have you ever heard. Me. Yell at. Anyone. No, I'm not a yeller at all. And and I went so crazy on someone from the HR department when I went off, I got. I went so crazy on this person was the head of HR in the city that I probably shouldn't talk about this but. Because I was off nicotine and she looked afraid and I. Could feel my I was like I lost. Troll, I said get. The **** out of my office right now, and then I filed an HR complaint against the head of HR. And like I called my producer and. I'm like, I would have found the Chuck. Like you found, he's like, whoa, whoa. So yeah, it made me I.

Unknown: Think if you use anything long.

Tucker: Enough. I'm not bragging about this at all, by the way. I'm saying this with some contrition and I and I would like to apologize. For her, for being that crazy. But yeah, I mean, I. Yeah, some people I guess are meant. To live without it. But.

Rosanne: Not you.

Tucker: Probably not.

Rosanne: But what about when you're writing? Are you on the computer, or do you long hand it?

Tucker: No, I'm I. I'm have dyslexia and I'm left-handed, right? I dominant. I mean, I can barely right at all, so I might even write on my phone. I've written a lot of.

Rosanne: On the computer.

Tucker: Scripts on my phone.

Rosanne: So what? What are you doing when you're like, you can't go, I guess.

Tucker: Totally, I always write with one of my mouth. I have a silver cup in church. I grew up and when you get baptized they they give you a silver cup. I don't know if they still do this, but it's next to my bed. Now to hold my my reading glasses. But for 25 years it sat on my writing desk and I would take a pack of camels and it fit of 20 cigarettes. And I take the pack of camels and dump it.

Rosanne: You can't do that. OK, I knew.

Tucker: In the Silver cup. Right in front of it has my name. On it you. Know Tucker Carlson, 1969. You know, Episcopal Church or. Whatever. And I would. Sit and there they don't have filters on it, so you can either way you do it, you can pull them out or flip them over. It doesn't matter. I keep them right there and I burn through multiple packs.

Unknown: But now?

Tucker: There's like industrial smoking.

Rosanne: But now you can write without that, huh?

Tucker: Yeah, it's been, you know, it's been nine years and and also the beauty of working in TV, I don't have this anymore. But we worked live obviously. So I had a deadline for my script. I filed at 7:45 for an 8:00 PM show. I had to have it, period. I mean, the show was going to go on no matter what. So that was such. A wonderful motivator, the fear.

Rosanne: Uh-huh. Yeah.

Tucker: Of that, and that is the only thing I miss from working in live TV, which I do. At all because it wrecks your life it. Makes you crazy, but.

Rosanne: Was making the deadline. Yeah, I just do everything.

Tucker: I love the deadline. I love because I'm so lazy. You know what I mean and entitled and like, I don't know. I'm gonna go fishing or play with my dogs or whatever. Chase my wife around TV show like you have. No, you know, no choice but to be serious. And I I do miss that. So. So smoking or not, you still have to.

Rosanne: Write the script, period. Well, how is it affecting you now, though? What? And you don't have, like, the Gestapo waiting for you to do so.

Tucker: Well, I kind of like it. I mean, I'm obviously older. And I'm I'm kind of marching toward death here, and I like being free. I took seven foreign trips out of the country. That's awful. It was neat.

Rosanne: Never did that. Before, right?

Unknown: No you could.

Tucker: Not. Wait, wait, go. You know, whatever. Or go to Europe for a week in the summer with my kids or something. But no, I. And we take one foreign trip or two a year at Fox. But I really want to know what's going. On the world, I think it's so interesting. And so you just flew to Spain. Yeah, yeah.

Rosanne: And demonstrated against communism. Over on your weekend.

Tucker: I didn't mean to. I went to go watch, actually. But yeah, I got it was great but. Anyway, it was so. Go liberating and great just to be able to see what's going on. I went to the Middle East. I went to South America. I went all over Europe, east and West and I just. I'd learned so much. And if you live here in the United States, we're cut off from everybody by oceans. And you have no freaking idea what's happening in the world. We don't care. Thank you. It's exactly right. They don't care.

Rosanne: Yeah, we are.

Jake: Well, we don't care either. Yeah, we don't. We don't. It's true. I don't really.

Rosanne: Well, because we we're. So bombarded by useless information 24/7. We don't. Yeah. Analyze *****. We we don't have any space. You know, our memory is full. We don't have any space to contain facts or, you know, actual things going on in the world.

Tucker: Yes, and lies and distraction.

Jake: And the arrogance of. Being American like you think, you're the only thing that. Matters. That's how I always feel I feel.

Tucker: And not feel feels really different.

Jake: I do feel that way. I actually feel that.

Tucker: The problem is that things change and but in your memory they don't. It's almost like you run into someone you knew when you were a kid or whatever, and they're like fat and bald, and you're like, wow, I can't. You're not 14 and. More. Yeah. This just happened to me in an airport. And like what happened? Well, time moved on, but you weren't paying attention. And. And the world is the same way. When I was a kid, we traveled a lot as a family and you'd be I remember getting pulled over drunk driving in a in Latin America in the 80s when I was in freshman in college, and I was just hammered. It was a rain. So I pulled over the military police. I'll never fit in this country. And I was like, I'm an American. Like, they can't do anything to me. Like the arrogance of being.

Rosanne: Oh my God. Uh-huh.

Tucker: An American then so. You know, I've got a blue passport. I'm sorry. You may not know this, but there's like now I'd. Be like **** you. You're going to jail. Yeah. Like our ability to all the rest of the world has just evaporated. It's gone.

Rosanne: Yeah, that's gone. That's all gone.

Jake: It's the opposite. Yeah, you don't. Want to say you're American? You gotta be quiet.

Tucker: It's sad. It bums me out and you don't get a sense. Of that living here at all.

Jake: When when in Spain, I mean, I just want to tie this together. It seems like something's happening there that's happening here. That probably a little bit more. Advanced. So we're talking. About this evil.

Speaker 3: Infiltration. It's the same thing, right?

Rosanne: Is it a popular software I? Think is that it?

Tucker: And it's global. It's it's absolutely global. And in fact we, yeah, we just had dinner the other night with Santiago, with the guy getting. But is it? Yeah. The main opposition leader in Spain runs the box party. And Abascal was last name and he was. I was just given the overview what's going in Spanish politics is very complicated. I've read a couple books in the Spanish.

Jake: That's great if we can.

Tucker: Civil war. I still don't fully understand it. It's very complicated politics, great country, but complicated. Everything is an acronym. Everyone's mad at each other for reasons you can't understand. And, but basically at the end of dinner, I was like that sounds like. Exactly the country that. I live in a small group of people. Are internationalists. They run everything, they have all the power, they're backed by, you know, immigrants who know nothing about Spain who are voting. Public employee unions, which are massive and and all the nonprofit sector and journalists, that's it. And then just normal people are completely screwed. Their quality of life is in rapid decline. They can't afford.

Rosanne: Right.

Tucker: Anything. And they're mad. And every time they complain about anything, someone screams. You're a racist. Shut up. Thing and it. I'm like, wow, that sounds

like where I live. Yeah, except in Spain, Spain is always the leading edge of the stuff. It was in 1936, during the Spanish of war, was obviously a preview of what happened to the rest of.

Rosanne: Right.

Tucker: The world a few years later, they. Have criminalized everything, so it is a crime in Spain is a crime in Spain to have the wrong opinions about the Spanish.

Rosanne: 40 my.

Tucker: God. And you're like, how can that even be? Well, they have a First Amendment and they don't have a tradition of freedom of speech. And so it just is you can't get up and say, I think Franco did something important for the. Middle class. You go to.

Rosanne: Jail for that. Wow. Oh, my God. I know.

Tucker: And by the way, I should say Spain.

Rosanne: Hillary sending that kid to jail for a meal.

Tucker: Exactly. Yeah, but what's crazy is this. Is not Africa, OK? Spain is a extremely civilized country, way more civilized than ours in a lot of ways. Yeah. With 1000 years of. Culture there are. And wonderful people, the most polite people in Europe, and just everything about it is great. It's not primitive at all. It's the opposite of primitive, and it's also very clean and pretty. And people are handsome. Everything about it is great, but their political system is is medieval. It's primitive, it's totalitarian in a way that you wouldn't think could exist in a place like that. And did not give me hope. At all at all.

Rosanne: Well, how are you feeling for our country?

Tucker: Not good, but I do think that the first step in understanding and combating what's happening now is seeing that it's not a political battle at all, not Republicans and Democrats have nothing in common with most Republicans in the Congress. They don't share my views or values. They don't care about my family.

Speaker 3: Right.

Tucker: They hate me. So they don't represent me at all. I. Would vote for. Them cause what else am I going to do but. But it's not about right. Left. It's not about Republican Democrat this. I mean, some arguments are of course, right. But the big ones are. Not no. It's light versus darkness. Yeah. And I'm not always positive that I'm on the right side. I I don't want to be. I don't want to imagine that I'm always right, cause I'm not, that's for sure. But I want to be. On the right side, right. And I want to see it in the correct terms and I don't think it hurts to say a prayer once in a while.

Rosanne: So your questioner, so you question it, right?

Tucker: I question myself a lot.

Rosanne: No, but I mean you question the information, that's how you know you're not under mind control is that you don't go back to the same sources for your information.

Tucker: I don't want those sources. In my head, I've read the new.

Rosanne: No, you've got to read a wide variety of sources, I think and other.

Tucker: York Times here. Yes, and knowing the one thing that I do know is that truth inflames them more than anything. That is a fact. So it's a pretty simple way to figure out what's true. You just watch. It's almost like, you know what? I like to fly fish and salt water fly fishing. You look for the birds. Where's you know where the big.

Rosanne: That's, that is.

Tucker: Fish going to be they're going around the. The bait and the little minnows swimming around where the minnows? Well, they're birds circling them. So you look up in the sky and there are a bunch of birds diving into the ocean. You're going to have fish there. OK. That's how fishermen know where the fish are. I want to know what's true. I look at who's being attacked.

Rosanne: Oh, that's a good one.

Tucker: Whose and what are they saying that has gotten them in trouble? Mm-hmm. And whatever they're saying is doesn't prove it's true, but it suggests it's true. Or it's truth adjacent. They're getting warmer.

Rosanne: So it's like where there's smoke, there's fire. Right. So they really don't. They didn't want us talking about anything to do with vaccines. And now and then they kind of relax that I got on YouTube. We're allowed to say it now and we're just not allowed to say anything about vaccine injuries. We're not allowed to say no.

Tucker: No, they didn't. Well, I had a try. Yeah. Yes. I happen to know for a fact those are real cause.

Rosanne: And work.

Tucker: It happened in my family but.

Rosanne: It happened in my family too.

Tucker: Yeah, yeah, this is a flu vaccine. Yeah, 15 years ago. And I didn't know. I can't overstate how conventional and trusting I am. I'm the opposite of a radical like whatever it is they tell me, I kind of believe it. Like, why wouldn't I? Because I try not to lie too much in my personal life. So I believe other people. Hmm. It took I I was shocked. Yeah. When I detected deception around vaccines, I never thought they would lie about science. You can't lie about it.

Rosanne: Ohh yeah you.

Tucker: Can. Well, that's for sure. Yeah. But it took me months to we were covering this every single night. I was like, this can't really be happening. They're pushing this on people when they know that it hurts them. And they don't actually know the long term offensive.

Rosanne: They factor they factor in how much it's going to cost them for when the families of the dead sue them. OK, that will be 2%. Blah blah blah.

Tucker: Well, they're not allowed.

Speaker 3: To see with vaccines. That's how they get it out.

Rosanne: Well did. I heard that they removed that. They removed that. Whatever it is that protects them.

Tucker: What trailers on that? I mean the trailers used to run DC like you'd shoot for everything, that's why.

Rosanne: That's what I wonder. I couldn't find one lawyer in all of California to go against Disney.

Unknown: What is that?

Rosanne: Everybody I called said. I'm sorry, we do work for Disney, so we. Can't take those.

Tucker: You can't even have an interesting playground equipment anymore because of the lawyers suing over playground injuries. Yeah, but you can't find lawyers to, like, push back against the VAX mandates. Like what is?

Rosanne: That are Disney in Hollywood. You'd think some *** ** * ***** that just got out of law school be hungry.

Speaker 3: It's fear, it's fear.

Rosanne: It's like a cut and dry case.

Tucker: Would you say Disney's are forced for good?

Rosanne: Or no. No, I say, you know, there's some things about it that are so cute. Like, I love the movie Moana, and I just love that movie. And because it's about a girl and her grandmother and you know, so of course, I love my grandma, you know, and she's like. I am Moana. And she's like, I don't know how far I'll go, but here she is. The chiefest. She's the chieftess when she's only eight, and she has to save her people by learning how to navigate this ship alone. On these and I was like, yes, that was me. I am Moana, you know, so. I love it.

Tucker: When, when did you realize you're Moana?

Rosanne: When I saw it with my granddaughter and we were sitting there and I was just when the grandma comes back and she's this dolphin that leads her granddaughter to save the people, I just could not take it and I took all my friends who are survivors of abuse and stuff. I go. I got something for your ***. Sit down here. We're watching moana. And they all we're reduced to tears, so I can't all the way hate dizzy because of Milan.

Tucker: Yeah, that's fair.

Jake: You separate the art from the artist.

Rosanne: And I just love it. And so did all my friends and my friend Kathy came to see me wearing the Moana necklace and we are all Moana because we see see that line where the sun meets the sky. I mean, where the sea meets the sky? I don't know how far I'll go, but it calls me. I must go. I am Moana. You know, it's like everything that I always felt my whole life. And you know, I'm going to go to the edge and find out for myself. And I did. So I have Moana.

Tucker: When did this come out?

Rosanne: Well, Maisie was 18 months old, so she's 8 now. It was 76.

Unknown: Five, 5-10 years ago.

Jake: Eight years ago.

Rosanne: Seven years.

Jake: But they have great movies.

Rosanne: You've gotta watch Moana.

Tucker: It's one of the big cultural events, one of the many I missed completely. I never heard. I've literally never heard of.

Rosanne: You gotta watch it. If you loved your grandmother, you will.

Tucker: I'll tell you, I didn't.

Rosanne: Ohh **** it then.

Tucker: She could never get my. Name right, she. No, she always. My brother's name, she always called me Buckley.

Unknown: That's what she does.

Tucker: I do that. She'd have a cigarette burning all buckly gonna pat my head. Give me a drink, OK?

Rosanne: That sounds just like my grandson was 8 years old and he goes. Granny. I wanna do my impression of you. They're all funny. I go what? He goes like this.

Unknown: Go on, go.

Rosanne: But I want to ask you before I don't know how long we have.

Tucker views Ted K as prophetic

Jake: We have a few minutes. I have to hit the hour mark. So we got about 7-8 minutes.

Rosanne: No, but we have to ask him about Kaczynski.

Jake: Yeah...

Rosanne: That's what we really want to talk about.

Jake: If you want, because I don't wanna get you in trouble.

Tucker: Ohh uncle Ted.

Rosanne: Ohh, we love his writings is beyond genius.

Jake: You and I were talking about it. Yeah, I mean, I don't wanna...

Tucker: So let me just say, I'm really trying to be a responsible citizen...

Jake: You can edit it, anything out Tucker.

Rosanne: We kind of get crazy.

Tucker: No, no, no. I'm just. I just want to say like I I think it's very bad to send mailbox to people.

Rosanne: Of course, absolutely unacceptable.

Tucker: And David Gelernter who is one of the people I respect in this world, who's a computer science professor, who was gravely injured by Ted Kaczynski with a mailbomb. So I'm totally opposed to that.

But, also, I'm opposed to the personal behavior of many artists and intellectuals. I can't think of a single... I love Tolstoy, I'm glad my daughter didn't marry Tolstoy. You know what I mean? So, like, I am capable of separating the two.

His *Industrial Society & Its Consequences*, and then the second book, it's name escapes me, but I've read them both, that he wrote in prison. Like some of the most interesting things I've ever read my life! Ever!

And the irony is I think he committed all those crimes, killed people in order to get publicity for this manifesto, this book. And it had the opposite effect, which is people ignore it. Yeah, because it's the rantings of a crazy man.

Well, read the book and basically the thesis is, I mean, he was no liberal either. I didn't realize that before...

Jake: No, he was not.

Tucker: No, he's. And he's a genius. You know, he's like one of the youngest math professors in Berkeley history and etcetera. But, basically it's that there's a massive cost to technology. I mean, if it's one phrase, there's a massive cost to technology that we don't perceive and it's entirely possible, in fact, likely in fact certain that technology will progress to a place where we can't control it and that it will instead control us. And clearly we're there.

Rosanne: Clearly.

Tucker: And it's dehumanizing and it has... it extracts a massive toll from the physical landscape, the environment, which I care very strongly about, not global warming *****. But like the actual environment, you know?

Rosanne: Yeah.

Jake: The actual planet.

Tucker: Because I.

Jake: Yeah, pollution is not...

Tucker: I love it. You know, I'm a sportsman. I'm an outdoorsman. So it's it's mean. Very meaningful.

So anyway, I think that his two books are. Among the most interesting I've ever read, and I've given them to people and everyone acts like I'm crazy or want to live in a cabin in Montana, which of course I do, but I don't think that makes you crazy. Actually, I think what's crazy is that working at Citibank. Yeah. You know what I mean? And like, driving in from some depressing suburb in New Jersey. For an hour and a half in traffic to work a soulless job that has no inherent meaning whatsoever, there's probably actually net net bad for the world. To be mistreated by some disgusting series of supervisors in the HR department and then to Schlep home to a wife who hates you because you've been emasculated. Like that's the experience of millions of people.

Rosanne: Yeah, yeah.

Tucker: Is that crazier than living in a cabin alone in Montana and growing your own food? It's way crazier! Way, way crazier.

Rosanne's experience hermitting

Rosanne: I did live. I did live in a cabin in the mountains of Colorado. Yeah, for a number of years, we'd be snowed in 10 feet of snow on our log cabin and have to break it down with our arms.

Tucker: That's my dream. Did you have electricity?

Rosanne: Yeah, we did. Have a single light bulb and two plugs.

Tucker: Could you heat? It with I mean I assume use.

Rosanne: Wood stoves. I don't remember if we heated it. I think we had a I think we had a thermostat in there too.

Jake: Yeah. Didn't you live in a cave for?

Rosanne: I did live in a. Cave. I lived in a cave because I became very ill and you know, one of those homeless type things. So I went and slept in a cave above my job.

Tucker: You lived in a cave.

Advert Begins

Rosanne: Listen to this, I know you won't give a ****, but Biden's new budget proposes \$4.7 trillion.

Jake: That's T trillion.

Rosanne: \$4.7 trillion in new taxes. Trillion. What is that like? That's a billion billion or three times a billion billion.

Jake: It's 1000 billion.

Rosanne: Good Lord, yeah. It's in taxes. That's just how the hell do we all?

Jake: The money.

Rosanne: It is what I want to. Know I'll tell you what, huh?

Jake: Mostly ourselves. Mostly our cell, I don't know. I don't know. No one knows I. Don't. No one knows what the.

Rosanne: I know because I've done the biblical numbers for it and everyone will say I'm crazy, but I am not crazy. We owe that debt to Jeffrey Epstein. Here's what you can do about it. It's critical that you protect your savings with gold and silver and precious metals, not paper funny monopoly money. That's worthless. Your money is being attacked from almost every angle, and pretty soon they're just going to say ohh your money. It's just worthless paper, so it wasn't even money. It's actually just what you owe Jeffrey Epstein. So sign down here on the dotted line. Do it. If you want your job and you're gonna take five or six of these shots after you do that.

Jake: Shots is in the vaccine or shots is in pictures of having sex with children. Well for black male.

Rosanne: OK. Yeah, because it's. Yeah.

Jake: That's the real currency.

Rosanne: Yeah, we have seen corporations for those with retirement accounts, they're offering Roseanne. Podcast listeners and supporters. Up to \$10,000 in free

silver when you open a qualified IRA account and for cash buyers, you're gonna love this. You can get a bonus silver just for making the purchase. So, like, OK, if you're, if you're gonna buy \$15,000 worth of precious metals. You'll get \$750 in bonus silver.

Jake: That's pretty cool. That's free.

Rosanne: Who's ever heard of that? But that's pretty cool.

Jake: Anyway, they've created a page for.

Rosanne: You. Yeah. It's called RB likes gold.com. That's me, RB likes gold.com.

Jake: You got your own landing page, so this so you.

Unknown: That's cool.

Rosanne: So you can find out more and just fill out the form.

Jake: Go there. Yeah, protect your wealth. That's what it's about. It's not an investment. I don't tell people to buy gold and silver cause like, oh, you're going to make billions of dollars. It's not that. It's not Bitcoin where it's ***** thing that's going to collapse. It's just it's.

Rosanne: It's a real Jew selling real gold.

Unknown: It's this is like this is what.

Jake: You do when you're a Jew is you sell gold. This is what God has asked us to do. That's why we're chosen. But. Really, it's about protecting what you have.

Advert Ends

Rosanne: Yeah, I lived in a cave there.

Tucker: What was that like?

Rosanne: You know, I had a sleeping bag and it was hidden. It was summer.

Tucker: Did you run into any mayors?

Rosanne: No bears there was mountain lions, though. But I I just you.

Tucker: Know see, that sounds a lot better to me than waking up in the Phoenix Marriott, you know, on the road is a, you know, some Mackenzie consultant. Yeah. So that doesn't sound.

Rosanne: It was cool in a way. I was a hippie then. I was a hippie. I walked barefoot down the mountain to work to wash dishes for 10 hours a day for \$50.

Speaker 3: So that serious.

Rosanne: A week, six days a week. That's how it was.

Tucker: So I used to make fun of that, but I I think it sounds idyllic now, yeah.

Rosanne: You know, I could do it again. I I. I thought you're going to smoke. I could do it again. I could be without nothing and still be very happy. I like it in Hawaii. I live in a I live in a real simple life in Hawaii. And I love having my toes in the dirt and growing stuff. And. Just having quiet times to write. I love to write. I write like a maniac.

Tucker: But you need quiet to do it.

Rosanne: Yeah, none of it makes any sense. It's like halfway this. And then I just put it in a in a plastic bag and save it. I never add it.

Tucker: You write in longhand.

Rosanne: Yeah, most that's why I thought maybe you.

Tucker: Did too. No, I can't. In fact, I could never. I didn't do well in school at all. And it was only when I didn't have a computer. I had a word processor in part of college, but that really liberated me. I've never seen, you know, we just wrote everything by hand.

Rosanne: I just wanted to tell you how excited I am to have had you on my show and to be able to speak with you because I I wanted to tell you when you used to wear the bow tie, I used to be.

Unknown: Always loved it.

Rosanne: So mad at you all the time, but I used. To always watch you.

Tucker: You were.

Rosanne: Not alone. And I used to go.

Speaker 3: Was that kid? Yeah.

Rosanne: I go like I, you know, I would like imagine myself in a room for.

Tucker: If only I'd known that I was giving my stupid opinions, that somewhere in LA, Roseanne Barr was yelling at the TV, I would have been, really.

Rosanne: No, but I was. I was like, really focused on it because I was like. I loved how you did it and I mostly liked what you said. But you know, when I I was really turned on when I disagree because it fired me up and I'd write like a.

Tucker: So they shouldn't put. I was in my 20s. They shouldn't put kids in their 20s on TV, like on what grounds? You on TV? I always wondered that even of of myself. Like I haven't done anything like why am I commenting on world events like I don't know ****.

Rosanne: Because that was. That was the diamond in the rough that became you and that we're also proud of.

Tucker: Well, I certainly learned a lot. I'll.

Speaker 3: Tell you, I'll tell you that.

Rosanne: Yeah. And you came to the light and you know, I'm so proud of you. And you're a big, big voice. That amplified a million times after you got out of, you know, the slats. They stuck you in. And we just love you so much.

Tucker: Thank you. Thank you. I and I thank you. Thank you for having me. I love this. The whole podcast. One last thing, the the podcast.

Speaker 3: Yeah, yeah.

Tucker: It's like that actually is. If I had known what it was like when I spent, you know, 27 years on cable TV, I would have quit a lot earlier, yeah. Maybe before I was. Fired because people actually listen to podcasts and it is a kind of ongoing education. That's my sense of.

Rosanne: It. Yeah. Well.

Tucker: Like people wanna know what's going on. They don't trust. Obviously. No ones gonna read the New York Times. It's pure garbage. Washington Post. Even

worse. Where do you get your news and people get it? They think things through with podcasts and. I didn't know that until really till I started doing them.

Jake: No, it's very. I'm like you. I never listened to him and we were just talking about. I started. It's like, why would I sit for an hour and? 1/2 and. Listen to someone ***** ever. No people do.

Tucker: Ohh people do.

Rosanne: Because they talk like you do in a language you can understand, and they're drawn to the opposite of *****. They want to. They want to hear something with integrity and honesty and truth.

Jake: Yeah. Yes.

Speaker 3: Yes, well, that's how.

Rosanne: So that's what's so cool about. I would have quit a ***** 100 years ago. I would have known too Tucker.

Jake: You build your podcast.

Tucker: Well, that's the blessing of getting fired. You don't have to quit. They do. It for you.

Rosanne: And onward may it go. Amen. Thank you.

Tucker: Amen. Thank you.

Jake: Thank you, Tucker.

Outro jingle: You see my patience is growing thin with the synthetic world.

Tucker Carlson - Part Of The Problem

Source: <listennotes.com/podcasts/part-of-the-problem/tucker-carlson-KF5JTicnmN9>

Dave Smith Brings you the latest in politics! On this episode of Part Of The Problem, Dave is joined by the legend, Tucker Carlson! Tucker and Dave discuss the cost of empire, the state of the media, the anti-war movement, speaking to Julian Assange, and the causes and costs for the conflict in Ukraine and Gaza.

Intro jingle: Fill her up. You are listening to the gas. We need to rollback the state we spy. On all of our own. Citizens, our prisons are flooded with nonviolent drug offenders. If you want to. Know who America's next enemy is. Look at who we're funding right now. Every single one of these problems are a result of. Government being way too big. Part of the problem on the gas digital network, here's your host, Dave Smith.

Dave: What's up, everybody? Welcome to a brand new episode of part of the problem. Ohh, I am excited for this one I. Finally got him my white whale. I finally trapped him here on the show. Ladies and gentlemen, needs no introduction. The man, the myth. The legend Tucker Carlson, how are? You, Sir James.

Tucker: What do you mean, man? I texted. You all the time. You never mentioned it. Till yesterday I. Was like of course.

Dave: I was working up the courage. Little by little. To ask you on my show, will you text me to like, say, like a nice thing? Like hey I. Really liked you on this. And then I feel. Like kind of being a jerk if. I'm like ohh, can you do something for me immediately?

Tucker: No, I was totally honored. Are you kidding? No, I love it.

Dave: Oh well, thank you. For for coming on I I was thinking a little bit about this since since we set this. Up yesterday and then. I had this weird moment this morning. I was just in my office and I looked. I glanced at my bookshelves and I there's this book that I really love. I'm sure you've you've read it. It is by Pat Buchanan called the suicide of a superpower. I love all Pat Buchanan's. Books, but this one was very good. And I completely forgot this, but the subtitle of the book. Do you remember it? It was will America survive to 2025? And I was like man. He really said that and now sitting here in the end of 2023, I'm like. 50505050 shot we make.

Tucker: Yeah, it it's that. I mean, it's just profit without honor. You know, as always, there's there. There's really no crime that carries a greater penalty than being right ahead of. I mean, those are the guy, you know, the the people who are like forever, you know, predicting some crazy douse bike or gold at 300 an ounce or whatever. Like that. They're they're totally fine. Nobody remembers Jim Cramer recommending, you know, many years of bad stock picks. Totally fine. But the guy who calls the big picture. Correctly 2. It's out, you know, he's relegated to his rec room and can never be seen in. Public again, it's. Just so perfect.

Dave: And and if you haven't read the book, it's not just that he's predicting like the decline of America, it's that he's specifically saying that we're bankrupting ourselves, we're destroying our currency. We have de facto open borders, which are changing the the, the, the makeup of the nation. And you know that we fight wars all over the world that are completely unnecessary to fight it. So it's not just that he called, like, the collapse, it's that he specifically laid out the main driving forces for it.

Tucker: No, it's it's totally true. And and and did it in a kind of. I mean I knew Pat well because I worked with him for years. And, you know, he was always being denounced as a hater and hitting this group or that group. And in fact, I I never, I never smelled that on him. And I've got a pretty keen nose for, you know, sublimated, suppressed rage. I never felt that on him. He was a cheerful guy. And he explained his points in in ways that were basically impossible to refute. And that's why they just dismissed him.

Dave: Well, he said. The one the thing cause I remember he was always labeled. An anti semi. And I I'm Jewish, you know? And so, like, I remember, like, asking at one point, you know, cuz I really like the feel of his books. I was like, so where's the anti-Semitic stuff? Like, cause I've never. I haven't gotten to any of that like and usually people who hate the Jews are quite happy to tell you that they hate the Jews. You know, like it's not. It's like they want to tell you like you're like, how's the weather?

And they're like the Jews control the weather. And you're like, alright, I wasn't trying to.

Tucker: And they're making it rain.

Dave: Get into that. Yeah, like I wasn't. I wasn't trying to go down that path, but OK. And then they they the evidence, I I was shown was that he one time during the initial the first Iraq war the Persian Gulf War in the 90s. He said he said nobody wants a war in Iraq other than some weapons companies and the Israel lobby. And they went see. He's anti-Semitic. And you're like, that's that's just objectively true. Like, these were people who were lobbying for, I mean, like, how is that? That makes you a hater. But anyway, it's. Yeah.

Tucker: And we're actually his that that's exactly right. And and by the way, you know, 30 years later, it's like there's kind of no denying that. And you can argue whether it was a good idea or not or whatever. I think there are two sides to every argument personally. But but that's not a very controversial. To say I think what really wrote him out of Washington, where he literally couldn't work in DC anymore, was when he criticized Winston Churchill and that was completely baffling to me. Again, Churchill's a complicated person. I personally think there are lots of things to admire about Churchill, but you can't say he helped his country. I was in London 2 weeks ago. Like that, they didn't win. Win the war in any meaningful way. Like you wrecked the country, yeah. So I'm not. English so you know, it's not my country, but I think it's fair to point that out. So and for some reason that was the red line. You know, you couldn't criticize Winston Churchills not even American. Like what? What you can **** all over Thomas Jefferson. You're totally fine to criticize, criticize Winston Churchill and like, oh, you're some sort of Nazi or something. And I think Pat partly didn't like him because Pat is. Bit of an Irish nationalist, maybe that was, or whatever his motive, but like that seemed like a fair topic of historical inquiry and analysis to me. But no.

Dave: Well, I would even go a step further than I mean, I think people. To some degree have been trained. To like perceive it any any type of thought about World War Two that is not just the conventional thought means like what you must be a Holocaust denier or something. But by the. Way, if you read Pat Buchanan's book. Churchill, Hitler. And the unnecessary. War, the whole thesis of the book is that the Holocaust happened during the war, and if we could have avoided the war, maybe we could have avoided the Holocaust. It's like the thesis. Is destroyed. If you don't believe in the Holocaust. So like it does, that doesn't make any sense. But you get that a lot with Israel as. Well, any criticism? Of the Israeli Government, people are trained to assume that must mean you're saying you hate Jewish people. But when you're talking about World War 2, you're talking about the worst thing that ever happened in the history of the world. The biggest mass murder campaign in history all around. I mean like but the. 10s of millions of people died. And the idea that we can never examine that and questioned man, was there any way we could have avoided this? Was Danzig really worth all of these people dying? You know, like, it's just that this is insanity.

Tucker: Well, there are three things. About the war that I, I. Think you know I've always had kind of conventional views about everything. I'm hardly a radical or a like a true free think or anything like that. But there are three questions no one's ever answered in my mind. One. And so Churchill committed his country, and then we followed to war in Europe in defense of Poland. Fine. OK. That was his view. But then he handed Poland over to Stalin. We're going to where we're going to wreck our country. We're going to, you know, join this where, where 10s of millions will die because the territorial integrity, the sovereignty of Poland, is that important. And then you just blithely hand it over to. Joseph Stalin, huh? Like, can someone explain that to me second? And it's clear there was foreknowledge of Pearl Harbor. It's just absolutely clear. It's like, not in dispute. The Senate actually had an inquiry. Into it during. The war and kind of concluded that, yeah, we sort of knew and then it was buried cause there was a war on what was that like? Why aren't we talking about that? And the third? Thing that I've never gotten. Over is that the war kind of ended American culture and Western culture like we haven't. Produced meaningful art at scale since 1945. Like everything we produced in architecture, visual arts, music is a little different. We I think we have. Created innovative music in that time. But certainly in the visual arts and architecture, it's just been pure **** since 1945. Really. 1945 like it, something changed at a very basic level in Western culture and like, what is that? I thought we won, like, why would it destroy our creative impulse? But it did. And why is there not a serious inquiry into that? I don't under, I mean it, I don't understand.

Dave: There's a there's this old. Adams quote and then I'm going to butcher it. But he said it's something like if we if we go around the world searching for for wars will become the dictators of the world. But we will lose our own soul. Right. And there's something about that, right, like happening right away. Like, OK, here's the trade. It's like this. Here's the trade, you know, empire for your soul. And that's that's kind of the deal.

Tucker: And and then.

Dave: Of course, that's after World War 2 springs. Up the whole what? We know is the national security apparatus today, the creation of the CIA and kind of. This whole you know.

Tucker: But it's also it does it it? Does affect us on the level of? Our souls, I mean you. You should not commit violence except in extraordinary circumstances related to your self-defense. And that's true in your own home. Your wife ***** you off. You shouldn't punch her in the face. That's grotesque. It's a. Time and the idea that you sort of wave away civilian casualties or even military casualties is no big deal or the cost of doing business or something. We should celebrate. It's disgusting and I don't care. Look, I hated Osama bin Laden. He killed 3000 of my countrymen and woody someone I know. But when he was killed, it's like I'm. I'm glad the threat is gone. But I'm not going to celebrate. The shooting of another person, and I don't care because not because he didn't deserve to die. He did deserve to die. But because celebrating people getting shot is bad for me. And if you have an entire country. That's like ohh

yeah. We, you know, burn down the city and that's great. No, no. Well, you should never celebrate violence or you will become a monster. It's super simple and every, I mean, that's all for the Old Testament, by the way. Everyone, like the Old Testament. So violent. Really. David, who committed a lot of violence, spends all this time talking about, oh, man, violence is bad. People commit violence, know how bad it is to talk to someone who shot someone else in war. They're very against violence for a reason. And when we're celebrating? Nationally, as a culture I I think we've really lost something important.

Dave: 100% man. And there's really something, particularly for conservatives to learn there. This is one of the reasons why I think you're such an important figure. You know, there were these guys like Ron Paul and Pat Buchanan, who kind of called everything right and still lost the power struggle to the neocons. And maybe that's because, you know, those type of. People grab power more. But there's something about this relationship between our culture and war, and it's like, look, when for conservatives who care so much about American, you know, like the history of American culture. When did when? Was the first time you really lost it all was doing Vietnam, right? That's when you have this huge countercultural movement. Like, come up and it's very easy for that to. Gain a foothold. When you're off celebrating killing a whole bunch of people and then like who are you? To have the moral. High ground in this situation and just look at the last 20 years. I mean, why is it that just culturally not just control of the institutions, but culturally the left has just won every single battle? It's like, well, you know what? I don't know. The 20 years ago, the Evangelical Christians in this country. And all in on. We gotta kill a million Iraqis. For nonsense, and so they they completely lost their.

Unknown Speaker: I couldn't read.

Dave: Ability to to. Tell you, oh, this gender stuff is nonsense. It's. Like who are you?

Tucker: Abortion is wrong. I completely I completely agree. And. But this is all a. Legacy of a previous period and I I what my. So my kids are readers. And I said to. One of them once. Hey, find me 10. Great Post war novels. Like, really great novels. Like I don't know, it doesn't need to be Anna Karenina, but like, 70% of Anna Karenina in the most powerful. And name that country in the history of the world, our country since 1945. Find 10 good ones. How about two good ones? There aren't any find 10 great post war buildings like something inside us dies. Our our creative impulse, which is our life force. That's what that is. Creativity is life. Something died when we begin celebrating. Violence at scale. I mean, OK.

Dave: Yeah, yeah, alright guys. Let's take a moment and thank our sponsor for today's show, which is monetary metals. We love this company. We are thrilled to have them on board. If you wanna start earning a yield in gold paid. In gold, you gotta check out monetary metals. Monetary metals is offering a real solution to the inflation issue and the constant currency debasement. By paying interest on gold paid in gold, they are revolutionizing the finance space by letting you opt out of the dollar.

Interest rates completely. Libertarians constantly talk about ending the Fed. Have never had a realistic vehicle for doing it and now you can. Now you can opt out of the Fed system completely by having your gold earned income denominated in ounces every month. The interest rates from monetary metals are all denominated in gold and aren't affected by the actions of the Federal Reserve. While owning Gold has protected your wealth until monetary metals, there's been no way to grow it now with monetary metals, you can grow your wealth in ounces every month and see your wealth compound in an interest rate that's set in a free market by gold owners and gold borrowers. Monetary metals lets you get on a sound money standard and makes it profitable. To Decrete and makes it profitable to decrease your exposure. To the actions. The Fed? This means no more worrying about dollar interest rate swings or how much the dollar loses value over time. Now you can get your own personal gold standard and end the feds grip on your savings. One ounce of gold at a time, which you'd rather earn 5% on a dollar or 5% on gold. If the answer is obvious, then head over to monetarydashmetals.com/POTP. That's monetary dash, metals.com/P OTP. Alright, let's get back into the show. One of the things that was very interesting to me and is the role you've kind of played. In this I mean the rule you obviously it's a feedback loop too, so it's like there's this big realignment, there's been a big kind of transformation in our country over the last few years. Obviously the most stark example of it is say looking at. Say, 2004, the Republican presidential, you know, ticket versus Donald Trump in 2016 standing. Up there and. Telling Jeb Bush your brother lied us into war in South Carolina at the Republican primary and then winning, dominating the next day at the poll. At that, at the voting and you know you've been. A big part of this where? It it was kind of shocking for a while that the 8:00 PM hour at Fox News and the top rated show in all of cable news was the most. Anti war voice in. In the corporate media and this for someone like me when I'm 40. And so I was like a young adult during the night and I lived in New York City during 9/11. And you know the, you know, the War on Terror years, I think for sometimes like younger guys, they they don't kind of appreciate how crazy of a transformation that was. And so it's kind of interesting that I think Donald Trump and you. I would say are probably the two. Biggest figures that kind of gave the right half of America's permission. To to reexamine some of this stuff. Like it it. It's not making you Michael Moore anymore to do it. You could just be kind of. Like Tucker Carlson or or Donald Trump, you know.

Tucker: Well, I I. Think the the slur was and it was rooted in truth, probably is. If you were against American military, the projection of American military force, you were against America. You didn't have self-confidence you were personally. Probably a *****. But you also didn't believe in your country or its ideals or its foreign. Projects, and I mean I I certainly trust me. I employed that. Slur on TV. I mean, I was on TV since I was in my, you know. Mid 20s so. I had a lot of years of repeating these these slogans, which were completely false and I just wasn't self aware enough to know

that what I was doing. But the point is, 20 years ago this week. Weirdly, I went to Iraq in the winter. Of 2003. And I won't be boring, but I'll just say in one sentence that completely changed my view of everything because it turned out what I had been claiming, espousing hoping for was all totally false. And so that set off a chain reaction in my head. And by the time I got back to Washington, where I lived, my views, it completely changed. I mean, I was in college at that point. I wasn't exactly sure what I believe, but I know. Didn't believe which was everything I had been saying and I said this out loud and immediately lost. You know an awful lot of friends that took it much more seriously than I thought they would, and we're not interested in intellectual inquiry or or thinking really at all. They were very lockstep Stalinists and I didn't. Know that I. Don't know how I've been living among these people. Some of them were very bright, but I just didn't get it. And some of them truly hated me. And to this day. Hate me just cause I reassessed on the basis of evidence. Now maybe I'm wrong. I always leave open that possibility. But I mean, why would you be anyway? Whatever. So that for me, for like 20 years, nobody. I didn't have any, didn't. Like anyone agreed with me. But Trump made it possible to make the case, hey, this isn't good for us. I'm against foreign adventurism. I'm against the CON program because I love America. I live here. My kids live here. I don't want to wreck it. He made that case. No one had ever done. That before and and. I mean, that was the moment. You're right. It was that South Carolina debate. And all the dumb people on TV, political reporters, the dumbest of all reporters. Because it's the easiest reporting you just like for site poll numbers and cliches. They were all, you know, I was on the. Set when that happened like oh. Well, you know, he just lost South Carolina checks notes. South Carolina is the highest percentage of military veterans of any state, and they're gonna hate this. And it turns out to be, of course, the mirror image military veterans who'd had their lives destroyed, or at least put on hold by these totally pointless wars were the most on Trump side. State and that's when they decided we spy on this guy and wreck his life, and that's never ended.

Dave: I remember because I was a big, big Ron Paul supporter, so I remember in 2008 and in 2012 and anybody can go look. This up, Ron Paul in the Republican primaries got more money from active duty military members than every other candidate combined. And I remember at the time being like, how is this? Not the biggest. News story in America. How is everybody? And so they just ignore this, but this is almost where you see like the atrophy in the? Corporate media is. That so they ignore this story because they get some cognitive dissidence out of it, so then they're totally unprepared when it's Donald Trump up there. And I mean, there's great compilations of this stuff if you don't know what what Tucker's talking about, if you're listening where everybody, everybody's like, well, I'm Mr. Expert and that's it. He's done. Cause if there's one thing you can't do is go to South Carolina and the Republican primaries, they're just all wrong. The big part of thinking.

Tucker: Not just wrong, I. Mean as someone. Who's been wrong? A lot. I I allow for people. To be wrong but wrong with the most kind of like hand waving dismissiveness toward anyone.

Unknown Speaker: Who? Well, if there's.

Tucker: Exactly as you. Said if there's one thing you can't everybody knows. You know what I mean? You can't swim for 30 minutes after you eat. You don't know anything. You're *****.

Unknown Speaker: How did you get on TV?

Dave: I know you've like you've made these like analogies before, and you talked about this in your in your book ship of fools, which is really great, but where it's kind of like it's almost like so right now. Now I like as I do. Right. OK, so right now I'm like, I have a really great marriage and me and my wife really love each other. Everything's really good. And then tomorrow I find out not only that she's had, like, cheated on me, but she's had a years long affair or something like that.

Tucker: She's actually a dude.

Dave: Yeah, yeah, something huge. You know what I mean? Something. Like you know. Put yourself in Barack Obama's shoes. Imagine. What this must be like? Kidding. No, there's no proof on that one. There's some questionable photos anyway, but. Like and and. OK, yeah, like you made this point like, yeah. OK. You'd be angry at first. You'd blame her, but but at some point, you think you'd go like, hey, this is this was the most important thing in my identity to know this. And I was completely wrong. Let's examine this and that just has never come. It's never come.

Tucker: Well, it's the key to growth can happen. I mean, not only is it the key to rational politics, it's the key to, to growth and happiness to, to contentment and.

Dave: Right.

Tucker: And and comments to a happy life, I mean the one thing I there's so many things I've never learned not eat Oreos. You know what I mean? Like they're I get enough sleep. I. Mean there's all. Kinds of lessons I will never learn, but the one lesson I did learn a number of years ago is blame yourself first. I blame myself first. I really try. I don't want to, but I make myself like. I ***** **. How did I do that? It's my fault. And I I just almost say it out loud. Or I say it to Mike, just to force myself to do it to, like, look inside a little bit. And I'm not, you know, self flagellator by any means. I'm the opposite of a self flagellator, you know, I'm explosive, not retentive in Freudian terms. But if you go through the if you force yourself to go. Through the exercise of an after action. Report in your own. Head how did I get this wrong? I get this wrong. You know they lied to me. Sure. Why did I believe that? If you make yourself do that, you become way happier, more balanced, and much wiser.

Dave: Yeah, it's I. It's something I try to work on a lot too and. What ends up? Happening and if this part of it is. Kind of rough is then it becomes almost involuntary. Like once you start making yourself do it, then you can't stop doing it and in the short run that can be a little bit annoying cause I'll be. That way, like even. If even if me and my wife were just like all doing, and I found myself just like digging into my position, I

just get that little. Voice now in. My head, that's like, OK, you know. You were wrong about this, right? And you're, like, damn it, little voice.

Tucker: Exactly. And by the way. Well, you might want to wait till tomorrow to admit that. I mean, this strategy is involved at some point. If you were wrong, you are morally bound and bound by your own self. Respect your own dignity to admit it. You you can't pretend you weren't wrong when you were, and if you do, you are totally diminished as a person and you become weaker. Paradoxically, you're doing that so you can appear strong. But if you keep doing it, you become like any of these neo con husks you see on TV, who are clearly just barely hanging on to the lies they themselves. No longer believe like it's just. For you, right?

Dave: Yeah, it's you. It's like you. You make this exchange for a temporary avoidance of feeling bad at the cost of wisdom. Never. You can never develop wisdom unless you have that. And so that quality. And I'll tell you, it's weird cause you know, you learn about people even if you don't know them. Super well when you. Watch their shows and you know, but I think that's part of. What you have been able to bring to the table over the last like. Several years really through the whole. Tucker Carlson tonight won. And now your your show on on Twitter or excuse me, it's going to take me years to get that right.

Tucker: We we we call. It we call it X Dave.

Dave: Yes, I'm sorry I didn't mean. To to I I messed up. Still not my. Favorite? Still not my favorite.

Tucker: It's the single letter.

Dave: It's it's I I like. A lot of what Elon Musk has done. Changing it to ex was the second worst besides his trip. To Israel anyway.

Tucker: Are we pronouncing? That correctly, or is it? Or is it? Is it more Chinese? I mean like what is? How do you pronounce it?

Dave: I was counting on Twitter to be the one non Chinese social media company, so I hope it's not. I hope that's not. That's not it. But there was one of the things you do on your show that I really like. I try to do this too, because I do show about the news, you know, and one of the things I try to do as best as possible, which is challenging in today's environment, is to zoom out as much as you can. Cause it's like, every day, there's a new crazy thing. But then one day, there's a crazy thing and you go like, no, wait, this is not just. A crazy thing. This is one of the biggest stories in American history. But this isn't just some crazy thing. This is like like, you know, like. The three letter agencies tried to frame the sitting president for treason. That's a really big deal. That's up there with like, top five stories in American history, right? Yeah. But I gotta say, I think one of them has gotta be you and this show you're doing on X and forget. Look, I love it. I never miss an episode of it, but regardless of that, the fact is that the biggest show host in cable news gets fired. And then has to move online and is bigger by orders of magnitude. Like, that's a really big deal that just represents.

Tucker: It it's a better medium. I mean we used to say in TV like I I was on a couple different or several different channels, cable channels, broadcast channels and like my ratings would vary dramatically and they show you know, maybe better or worse depending. But like over 20. Five years. But it was it's the venue matters a lot and it just turns out that people use social media and far fewer subscribe to cable news and consumer information. Sitting in the living room like that. It was just so obvious. And I'm such a late adapter because I'm not into tech at all. You know, we don't have a TV in my house. You know, we're not tech people at all. We're book readers. So I didn't. I only sensed it, but. As soon as you make it easy for. People to consume. Free effectively or you've got a subscription service launching but, but basically you know the. Meat of it. Is a lot of it is free. And always will be. Your viewership goes up and also I think you know, it's pretty obvious. It's certainly obvious to you and your entire audience, but like media are controlled, that's the whole point. And as soon as people sense you're not controlled or less controlled or. You're out of control. They they want. To watch us, right? I mean, why wouldn't they?

Dave: Yeah, no, absolutely. But it does like what it represents is right, like a real losing of that control. And for the first time, at least in my lifetime, that there isn't kind of this monopoly on the flow of information and of course, Elon Musk buying Twitter is a big part of that. And he's going to be dealing with. Is already. Dealing with tremendous sources trying to, you know, interfere with that, but at least for now, it does seem like, yeah, they're, they're the two guys I usually point to. Are you and Joe Rogan. But between you two guys and then a whole bunch of other guys like on smaller levels. But like a lot of them. It's like, yeah, the there's. A whole new generation of people who are consuming their information that is not controlled. That doesn't mean it's correct all of the time, I'm sure we. All make our. Mistakes. But it's not controlled by the. CIA, you know, like there is a difference there.

Tucker: Well, that's exactly right. And and actually. I know you know this because we've talked about it offline, but. If if you were to say out loud in specific terms the degree of control that that specific agency and there many other agencies, but that one specifically CIA had over our public conversation and over our politics, you'd sound like a complete freaking wacko like you would, people wouldn't even believe you. And yet it would be absolutely true. So I guess what I'm saying is. We understate the power and I'm this is I'm speaking this from knowledge after 35 years in Washington going a lot of people work there. And knowing a lot about it. We understate the power of this Intel agency with an unknown budget. Unknown staff, unknown reach unknown mission like it's completely out of control, like much more than people and just completely out of control. And it's also completely corrupt. I was telling my wife at dinner actually two nights ago with a bunch of relatives in there. We were thinking of. Four separate real estate transactions that we were personally partied to or on the same straight or next door to or whatever of CI officers court C. The officers who are paying millions of dollars for a very expensive real estate and. My wife said oh. What about that one, we sold our house once to a CIA officer for all this money. It's like, and

the question was, like, where did they get all this money? You're a federal employee. What did you get \$4 million or \$12 million? You know what I mean? Like. Leaving aside the assassinations and the the subversion of democracy, just the pure financial corruption of the CIA is that a mind blowing story that the average person knows? Nothing about true.

Dave: Yeah and look, and this is one of the things that Trump and and in many ways, just to be clear here, I think Trump is almost like this like a inspector gadget type political figure, right. You know, like he's just kind of walking around and things just all fall into place. But one of the things that Trump kind of revealed even to people like myself, who probably like if I was taking a written test on this, would have gotten the answer right. For Trump, but to actually witness it, and not just on like an intellectual level, but to watch it happening. That you're like they do not work for the president. I mean, this is not something that, that idea, and it's almost as if we're talking about the federal government of the United States of America, and we're still discussing it as if there are these three Co equal branches of government and the people elect the President and they elect the House of Representatives and they're. You're like, oh, that's not. That's not really the government we live under. That in fact, there's these whole other shadowy forces that are completely untied to that they they don't, they oversee the politicians much more than the politicians oversee them. And that that's really who's kind of in charge. And then it's like, OK, we're talking about a whole different thing.

Tucker: I mean, I could. I could bore you for hours, but I would. Yeah, you're absolutely 100% right. It makes a mockery of democracy, and the defenders of democracy are the ones propping it up. It's it's also grotesque. But I would just say one thing, and that is that the I notice for a fact that the sitting President of the United States have been course 40 odd. Since the 2nd. World War have routinely been left out of briefings on the two the two big programs that I know about, one it. Is the US. New stuff where there's a lot of evidence, U.S. government has had direct contact, maybe even negotiations with whatever these forces are. That's real, I think. But I know for a fact that Presidents have not been briefed on that. 1/2 is the Kennedy assassination, in which the CIA was implicated, not the whole CI, but the operations were accurate. Under Angleton of yeah, have a role in that. That's just true. And and I know for again for a fact that there have been a number of Presidents. Richard Nixon famously on tape. Asked the CIA director about that and he said I, you know, I think the CIA was involved in killing John. And they did not respond. They did not brief him and instead they said in motion the wheels of Watergate, which had him out of office in less than a year. So, like, that's not a democracy. That's an oligarchy by unelected spies. And there's nothing scarier than that. And by the way, last thing I'll say, if everyone talks about, you know, the famous Eisenhower retirement speech. Where in 1960, where he talks about the military industrial complex, that's where that phrase comes from, that famous speech. Last year I was on a freaking treadmill trying to lose weight. Perpetual mission of mine and I'm bored. So I I was like I'm going to find out

YouTube I'd recommend to you as your watch that speech. I think it's only like 30 minutes long. Eisenhower wrote it himself. Two things you'll notice. One it's written at the level of like postgraduate like the average American. It's such a higher IQ. It was so much more literate. In 1960 than now. People wouldn't understand. You're saying AB Eisenhower was, like, deeply distressed by the power of the Pentagon and the CIA and said so in public. He's like their budgets are too big, thanks to the Second World War. And this is gonna end democracy. He said that on television, in front of everybody, it's totally worth watching. And he was right.

Dave: And hands the country over to John F Kennedy. I mean this. Is like, so you know like this is the next president that comes right in on the heels of that right. The and. And then also, you know, this is something I remember you talking about this when you cover it cause it's so like I I was a kid I'm born in 1983 it's like I grew up in the 80s and the 90s and at that point the only thing you knew about Richard Nixon was like he was. Most corrupt. President and it's like this tiny little detail that's left out that he was the most popular president. When he was the. He lived. He won 49 states.

Tucker: He won by. The biggest margin ever, 16 million votes, in 1970. The biggest margin ever recorded.

Dave: And he's gone shortly after that and they control the narrative so much that the narrative almost becomes like, yeah, you know, the people really don't. Him. I really don't like him so much. We had to get him out of there.

Tucker: Well, what's so crazy is that he was undone by. This guy famously called. Bob Woodward is still around, still writing. Books still get. The participation of all of our leaders, who's Bob Woodward in 1973? Was he a famous journalist? He got the biggest story in the world, was handed to him by Ben Bradley, the head of the Washington Post. No, he was not a journalist. He was a naval Intel officer who'd been detailed to the White House. The Nixon White House. That's a fact. Look it up. And yet, somehow, he winds up with this story that topples the president. Hmm. And his main source, who was the main source. That was Mark, felt the deputy director of the FBI. Who ran the total program? This is not conspiracy stuff, this is. Like on Wikipedia, yeah. That's whatever says it. It's crazy. And by the way, who replaced Nixon? Gerald Ford, unelected. Who happened to be on the what? Oh, the. Warren Commission top Nixon. Pick Ford. Well, because they took out his VP Spiro Agnew on a tax charge, and then Carl Albert, who was the Democratic leader in the house, said you are picking Gerald Ford and he did.

Dave: It it really is like it's all it's. Out of a movie. Man and it does that like I get where it does sound like if people don't follow this stuff, it sounds like nutty conspiracy talk, and it is conspiracy talk. It is a it is a conspiracy. It's just not a theory. It's just like, no, this is all like documented.

Tucker: And Bob Woodward, I mean like I know, Bob Woodward pretty well, I lived right down the street from Bob Woodward and Georgetown as a kid and and. It's like I'm. Not attacking, you know, he's perfectly nice guy and. He's not stupid,

actually, but the idea that. You know. Ohh. He's just a shoe leather journalist. No, he was a naval Intel officer who somehow wind up as like his first. One of his very first stories in the Washington. Post is Watergate, like that's just no obviously ***** that, like, I've never heard one person say that not one person. Why?

Unknown Speaker: I know.

Dave: Yeah, that's just not how it works. Right, right. And and it's. Such an interesting story that you're like. It kind of. Goes to show you. Oh, that's. Why? Like you would want to talk about this if you were just trying to get eyeballs on your show. But. No one will touch. It, at least in the corporate media, nobody.

Tucker: Yeah. Why though? It's so in look.

Dave: Will touch it.

Tucker: I mean I I'm 54, my kids are. On so I I don't really care but like. I just think if you're in this business and you're not curious, the question is why are you in this business like the whole point is curiosity like. Wow, tell me how that happened. That's an amazing story. Like, that's that's why I I do this. That's why I got into this in the 1st place, no one is interested in anything. It's. Like bizarre. It's like, shut up everything.

Unknown Speaker: What's the?

Tucker: You heard in 4th grade is true. Shut up, racist.

Dave: Alright guys, let's take a moment and thank our sponsor for today's show, which is yo kratom.com. This is for those of you who are over the age of 21 and are responsible adults who enjoy kratom. If you don't know what kratom is, don't worry about it. But if you already. Using it, go check out yo kratom.com home of the \$60.00 kilo long time sponsor of everything on the gas digital network. This is lab tested, quality kratom. It's delivered right to your door and you're gonna get it for the best price you will ever find on kratom \$60.00 for a kilo. Yo kratom.com home of the \$60.00. Below. Alright, let's get back into the show. Do you you remember? I'm. I'm blanking on her name. Maybe you remember. It was the ABC reporter who she had the the hot mic tape that leaked where she was talking about how she had the Epstein story broke years before and they told her to squash it because it might mess up their relationship with the royal family.

Tucker: What? What happened to her? Do you know?

Dave: I don't. I don't. I'm. Not sure where she is, but that but that.

Tucker: If you rollback, it was Amy Robach.

Dave: Yeah, yes, yes.

Tucker: Who I worked with at at. Another you know the cable arm of NBC News. Years ago, I didn't know her very well. I was totally nice. She says that. Here and I'm not a conspiracy nut, I've just, you know, everything. I know I read in the Daily Mail. I'm just. I'm just telling you that. And then like, two or three years later, she gets bounced out of her job at ABC because she had an affair. Now I'm not endorsing affairs. I'm not having one. I'm against them. However, if we were to fire everybody

in television, who's having an? Affair with a coworker. No one. Don't report for work like. That's not a fireable offense and.

Dave: MSNBC might need to. Find a new warning show. I'll say that much.

Tucker: No, no. Well, exactly. And like, just trust me. That's not. A criterion for firing, and yet Amy Robach got fired for having an affair. Huh. That's kind of weird. It's almost like they were looking for a way to fire Amy Roblox since she got caught. And by the way, they.

Dave: Right, right. I I forgot about that part, yeah.

Tucker: Made her apologize for it. They made her apologize and she like, she issues this hostage statement trying. To keep her. Job like, oh, when I said. The Epstein stuff was real, I. Was just kidding. It's like what?

Dave: So bizarre but and and and. You know, there's something else you you touched on that I was literally thinking about a lot. I think about this a lot, but just this it was a good example of it. But when if you look at. You know the the farewell address by Eisenhower. And that is one of the things you if you just listen to old political speeches, I even listen to them. The the first televised presidential debates, which were that same year between Jack Kennedy and Richard Nixon, they're just, you could tell they're just talking to a.

Tucker: Yes, yes.

Dave: Smarter country. There's no there's. No way you could talk like that to the American people today. You'd be like, yeah, that's. What are you gonna get 2% of the the the voting population with this you gotta dumb it down. And in some ways, by the way, This is why Donald Trump figured out how to hack modern politics cause he's like I'll I'll take. It to kindergarten. How about that? Like I'll you know.

Tucker: The only way? It's totally right and the amount of lying that accumulates like barnacles on a ship about people and eras and all this stuff is it is remarkable. And you notice it when you go back. And so I actually made a practice of doing this just like you. You read about some. I'll give you a great example of Malcolm X I I read the autobiography, Malcolm X, when I was a kid. I, you know, I don't know what I think of it. I'm not. He hated. Whites. I. I'm white. I guess I'm against Malcolm X, but I know much about. Him and a. Few years ago, again, running on the treadmill, I watched him, Malcolm X speech from right before he was killed in 65. In Harlem, famously right, while giving a speech. But this was like maybe a couple months before. Go watch a Malcolm X speech. I'm not a Muslim. I'm not a black Muslim. I don't agree with everything he said, but Malcolm X had two qualities that left me kind of shocked. Really smart. Like legit smart, not grading on a curve. Smart, like just smart. And second, very funny. And I have to say, like you know, everything Martin Luther King is fine, I guess, but no sense of humor and like, honestly not a genius a plagiarist. Malcolm X was like, a legit, smart guy said, you know, a lot of things I disagree with. Again, as a white Christian, I'm not in favor of black Muslims. However, not it was not all crazy. All a lot of it was like great and super smart and super insightful. And I finished that speech. And I thought, wow. I guess I know why. They killed him. Nice.

He hated white liberals too. He has great, ripped and watched him. He's like, you know, he's like all whites are bad. He, like, we're against whites say OK, fine. But if the white liberals are scary because they're like, oh, I'm your friend, he goes, they're liars, and that's true.

Dave: Yeah, he's ohh. He's great. Him eviscerating white liberals is some of the. Best stuff ever and yeah. Really, really great speech. Great Lord are in very. Smart guy and and listen. But I'll tell you this, whatever this atrophy in like the intelligence of the American people, it's still, I think it's accelerating. I mean, it's a look. And again, just like you said, all disclaimer as well. I'm talking about people who I. Don't necessarily like. Like I view Bill Buckley as one of, like the great villains of the 20th century, I think.

Tucker: I couldn't. I couldn't agree more, but.

Dave: Ruined, yes. But he was a clearly, very also CIA, by the way. But he was also a very intelligent guy and witty and was not speaking down to his audience. And and like a popular show, his firing line show would be Gore Vidal and William F Buckley arguing with each other. I mean, what? You know, but look, even. When when I remember my my mother and my stepfather, they used to love crossfire. This is before you came out. They watched when you were there too. But when I was a little kid, it was the Pat Buchanan. And Kinsley. Is that his name was Michael Kinsley.

Tucker: Yeah. Michael Kinsley, who was really the last really smart liberal in. American television, yeah.

Dave: Right. And they were, they were on. Kinsley's side, like they were liberals, they were not on paper. Cannon side but they. Certainly respected that Pappachan was brilliant and like that it was an interesting conversation and you and and then even going to look, I mean I. Remember I used to watch your show. On MSNBC and when you the line up there on MSNBC, even though a lot of the. Same people were there. It was just so much. Smarter than it is today, I know we've talked all there and you don't have TV or watch TV or anything, but man, you have no idea how dumb it is today. I mean, it's just like if this is not that long ago. This is like maybe. 2006 I'm talk. Thinking about and that. Rachel Maddow had not lost her mind yet, and she was very intelligent. In fact, Rachel Maddow. I believe right around that time wrote a book about the military industrial complex, which was really good. I'm blinking, I I own it. I'm blanking on the name of it dressed maybe or something like that anyway. But. But it was like about. The George W Bush administration. So it was safe for a liberal to write a really great book about how, you know, like the military was lying. Us into all of these. Scarborough show was would have you on regularly and pat you can and on regularly and even like Ron Paul would be on regularly and there would be just really interesting conversations and everyone didn't seem to hate each other as much you and Rachel Maddow would have some. One-on-one. Things where you'd argue, but it was. Kind of in the spirit of, like, we like each other. What we disagree, and even just since then, but you can't fathom. That happening today, you can't.

Tucker: Fathom. And it's weird. I mean I. Know that you. Know I worked there for four years and back when it was trying to like become conservative, they didn't know what they were. I mean, they would be anything that worked and in the end, Rachel worked a lot better than I did. So they fired me and gave her my show. And I was got along with her very well. But like and I and I still have talked. To her and get along with her. Great but. But Joe Scarborough, like something, broke there, and he's to me, is like I always like Joe. I people would always whisper at the company that he had murdered, you know, someone who worked for him. I I didn't have views on that, you know, but but a lot of people thought that he did it. I didn't know. But I will tell you that I got along with him really, really well. He was my filling guy when I was on vacation. And like I look up and like. Maybe an airport? You know, news stand and they're playing it. And Joe Scarborough, like insane and like angry now maybe it's like his personal life. I don't know what it is, but I think that brand of neoliberalism became highly venomous and hateful, not analytical at all. No, nothing dispassionate or reasonable about it. But like, completely like. Kill the.

Unknown Speaker: The guy.

Tucker: And I just turned my life, thought Joe Scarborough. I mean, maybe he goes. Liberal, that's fine, but. To go neoliberal and hate still, I was. Like blown away. I still. Don't understand that.

Dave: Well, here's a here's a good example of this and I sent you these these tweets, if you. Remember, but so Scarborough I. He said something and I responded to. Him and then this kind of, I guess cause. Rogan show is so. Big that it just this is so weird to me because I'm just in my own little world. Like I'm just like I just. I do stand up comedy and I talk about the news and like. I don't know. These are the people on TV or whatever. But so I said something to him because. He was trashing Trump. Orders and and I just said something back to him about it being like elitist and he knew who I was. So he goes. Ohh. So the guy who thinks that the US provoked Putin into invading Iraq and we provoked Osama bin Laden into fighting into doing 911. This is the guy who thinks I'm unamerican for attacking Trump supporters. And there was just. This weird moment. Where because when I first like around that time when you guys were on MSNBC together is when I got into the Ron Paul movements. I was really into politics. And so I loved. I loved everything that was even libertarian. It's. So I'm. I'm just like, excuse me, Mr. Scarborough, but I read your book and in your book you told me that you voted for Ron Paul. So how outraged are you that I'm making the argument of blowback? You told me you voted for Ron Paul for president of these United States of America. So where did this come from? That that is somehow now this, like, off limits out of bounds opinion. When that was the central message of Ron Paul's presidential campaigns. Was that the the term? Tourism was blowback for American foreign policy in the Middle East, not justifying it of. Course, but to? Kind of understand that there's a relationship here, like Pat Buchanan said, terrorism is the price of empire. And so anyways, just so you're like, dude, this is an act or even maybe that was an act, but something here. Is an act.

Unknown Speaker: I I think.

Tucker: I mean, and by the way, it's also a non sequitur. It's like, OK, you know, I said something disagree with years ago, but assess what I just. Said about something. Like like what is that? It's like, you know, I catch you stealing from me and you're like, well, you got drunk in college.

Dave: Right.

Tucker: And stuff with the *****, it's like well. OK. But for me like what? But? I think in Joe's case. And in the case of most people, like the hatred is really self hatred. Obviously. You know, happy people or not, they may be annoyed. You know what I mean? They may make bad judgments. They may even want revenge from time to time. But they're not angry because why would you be people who hate themselves or or angry. And I think Joe made a deal. I mean, they got, you know, caught in that marriage. I don't think that was the plan at all and he just kind of decided to make these accommodations, and he's mad about him, cause Joe is actually not stupid. Believe it or not, watch his show. I hear that it's mine. But he's not mindless. He's actually pretty. They're quite smart, quite clever. And I bet he just feels trapped. You know, he's like 60 years old, repeating, like, stupid talking points from the Biden White House. Like you'd shoot yourself. Before you did that.

Dave: Yeah, yeah, sounds awful. Well, I did get him back. I did say in my response, I said I said, well, if you disagree with me, that US foreign policy provoked Osama bin Laden, can you at least agree with me that your wifes dad shouldn't have? Told him. They did.

Tucker: You attach is a big and then, yeah, he stopped responding. To me after that But by the way how could you deny you know the 9/11 thing? Is I think you make an entirely fair. Case to the extent I understand it. But I think the Ukraine thing is like not a close call. We sent the Vice President Biden sent Kamala. Harris, to the Munich security. Prince and said to Zelensky on camera we want Ukraine to join NATO. Well, I mean, what you're saying is Russia, please invade. We're gonna put missiles on your border, she said this in public. Like, what would be the other reason to say that other than to provoke a war? Well, that's what that that was the purpose. And they did it.

Dave: Yeah. Alright guys, let's take a moment and thank our sponsor for today's show. Which is paint your. Lights. If you are looking for a great gift to give this holiday season. I know a lot of you guys. You've given all the same things over and over. You gave the earrings you gave the. Necklace. You're looking for that special. Your gift. I've got you covered. Paint. Your life is what you got to check out. Paint your life transforms your photos into a one-of-a-kind. Beautiful hand painted portrait by a professional artist. You get a professional hand painted portrait created from any photo for a sentimental holiday gift right from the heart. Use their compilation. Service and upload multiple photos to create anything you imagine. Put yourself in a location you've always wanted to go to, or add a lost loved one to a special occasion to create the portrait of your dreams. There's lots of options. You can customize your

experience with a payment plan that works for you as little as 10% down makes this a truly affordable gift. They have a user friendly platform that lets you order a custom made hand painted portrait in less than 5 minutes. You'll get to approve every stage of the portrait process and request as many modifications as you'd like. To ensure the portrait is painted just like you. Dreamed get a hand painted portrait in as little as two weeks. The perfect holiday gift. It's meaningful, personal and heartwarming. This is a gift that will. This is a gift that will touch the heart and make your loved ones holiday unforgettable this holiday season, you can give the most meaningful gift you have ever given from paintyourlife.com. And there's no risk if you don't love the final painting, your money is refunded. Printed and right now for a limited time offer you can get 20% off your painting. That's right, 20% off and free shipping. To get this special offer text the word problem to 87204. You just text the single word problem to 87204 again. Problem to 87204 paint your life. Celebrate the moments that matter most. Message and data rates may apply. See terms for detail. One more time text the word problem to 87204 for 20%. Went off. Alright, let's get back into the show. Did you ever see? Did you ever read? There was a. I'm sure you have read this, but there was a a private cable that Julian Assange dumped from Burns. The current CIA director who was at the time the ambassador to Russia was in 2008. And he sent a private cable to Condoleezza Rice, who was at the time the Secretary of State. And it's the it's titled Net means Net and the whole thing is about how Ukrainian entry to NATO is the brightest of red lines for everybody in Russia, and they simply will not stand for this. And and look again, it's not reasonable that Vladimir Putin invaded and killed all of these people, but it is totally.

Tucker: Exactly, yes.

Dave: Reasonable to say you cannot expand your military alliance to our biggest next door neighbor. We would never accept that.

Tucker: And like and.

Dave: We would totally invade. I mean, you'd think like if if, you know, the Soviet Union was still around and they said Mexico is a part of the Warsaw Pact that the Washington, DC would just go, well, they made their decision.

Tucker: You can't.

Dave: Like, we're just going to accept that.

Unknown Speaker: We we almost went.

Tucker: To war over missiles in Cuba? No, you're totally.

Dave: Yeah, yeah, right, exactly.

Tucker: Right, and by the? Way that that Burns memo, which I've read, he he doesn't just from in my read of it, doesn't just report that this is the Russian position. He validates and he's like, yes, you get it. Like that's a that's not a. Crazy position to. Have and I just was with Assange in prison in Belmarsh prison in London, like last week or two weeks ago. And you know they're they're torturing him to death, obviously. And and I'm thinking to myself like, why would they? It's what they're doing him so cruel. Why would they do that? And it's stuff like that's the Burns memo cause it it

really late if you knew what was really going on, these people would be on their way to prison. And so they can't. You can't have Julian Assange's. You can't have anyone who tells the truth. Because it's big a threat.

Dave: It's interesting too. If you go back, if you read like all the stuff from a project for a new American Century or a clean break, or any of that, and you realize how much it's all like they pretend it's not. But this was the plan all along. This was the project for a new American Century. And, you know, 23 years into it, it's it's not working out so well.

Tucker: You know, it's so funny. I I they. I shared an office with with Pinac as we call them. When they wrote that memo, which is in 1998 ish and that worked at The Weekly Standard for Bill Crystal at the time and they I'd come back from lunch or go out to the. Men's room and. They would. You'd walk through the peak. Office and there were these kind of nerdy guys, totally nice to the extent I talked to them, but they be like, banging away on their computers, like about a rock or something. A rock. I didn't, you know, like, what's that? And I remember we all made fun of them, like, oh, they've got some plans. And the idea was they were like every other thing tank and wash them. That comes up with white papers that nobody reads. And that certainly are never affected into policy.

Dave: Wrong. Well, it does sound kind of. You know, it's funny because I was. I I've been, you know, just because the all the stuff happening in Israel now, I've been kind of just going back and I'm pretty well reading it. But going back and reading like early. Zionist writings and. It's a kind of similar thing where like and look in in a sense, you gotta tip your hat to them on this, and particularly with Israel, where you know as much as I may disagree with some of their. You know, policy toward the Palestinians and. Stuff they did. This thing. That is just insane. Theme. This was just like a few a group of like radical young like 20, something year old Jews in Eastern Europe who are like, hey, we're gonna start a new country in the our Bibles Holy Land and they did it like you would have if you had walked through that office. If you had to go to the bathroom through like the. In this office. In like 18 in the late 1800s, Jesus.

Tucker: Well, there's theater. Hertzal got that OK.

Dave: Sure, Theodore. Yeah. You're gonna go conquer Palestine. Where? You've never been. You've never been to. Palestine, but yeah, you're about to go conquer and you're like, well, alright, maybe I should have taken that guy a little bit more serious.

Tucker: Is that true? Did Herzal never never actually go to the region?

Dave: He may have have at some point gone, but when he first came up with Zionism, he had never been there. So I don't know, he he may have gone later, but like when his the earliest Zionist writings, he had never been. There and almost none of them. There was like a couple, there's like. One of them. Who ended up going there? I can't. I'm blaming it on his name. But he was one of the first ones who went there and he was like, oh, yeah, no, this is sorry. There's people there. This isn't. This isn't gonna work. There's. Gonna there's gonna be. A whole thing if we do it. Yeah. And it and it turns out it was. It was a whole thing. But anyway, so let me ask you just a

little bit about this, this kind of latest conflict. It seems like in the right. And when I say the right, I just mean broadly like say the right. Half of America. It seems like there's been this kind of. Where 50% of the rate stepped into a time machine and is now in 2002. And then there seems to be the other half that I think you are kind of in where you're still like hey, but I thought we kind of learned some lessons over the last 20 years and I thought the whole America first movement was kind of about like, shouldn't our government? Be primarily concerned with what's best for our country. Can we at least have a conversation? Maybe before we. Give a blank check to level Gaza and what what's this kind of been like? For you and. We responded on the show to Ben Shapiro, kind of really emotionally attacking you over saying like, hey, we have our a lot of very serious problems here that don't seem to generate nearly as much concern. Amongst the political class, like what do you what? Have you thought about? This dynamic and this kind of shift in. The right in America well.

Tucker: I mean, I honestly there are days when I. Tried not to. Think about it, because it's just too revealing. I mean, it's really like walking in on your parents having sex. You wanna Unsee it? You know, like you shouldn't. There's some things you. Don't ever want. To see and one of them is people revealing themselves to be totally false, just like deeply dishonest frauds. And there's been a lot of that look. So from I I would just, I mean most of my opinions on most things are not very interesting and I have a million opinions on a million different countries. I've traveled so much over my life. But one thing I've learned is like the closer you get to something, the less you realize you understand it. You know, and so. I really am trying to discipline myself to focus on the country that I live in and that my. Children are living in, which is. US. And so I just from day one, I'm like, you know, I've got all. Kinds of opinions about a. Whole suite of different issues and countries, but I want to, for the purposes of my job like focus on this country #1. We have freedom of speech is guaranteed in our Constitution, is the First Amendment in the Bill of Rights and anything that abridges that is not only unconstitutional, it's immoral. And so we just have to stick to that no matter what. I don't care if there's a war or financial meltdown or riots in the streets. I get to say what I think because I'm a free man, not a slave. OK, so anyone who is against that is transactionally my enemy, OK, number one. Number two, I don't want to get into a war that doesn't benefit us. We've done that a lot over the past 20 years. I've covered all of those wars. I think I can say with certainty we didn't benefit. And by the way, those countries didn't. Benefit either. For what it's worth. And so I don't want. To do it again, #3 we're not. Capable of winning a war in a meaningful sense with Iran. They closed the Straits of Moose. We would have a full financial meltdown like we'd be poor, like in a day. So the stakes are incredibly high. Leaving aside the potential for nuclear conflict, I don't want that. The fourth thing I want is the ability to to like, have a conversation about it. For example, on the question of refugees or what two and. A half million. People living in Gaza, obviously a lot of people in Israel, want them to leave. I get it, you know, whatever, that's their country. But their argument is these people are too dangerous to live next to us, OK? That's their view. But then for

people to argue that they should come here. Wait. I thought you just told us they're too dangerous to live in the place they were born. So they have to come to the United States. What does that say about how you feel? About the United. States. It tells me that you consider this country my country, my children's country, a trash bin into us to throw your **** when you're done with it. And I'm so offended by that attitude. I I can't even process like it actually makes me red in the face, man. It's so disrespectful to my country that I can barely deal with. It and I. I have a lot of trouble speaking to like people get. Their views about, you know, is it. Justified to kill thousands of civilians? OK, I'm trying to stay out of it, but nobody can justify that argument that these people are too disgusting and immoral and dangerous to live next to Israel. But they should live. In the United. States. **** you. You're making that argument. And I mean.

Dave: You know one hundred 100%. One of the things that was really amazing to me was to see when Donald.

Tucker: Sorry, I lost control. It makes me so mad. It's.

Dave: No, you're you're absolutely right.

Tucker: So it's so wrong my. Wife or something? It's so. You don't even like America if you're making that argument.

Dave: Well, well, no. And like and and like. You said like, like you said, I mean I have the same attitude. Like I my my kids. Are growing up in this. This so I don't like care about the future of this country. I like care about it more than I've ever cared about anything else in the world. That's the most important thing is where my kids are growing up. Like what are what life. Are they going to have? And it's not just, it's not like there's one or two people making this argument. This is like the. Establishment of the Republican Party's position.

Unknown Speaker: The Wall Street Journal wrote an.

Tucker: Like essentially. Op-ed saying that and I was. I thought you were the Conservative news. I mean, obviously it's not. It's a joke paper. But still yes believes that some editor signed up. Yeah, let's. Here's an op-ed from foreigners who want to expel these people because they're too dangerous, telling us that we have an obligation to take in these people who are too. Dangerous like, are you?

Dave: Even kidding? Yeah, and like, and those are their two. Positions like personally I. Don't I have two different positions? I think they're like, oh, they're kind of dangerous, but they can still be given their statehood over there. And also we. Have no obligation to take them. In over here like but regardless it's your.

Tucker: Hey, exactly, totally fair, right?

Dave: If you're but. Those positions at least can coexist. But look, I remember. And this was stunning to me because I was politically radicalized or whatever during the George W Bush administration and then to see when Donald Trump said in 2016 that we need to shut down Muslim immigration to the United States of America. You know, in his words, until we figure out what the. Hell is going on, we. Need to have a moratorium. He wouldn't use a big word like that, but some, you know, like that we

need to shut down Muslims. Operation and every NEO con establishment Republican went this is Islamophobic. And it's like after just years of every right wing radio host in this country being perfectly fine with, you know, the Obama's problem is he won't say radical Islam and radical Islam and they it when they're selling a war. Based on this, like Islamophobia or whatever you want to. Call it totally fine when you're saying, hey, maybe. We should protect our own borders. You're a bigot now. All of a sudden for using that and you see it right again and now to your point, they're doing them both simultaneously. It's it's, it's just, it's madness.

Tucker: It it is insane and I just feel. I guess honor bound to make the point, and I I'm not. Sure, it adds up to anything. I'm just being honest. There are a lot of Muslims that I happen to know and really like and obviously I hate extremists of all kinds. I'm just not temperamentally an extremist and I don't like violence and I don't like radical change. OK, so that's where I am. But, you know, I know a lot of people who have spent time over there in the Middle East, really great people and they're Muslims, totally moderate. Truly like. Actually, in fact, I will say there's almost no one in the world more moderate than a moderate Muslim, because there are a lot of radicals there. So like, they've thought through their.

Dave: Right, right.

Tucker: And also again, it's just personal preference, but like anybody who gets on his knees five times a day and admits that he's not. I you know, I'm I'm kind of for that. I'm just being honest. You know? I don't. I don't believe in their God or whatever. I'm. Not a Muslim, I'm. Not gonna become a Muslim, but I like the acknowledgment that they're not ultimately in charge of the universe, and I wish that our leaders would acknowledge that. Once in a while it would be good for them.

Dave: Yeah, no, 100% and the you know, the last thing I'll say on the subject, which is just kind of my thing is that like I'm not even against. So I'm like a like a pure libertarian. I just believe in freedom and natural rights and all of that stuff. That's like, that's all I I believe in. And I just hate government and. The Federal Reserve. And unnecessary wars and all of. That that's all. That's my. Position, so I'm theoretically I am totally for even like I'm totally for. Being a snob. Criticizing the rest of the world for not being as free as they should be. You know what I mean? Like I be I. Have no problem with. Any of that, I hate all tyranny.

Tucker: Yes, good.

Dave: But when the when your government. Has expressly had had a policy for decades of funding, arming and promoting the most radical elements of Islam. You don't get. To then sit up there and go look at how barbaric and radical these Islamists are.

Tucker: We agree.

Dave: Yeah, it's just, it's insane. Alright, listen, I'm. I'm going to. Let you go, but I just before before. We do because I literally.

Unknown Speaker: You've spun me up, Dave.

Dave: I Tucker, I would sit here and talk to you for 10 hours and then I just feel like there would be other people in the. I feel like you would do it. But then all of the. Other people in your house would be like, what is he doing? He's gonna start. Setups, but I just want to ask you because things are so crazy right now and I don't know if if this has got to be probably the hardest like presidential race to make predictions about because literally, I mean the sitting president of the United States of America could die at any moment, and I'm not being hyperbolic, could at any moment set of staircases could take him out.

Tucker: It's me at dinner? Yeah. You wouldn't sell them life insurance right now, yeah.

Dave: Yes, that's that's certainly be. You could sell them it, but it. Would be at A at. A very high premium, yes, there's.

Tucker: My yeah.

Dave: Always a price though. You know, if you understand markets, there's always a price you can need. That but Donald. Trump is at war with the most powerful interests in the. World do you have like a feeling? What do you think is gonna happen over the next year if you? Had to guess politically.

Tucker: Gosh, I mean, it's just opaque to me. I know that it's very unlikely that we have a race between Trump and Biden. I just refuse to believe that's going to happen. The Democratic Party didn't want Biden in the 1st place. That he didn't want Bernie Sanders cause that iteration of Bernie Sanders. This more sincere one before he became just a neoliberal. Robot but really was kind of calling out the banks and that you can't do that. You know, if you're a Democrat running for president, cause the banks are are your donors, so they they couldn't have Bernie Sanders. He was the only candidate with organic support. And so they tried to run Pete Buddha judge and they were like, yeah, he's. A robot? He's got a. Record of 0 achievement. He's got a horrible. Personality. He's gay. He's gay. And of course, there's some question as to whether. People to judge actually is gay. Right. And notice. The case will work for me like he's. Not really gay, but you know, I don't know. I'm not making. The point is that the the dogs would not eat that dog food like no one actually like eat. But a judge, even the dude he's married to clearly doesn't like people to judge. And and I understand why. So they're just like, ohh shift you. Know we could. Either get Trump reelected or. We win it with Bernie. Freaking Sanders, which is is just as bad. So they're like, ohh and. They pick Biden and they throw him in and then you know, the rest happened. But at this point, with him losing in the swing States and head to heads against Trump like, there's no utility in having this guy. He's embarrassing. He's now 81. And they're going to take him out. I mean, I I bet my house. Look, I've been wrong a lot and I could be. Wrong again, but I. Just don't see their. Motive in in that like you know, all they care about is winning. All they care about is accruing power and Biden is now in the way. He was once useful, and now he's not. He will be discarded. And that's what the regime. Does that's what the BLOB does. The org doesn't care about the individual. It's the opposite of your views. You cover the individual. How does it

affect me? People, I love names and souls. They don't care about names or souls or individuals. They care about groups. The blacks, the Hispanics, the gays.

Dave: Right.

Tucker: That's another way of saying we don't care about you. You're just a voting bloc. And so they definitely don't care about Joe Biden. Trust me at all. And he will be disposed of into the dustbin of history. And I won't mourn his his departure. But then it's like, who takes his place? Obviously, it's Gavin Newsom.

Dave: Right.

Tucker: He's he's like the most unrestrained, most evil, most sociopathic person in the. Whole party. So of course he's. Going to rise to the top of.

Dave: Yeah. And then what? You think it's you think it's him versus Trump or do you think Trump, I I see I look at it and I go Trump is basically at war with the deep state. And if you're at war with the deep state, you should probably bet on the deep state.

Tucker: You know, in general that's been kind of true. You know, Trump's bet is that, you know, 10s of millions of people support him. So it really is kind of a question about democracy. Like, does it actually work? Do people have? Any political power at? All allowed to have a voice in the process. Do they? Do they have?

Dave: Right.

Tucker: A say and. Trump's betting that. They do. I mean, I just. I just will say this. I just keep arriving at the same kind of banal conclusion, which is this next 12 months worth the end of November 2023. By the end of November 2024, it's going to be. A different country and. I and I really feel that strongly. I mean, of course, I hope I'm wrong. I I, as I said, I don't like radical change. But I think we're getting it for sure.

Dave: Yeah, yeah. I I hate to agree with you, but I think you're right. Dude, I enjoyed this. So much, Tucker, thank you so much.

Tucker: I did immensely, Dave.

Dave: Well, I'd love. I'd love to do it again anytime. Everybody, if you don't already, it seems almost ridiculous to plug. It's like the biggest show in this world. But go check out Tucker show on X. It is just always phenomenal, always really thoughtful and really interesting. Thank you so much for coming on. Thanks everybody.

Tucker: Great to see you man. Thanks.

Dave: Alright, catch you guys next time.

Count Dankula

Absolute Mad Lads - Ted Kaczynski

Source

1.3M views

Count Dankula

1.03M subscribers

Nature is amazing. It's very easy to take it for granted, but it is truly incredible just how much beauty and joy some greenery can add to any setting. But sadly it's disappearing for the whole of human civilization. The slow March of Progress has made us increasingly dependent on. Literal and metaphorical machines while. Shrinking all that's green and good in the world, even before the return to monkey me, many people have advocated for returning to a simpler style of living and a more harmonious relationship with nature. However, they've very often been dismissed as tree huggers and hippies. One man refused to be ignored. This Lorax was going to speak for the trees, and he made it clear that they were ***** angry. He went to extreme lengths to make sure that the world listened as he stood up and said. The Industrial Revolution and its consequences have been a disaster for the human race. Doctor Theodore J Kaczynski, better known as. Please leave a like and a comment on this video because it really helps me in the algorithm. But before we get started, this video was brought to you by Atlas VPN. Get the greatest VPN deal on the market and enjoy the most affordable Online Protection for just \$1.83 per month with a 30 day money back guarantee. Enjoy blazing speeds and stream your favorite show and high quality or. Play your favorite games at Lightning fast speed, all while protecting every single one of your. Bases with just a single subscription, I enjoy using Atlas VPN because it is seamless, fast and easy to use and no one should have to deal with corporations, governments or hackers spying and stealing their data. And that list VPN gives you a way to avoid that. I use it to watch shows on the American Netflix and Adult Swim because. Annoyingly, they have lot more content than the British value. You will also be safer from malware and also stop annoying ads since the VPN immediately blocks all connections to malicious links, ads and trackers and that notifies you if someone tries to steal your data. Save money while shopping online and get the best deals while getting the most out of your online subscriptions such as Netflix, Spotify Airlines, Hotels and much, much more. And right now Atlas VPN is running a massive discount. You can get a three-year subscription for just \$1.83 a month with a 30 day money back. Empty time is running

out, so if you want to get this great deal then click my link down in the description Theodore John Kaczynski was born in Chicago on the 22nd of May in 1942 to Polish American parents named Wanda and Theodore. By all accounts, little Ted was raised in a very ordinary. However, there was just one problem. Play it far from normal. Thus first became apparent after Ted was isolated in the hospital with hives brought on by a severe allergic reaction. His mother believes that this stint in the hospital is what's set in motion. The key events in Ted's life, because he was never the same afterwards. The isolation reportedly left head with terrible separation anxiety because his family were only allowed to visit him in hospital for two hours twice a week. However, Ted disagrees with this assessment and he insists that he never had any problems with the solitude. Of his early life. Now this is going to become a recurring theme throughout this video, Ted is going to disagree with a lot of the things that I say because Ted has a lot to say about both the mainstream narrative of his story and the accounts of his family. Ted says that the story of him being. Cripplingly lonely, was manufactured by his mother, and he even alleges that he was subjected to extreme psychological verbal abuse by his parents when he was young. Either way, regardless of exactly what, if anything, ***** head up as a kid. His isolation and difficulty connecting with others would go on to set the tone for the rest of his. Life when Ted was just five years old, his little brother David was born. Now it's natural for all older siblings to be a little bit jealous and need some time to adjust to having to share. Tension, but you can see why. It's believed that David's arrival didn't exactly help with Ted's situation. However, the boys mother made sure that David knew how important it was. To be there for. Said out of concern for his fear of abandonment, and David swore never to do such a thing to Ted. In the business, we call this foreshadowing. However, David did actually really look up to and love Ted, and in his own way he always. Kept that promise. However, Ted wasn't exactly the. Easiest kid to love because his greatest gift turned out to be a bit. Of a curse. He was a ***** genius with an extremely high IQ of 167. Ted quickly proved to be extraordinarily gifted and he skipped 5th and 6th grade at school, however. There was a catch. Ted ended up being a massive loner, but not because he was a nerd. I mean, he was, but it's not that Ted was shunned by his peers. He just didn't have any. While skipping grades helped Ted develop academically at a more appropriate pace for a mind. Of his calibre. It ended up stunting him socially because being two years ahead meant that he was separated from kids his own age and he couldn't relate to his older classmates. By the time high school rolled around, this lack of social development led to Ted being seen as a bit of a freak by his peers. The frustration that this inevitably caused it then led to Ted acting out a bit, and he often found himself getting into trouble. In one such incident, Ted built a pipe bomb in chemistry class that blew out two windows and gave a girl temporary hearing loss. And the business. We call this foreshadowing. It should not come as a surprise at all that Ted got into Harvard. At the age. Of only 16 with a full scholarship, because universities just can't get enough child prodigies throughout his time there, Ted lived at 8 Prescott St. Alongside other students that were also his age and he ended up seeing a lot of that house because

he. The Harvard put all of the younger students in the house together in an attempt to make the experience of being at college a bit less lonely. But just like most other attempts by universities to improve the mental health of their students. It only made things worse. All this boarding arrangement achieved was isolating all of the kids from the rest of their classmates, which meant that. Most of the students that lived there never really went out or left the house unless they were going to class or the library. But see when you think about it, the concept of gifted kids is actually quite ***** **. I mean, obviously it's good to nurture a child's natural talent early on and. Help them unlock their full potential, but all that really happens is the child is ripped away from their own peers. They have a massive amount of pressure unloaded onto them that they are just not ready for and essentially they are robbed of their childhood. I mean, if you want to see what I'm talking about, have a look online at gifted children. You know, the ones that get sent to high school and university early and then have a look at their suicide rates. So Ted's environment obviously wouldn't have been very good for his well-being, but don't worry. It's about to get a lot worse when he wasn't busy putting that big 10 pound brain of house to good use in class. Ted was one of 200 participants in a really ***** ** study titled Multi Form Assessments of Personality Development Among gifted College Men, which was conducted. By Henry Murray, who was looking to test how people react under stress, Ted and the other participants were tasked with writing a personal essay about. Their core beliefs and goals in life as the basis for philosophical discussion. It sounds fairly simple, but it quickly became clear that the essays were actually ammunition for psychological abuse that Murray carried out over several hours while the subject was hooked up to electrodes. Ted likely took part in this study for three years in which he was berated and humiliated for a total of over 200 hours, and what Murray described as vehement sweeping and personally abusive. Never mind knocking the egos and beliefs of his subjects down a peg. Murray was trying to wipe them right off the crib board. But don't worry, abusing these vulnerable young men. As for a good cause? Trust the science. Considering what else Ted had going on in his life at the time, it's pretty clear. That this really would not have a good effect on his mental well. Being later in life, David said that Ted was harder and more defensive with others after he took part in this study. But on the bright side, it must have helped save a fortune on his electric bills because of how intensely the whole thing glowed because you will never *****. This. Who? Murray. What for The Office of Strategic Services, which is better known as the precursor. Of the ***** CIA. I **** you not. There is a very good chance that Ted may actually have been part of MK Ultra. He got none of the benefits though, because they didn't even score him some LSD for his trip. People in true three letter agency fashion everything that happened next in Ted's life might actually be their fault because it is heavily theorised by both Ted supporters and detractors that the study might have only just really solidified his beliefs and trying to strike him down. They only made him more powerful. But it's really funny how pretty much every case like. This leads back to the feds, I. Mean it's just. It's so funny. It's so strange. You know, maybe one day they will actually stop

someone that was on their radar. Ted even believes that the feds had something to hide because a few decades later, finding the data from this particular study became very important. Or certain legal reasons that we will get into later. But the psychologists that conducted the study all refused to talk. OK.

It's funny that isn't it. However, this assertion that the Harvard study was a dark turning point in Ted's life may be somewhat exaggerated. Once again, Ted gave a very different account of his experience at Harvard, saying that he was perfectly fine and he struggled neither emotionally. Psychologically or academically, although he did complain that many of the lectures were poorly organised. Which, to be honest, is pretty standard for a university, but despite his dismissal of the potential drawbacks of his time at Harvard, Ted did admit to being affected by one major problem that may have been worse than anything that even the CIA could throw at him. As Ted put it himself. They did suffer from acute sexual starvation. I was in daily contact with smart, physically attractive Radcliffe women, and I didn't know how to make advances to them. So despite being a bit young, Ted really was just an ordinary student after all. All that skill with numbers. But he couldn't count any *****. In 1962, Ted graduated from Harvard and began his postgrad education at the University of Michigan, where he and his Masters degree in 1964. At this point, he would have preferred to move on to UC Berkeley or the University of Chicago. Michigan came with a teaching job that made the best offer, and it earned \$2310 a year, which is a salary of roughly 19 grand in today's money, despite being in a really good place in life, both professionally and academically, Ted really wasn't having a good time. Of things eventually, all this frustration manifested itself in a pretty bizarre way for. For weeks, Ted ended up fantasising about turning female. But this wasn't just a case of grabbing a Scott and some thigh highs and calling it a day. He actually set up an appointment with the Universities Health Centre with the intent to undergo a sex change. So yeah, Ted had a bit of a trance phase. However, we are not going to be calling him Theodora for the rest of the video because Ted. Did didn't actually go through with it on his way to the appointment, Ted found himself struck by shame and a burning hatred for the psychiatrist that he was on his way to sea. He then proceeded to lie until the appointment was over, but while he didn't actually address the issue, he was there to discuss. He did have something of a breakthrough in his utter despair. Ted thought that the future looked completely empty. And he wanted to kill the psychiatrist because of it, which provided just the shock that he needed to snap out of his slump. As Ted put it himself like a phoenix, I burst from the ashes of my despair to a glorious New Hope. Experience also taught Ted that he really felt like he could actually kill someone. But don't worry, I'm sure he was just exaggerating. I'm sure that. Absolutely nothing bad will come from Ted. Having that knowledge. But more pressingly, Ted also realised that what he actually needed was to get away from it all and live a simpler life. He soon began making plans to do so, but. More on that later, because for now. Ted still had what to do. Ted went on to earn his PhD in 1967 with a dissertation that was titled Boundary functions, and this

dissertation won him first prize for best dissertation of the Year. However, Ted didn't seem particularly overjoyed. By this monumental achievement, even despite the number of doors that a doctorate would have opened for them, according to David, instead of being proud, Ted was, and I quote. But more and more interested in the woods. But Ted wouldn't answer the call of nature just yet, and instead embarked on the next step of the standard mass nerd career path that autumn, at the age of only 25, Ted became the youngest assistant professor. In the history of UC Berkeley, well, he taught undergraduate geometry and calculus as you would expect, Ted didn't really enjoy his time there because surprised. Teaching is something that really doesn't come naturally when you are extremely socially awkward. Did struggled with delivering lectures and he actively avoided interacting with the students under his tutelage. And as if that wasn't bad enough, he also grew very black pilld about the absolute state of modernity and technologies role in it because he began to see that this brave new world. That we were progressing toward. Odds may actually be the cause of many of society's problems, so he decided to escape once and for all, despite the fact that he was in a very cushy and well paid job and was doing well enough that he was on track for tenure, maths wasn't really Ted's calling. I mean, sure, he was a prodigy, but. He only really saw as a game that he was very good at and he even resented the way his mother would call him a genius. So it wasn't much of a loss for Ted when he abruptly resigned from his position on the 30th of June. 1969 he then moved back in with his parents in Illinois for two years until he bought an acre and a half of land near Lincoln, Mt in 1971, on which. He lived in a cabin that he had built himself with some help from his brother David at 10 feet by 12 feet, which is 3 by 4 metres, and real measurements. The cabin was very small and it had no electricity or running water. Not that Ted needed either for his new primitive lifestyle. On the rare occasions that he needed to head back to civilisation. Ted, that got around by bike and he usually only went to the nearby library. Otherwise he spent his time reading, writing, hunting rabbits, growing vegetables, and generally. Living off the land as much as possible, however, Ted's little slice of Paradise couldn't provide him with everything because he still needed a financial income to pay property taxes of \$110 and property taxes only exist to stop people from living off the grid. I'm not getting any. This video is going to be long enough. The point is that despite his primitive and self-sufficient lifestyle, Ted still had to work on jobs every so often so he could get by. One such job was a relatively brief stint at a factory in Chicago in 1978. Well, his brother David was a supervisor while working there, Ted dated a female supervisor. But as you can probably guess from Ted's, life is alone or the relationship didn't last long. And didn't take the break up very well. He decided to cope by writing crude limericks about how and posting them around the factory, which as funny as that sounds, was ultimately a petty stunt that got Ted fired by his own brother. Sadly, Ted's little bit of land in the Montana woods. Just wasn't off the grid enough, no matter how far he went. The slow March of Modernity kept creeping up on him, and his little plot of land began to feel less like a sanctuary and more like a corner. He was being backed into his favorite patches of. Pitcher kept getting

bulldozed and paved over, and industrial and land development projects, which Ted just found many of these trees were my friends. Ted had previously discussed not being off the grid enough any 23 page essay that he sent his brother back in 1971, in which he vented his frustration with humanity's destructive obsession with advancing science and technology. Role he had watched it erode nature and his own sense of freedom right before his eyes. Ted had actually initially planned to go even further into the wilderness, but he settled where he did because the Montana Mountains were just too beautiful to pass up. But sadly, this was no longer the case. The corruption of Ted's wilderness had gone so far that writing down his feelings just wasn't enough anymore, and before long, Ted's righteous fury spurred him into action, and he decided to do a little troll. Then he started to sabotage construction sites and **** with neighbours that were bothering them. In one case, Ted pulled sand into a sawmills engine, and in another he used an axe to trash the cabin of a neighbour that kept riding his motorbike on a nearby trail. Even took a **** in his bathtub for good measure. But this petty mischief wasn't enough. Ted needed to think bigger if he was going to make any kind of real difference. He thought that. People were so cucked by the machine that they were too comfortable with their own oppression, and they needed to be forced out of that comfort for any real change to take place. He needed to light a fire under society's **** to get them to understand just how bad things really are. Which would spur them into action. So Ted decided to deliver a message. Literally on the 25th of May in 1978, a materials engineering professor at Northwestern University in Illinois named Buckley Christ brought a package with his name and workplace listed as the return address to the mail room. He had no recollection of sending it and had no idea of who it was addressed to. So a suspicious campus police off. So took it off his hands and he ended up becoming Ted's first victim. Fortunately, however, his injuries were very minor. Almost a year later, on the 9th of May 1979, a grad student was similarly injured after detonating a bomb that Ted had sent to the university disguised as a cigar box. But the two incidents wouldn't be linked until half a year later, on the 15th of November 1979, Ted put a bomb in the cargo hold of an American Airlines flight that was headed to Washington, DC, from Illinois, however. It had a faulty timing device, so all it did was start smoking mid flight, which caused a dozen passengers to suffer from smoke inhalation before the pilot could carry out an emergency landing in Virginia. Despite the bomb's failure, which experts reckoned could have absolutely obliterated the plane. Had it worked properly, the attempted bombing of a commercial flight was enough to get the FBI involved, and they quickly connected the bomb on the plane to the two injuries at North Western University. The hunt was now on a task force was put together by the FBI so that they could get to the bottom of the bombings and this task force had the code name. Unabom, which stands for university and airline bombing in reference to the targets, upon hearing this, the press quickly dubbed Ted. In addition to the FBI, the US Postal Inspection Service was involved for obvious reasons, and the ATF decided to join the show because explosives are in their wheelhouse. But mainly the feds just wanted to use terrorists to catch a terrorist on the 10th of June. In 1980,

Ted sent a bomb to the home of the American Airlines President Percy Wood, which left him with severe cuts and burns. The bomb was very quickly linked with the last three, but this time. They found the letters FC stamped into a bit of shrapnel, which the feds interpreted as a signature. The investigation started to ramp up a bit more with this piece of evidence, and then the feds were absolutely ecstatic when another pipe bomb found at the University of Utah on the 8th of October 1980. One turned out to be a dud. So not only was luckily no one hurt, but the authorities finally had an intact device to gather evidence from. As the bombings continued throughout the 80s, it gradually became apparent that sticks and bits of wood appeared in the construction of the bombs, or. References to word appeared in the addresses of the packages, such as the name of the American Airlines president. With this in mind, the authorities analyse the wood and the bomb remnants to try and trace its source. But to no avail. The bombs were all handmade by Ted after he taught himself how to put them together for obvious reasons. Ted didn't use any power tools and he made any tools that he did need by hand. He also casted metal parts by melting metal. Scraps on his cabins, wood burning stove. But despite the bare bones construction, the bombs were meticulously constructed and they didn't leave behind any real evidence because they were made out of scrap metal and wood that you would find lying anywhere. So the materials couldn't be traced. Ted's vigilance didn't help either. He never left any fingerprints on any of the bombs because, well, he's not an idiot, but also any parts that had to be bought in a shop were purchased very far away from Ted's cabin, and he did so. In disguise, Ted also had no personal relationship with his victims, so there was really nothing to link them back to him. But while Ted was giving the authorities absolutely nothing to go on, that doesn't mean that the targets were selected at random. Ted specifically went after people that he saw as threats to the environment and his idyllic life in the woods. Another set back to the investigation occurred after a 1982 bombing with the discovery of a note on the bomb that read Woo it works. I told you it would, and this note was saying. RV naturally, the feds absolutely jumped at the chance to see where this clue led and they undertook the monumental task of running down everyone named Wu and everyone with the initials RV. They found absolutely nothing. Because the note was just a complete red herring. Also the FC. That Ted had stamped on all of the bombs. Yeah, that was also completely meaningless. Ted was trolling the feds with fake clues. It's also kind of funny that the bombs were so janky that the feds couldn't really understand them, but the trade off was that the first few bombs luckily kind of sucked, however. Practice makes perfect and the bombs became increasingly dangerous overtime, causing more and more serious injuries as Ted got better at his craft. Nevertheless, Ted's first kill didn't occur until his 11th bombing on the 11th of December 1985. When the owner of a computer store in Sacramento named Hugh. Scrutton died from his injuries after unwittingly detonating a bomb around this time, Ted's bombing campaign wasn't the only thing he had going on. 1986 was an explosive time in Ted's personal life, as it was the last time that David visited him at his cabin. Soon after Ted completely cut David out of his life over David's engagement to a

woman named Linda Patrick. Even though Ted had never met the woman, he urged David to call off the wedding because he hated the perceived effect that Linda was having on him. You see, David had always looked up to Ted and even bought some land off the grid, just like his older brother had. But Ted felt like Linda had changed David. For the worse, corrupting his mind until it was full of standard middle class attitudes. Basically, Ted hated Linda because he felt that Linda had turned his brother into a normie. Ultimately, Ted felt betrayed when David refused to dump her, likely seeing it as being abandoned by the only person in his life that was somewhat close to his level, both intellectually and in the fact that the. Two of them. Were both virgins with rage? Actually said in a letter that David's marriage broke a bond between them because David was now getting laid. But despite being chronically single, there was one woman that noticed Ted just. Not in the way that he hoped. In 1987, a secretary at a computer shop in Salt Lake City spotted a mustached man in a hoodie and sunglasses putting an object on the ground in the car park. Outside an hour later, the shop's owner was seriously injured when he tried. To pick it up. The elusive Unabomber had finally been seen in the flesh, which led to a police sketch being circulated. Everywhere. However, aside from the bombing, stopping for six years, the sketch didn't help even after it was redrawn in 1994 into the iconic image that you all know the feds ran out of leads and gradually began to hope that the dreaded Unabomber. Had either died or had been locked up on other charges, in reality Ted was just doing his own thing and essentially playing IRL Stardew Valley whenever he wasn't reading or writing, but just because he'd been away for a while. Doesn't mean he was finished. Eventually Ted returned with a vengeance in 1993, severely injuring a geneticist in Tiburon, CA, and a computer science professor at Yale within. Two days of each other and after this explosive return that shook America to its core, Ted immediately followed it up by taking a break for another year, but not without having a little fun first. Soon after his last bomb. Ted sent a letter to the New York Times claiming to be from an anarchist group responsible for the bombings named FC. The letter promised to be in touch in the future and included an identifying number to prove the authenticity of future correspondence. There was also a faint impression in the paper of the letter which? Red call Nathan R Wednesday 7:00 PM yet again, the feds were absolutely delighted with these two leads. They followed up on them by doing as the message said, and called Nathan R. They interviewed over 10,000 people named Nathan that had some names beginning with the letter R, which was a huge undertaking that must have cost a Fort. Tune and countless manners. The FBI were desperate to see how deep this rabbit hole went, and they chased this lead as hard as they could before it went cold. So after over a decade of trying to hunt down the Unabomber, what did they find? And absolutely nothing. The clues were complete *****. Ted was just ***** with them again. The name Nathan R was just plucked out of thin air and the authentication number from the top of the letter. Well, that turned out to be the Social Security number of just some poor random guy. In Northern California, the hunt for the Unabomber went on to become one of the most expensive investigations

in the FBI's history. And I'm starting to believe that that wouldn't have been the case if they didn't have Ted constantly ***** with them. The feds decided to publish the letter in the New York Times to try and get some kind of lead out of. It however, that just resulted in them being trolled by the public is they just ended up chasing after random students and at Dungeons and Dragons club in Chicago. Didn't spend all of his time just ***** around on the 10th of December 1990. Before Ted killed Thomas J Mosser, an advertising executive at Burson Marsteller in New Jersey, now an advertising executive, doesn't really seem like the kind of target that would be on an eco-terrorist hit list. But Mossel had helped Exxon repair its image after they caused a massive oil spill in 1989. Ted then claimed his third victim on the 24th of April the following year, a lumber industry lobbyist in Sacramento named Gilbert Brent Murray. And it was after this third killing that Ted finally laid his cards on the table in April of 1995, Ted contacted the New York Times, and he revealed to them that the bombings were his wheeled and frankly, pretty ***** way of drawing attention to his magnum opus. A manifesto that was titled. Industrial society and its future, and Ted wanted this manifesto published in the papers. He promised to stop the bombings if they published it, but he warned them that he would blow up a plane if they refused. Obviously, the feds didn't want to actually publish the manifesto. Because they didn't want to boost his ego or let him have a win. But in the end, the feds were so desperate for. Leads that they decided to oblige. So on the 19th of September 1995, the New York Times helped to get the manifesto published as an 8 page supplement in the Washington Post, because that whole we don't negotiate with terrorist stuff is obviously a lot of ***** . But what was in? This dreaded document that Ted thought was so important that he pulled off such an outrageous publicity stunt. Industrial society and its future is Ted's magnum opus, containing 35,000 words of. The most base chat you'll ever read.

It is like look you can approve of the message even if you deeply disapprove of the method. You know, like the IRA, for, for legal reasons, that's a joke. And just like the pipe bombs the manifesto was signed. FC, which by this point was believed to be an acronym for Freedom. Club if it wasn't clear before, FC doesn't exist, there is no such thing. It was just all a bunch of hokum that Ted made-up to troll the feds. Only the feds could believe in an anarchist organization with a name as ***** cringe as Freedom Club throughout the manifesto or as I like to call it, Ted's truth bomb. Literally rages against the machine asserting right from its infamous opening line that the Industrial Revolution and its consequences have been a disaster for the human race. Ted argues that technological progress has gradually stripped us of our basic liberty and made. Subservience to the technological system itself by reducing us to mere cogs in the machine that maintains it, which has led to the rise of both big governments and corporations, in addition to many of these social ills that plague our society today. This subservience is caused by the. Fact that as technology progresses, the system based around it increases in size and influence, which has molded society around supporting its growth. For example, think about how we are gradually moving towards a cashless society. With cash, you are free to spend your money however you

want without having to worry about being tracked. But with all of your transactions taking place through a credit card or on your phone, we are increasingly at the mercy of the banks that can record and trace all of our purchases and freeze our accounts. Do you want to buy food? Well, you better not do anything that the bank doesn't like. Do you want to make your own food? Well, good ***** luck, because we have put miles of bureaucratic red tape in the way. Ohh, and don't even worry about trying to even think about buying farmland because we have priced you the ****. Who have ever. Hoping to obtain that now you may be wondering how the system gets away with the wanton erosion of our liberties like that. Well, Ted argues that the system distracts us by providing increasingly impotent populations with the feeling of security through fulfilling their physical needs for them as it takes away their dignity and freedom. Yes, we undeniably are much healthier and longer. Live now than we were in the past, but, Ted argues that. This progress hasn't been worth the fact that we have been robbed of what Ted calls the power process. This is essentially what Ted views as the gameplay loop of human life in which we make a goal, and then put an effort to attain it. But the most important part is having. The autonomy to do so, however, we wish, even if the method we choose can fail. Ted argues that technological society has robbed us of this power process because the things that we need to survive, like food, water, shelter, they are all practically handed to us on a silver platter. And we don't need to put any real effort into attaining them, which means that. Basic human needs like being fed and having roofs over our heads. Just aren't as fulfilling as they used to be. After all, what do you think is more satisfying? Applying your own knowledge and physical ability to building a heart tracking, stalking, shooting and butchering a deer, making a fire and spending a rainy night eating venison while all cosy, warm and dry? Signing a lease and going down to Tesco. Now I know what you're thinking. Yes, getting food and shelter are now so easy that we don't need to actually work for them as in create them ourselves. But we do have plenty to do. Modern technology has created more jobs than ever, and some of us have so much time in our hands. Those lucky few that we have an absolute wealth of sports and entertainment to enjoy. Well, that is exactly Ted's point. He views all of those things as surrogate activities, which are essentially coping mechanisms. Since we've got the system nannying us, we need to fill our time with something, so we pursue empty, fake goals that are inherently unsatisfying. Because they don't actually fulfil any of our biological needs. Ted believes that we are so coddled by the system that our entire society is essentially one big giant adult daycare, and that we have never experienced true fulfillment in our lives. And this is where the leftist politics come in. To Ted, Leftists are both the systems. Biggest victims and its biggest since because their lifelong lack of struggle has left them so weak that they are teeming with self loathing and defeatism. I mean, yeah, Jesus. Yeah, they are. This then fuels their bread and butter activism. However, Ted views this activism as just another surrogate activity to Ted. The activism of leftists only functions on a superficial level because all it does is feed. Into the system, and because achieving their petty aims doesn't satisfy them, they just move on to the next thing

and then the next, and then the next. You know, the whole current thing mean. As they inch towards complete totalitarianism through the rise of both big governments and big corporations. After all, if your activism is about asking the government to bring about change, you have to give the government more power to bring about that change. Do this enough times over and over. And you will eventually create a massive, powerful totalitarian state. And finally there is the most obvious consequence of our technological society. It's complete destruction of the environment, technology. To has not only ravaged nature in more ways than we can count, but the replacement of trees and grass. In our lives. With steel and concrete has actually alienated us from it. In a world where so many people are crammed into cities, rural life has shifted away from the peasant class and become. The domain of the rich, who are buying up the land on mass for industrial farming that actively ruins soil and harms livestock. Ted believes that the system has destroyed our relationship with nature by massively shrinking its domain, forcing us to live in the pod and taking away our ability to live off the land like our ancestors did before us. Look at you, sitting now. Right now, I know he's a murderer. He's a mother. He's a crazy mother and you're shutting yourself right now because you're sitting there agreeing with him.

Don't worry I felt the same way. Look, even though he was a maniac and a mass murderer. he's ***** onto something. In order to reverse this damage. And as Ted puts it, return to wild nature. Ted advocates for the complete collapse of technological society as we know it. Now that sounds like a pretty monumental undertaking, and Ted does acknowledge that the fallout from such a collapse would be very painful. However, he insists that it needs to happen as soon as possible because the longer we put it off, the system will get even bigger and the immediate impact of the collapse. Will be much worse. You know, it's like a bad relation. And ship the longer you put off ending it, the messier the breakup will be. This should not be confused with overthrowing the government or eating the rich, though, and Ted makes it very clear that that's not what he's talking about. After all, such a boogaloo would only change things on a surface level what Ted wants. Is a full scorched earth butlerian jihad. Well, we get rid of all computers and machines, and generally overthrow the very technological foundation that our entire society is built upon.

Come my friends after it was published, the reaction to the manifesto was surprisingly mixed. Obviously, most people expected the ravings of a lunatic, and they held onto those preconceived notions even after reading it. The manifesto was so well thought out and put together that many people were actually quite surprised and they couldn't resist giving credit where it was due. One criminologist called the. The bomber, the most intellectual serial killer the nation has ever produced, which is a title I'm not sure anyone wants, and one political commentator named James Q Wilson once said about the manifesto. And I quote, if it is the work of a madman, then the writings of many political philosophers. John Jack Rousseau, Tom Paine Carol Marks are scarcely more sane, despite being a bit of a sleeper hit among the intellectuals. The fruits of Ted's bombing campaign, ultimately. Proved to be his undoing. Before the manifesto

was published, the feds had absolutely nothing to go on, no leads, no suspects, nothing. Until Ted was stabbed in the back, David's wife Linda noticed that the writing style of the manifesto seemed strangely familiar, and she brought her suspicions that Ted was its author. To David's attention, naturally, David didn't believe this at first because he thought the world of his older brother. But after three or four months of convincing from Linda, David started pouring over all of the ratings from Ted that he had, and he compared them to the manifesto and he. Desperate bid to prove his suspicions wrong. David came across a specific phrase in the manifesto that really worried him. Cool head logicians, A linguistic clerk that he had heard his brother say before freaking out David then scrambled up into the attic in search of a similar essay that Ted had written all the way back in 1971 and the. Was finally unavoidable. The ideas and writing style were practically identical. David knew that the feds would be very busy combing through all of the other tips, so he hired a private investigator to gather and compile more evidence before finally getting a lawyer. And handing everything he had over to the authorities in exchange for the promise that his identity as the rat would be kept private. So yeah, the feds are. So ***** useless. That Ted was only caught because he was ratted out by his own brother. In fact, they are so useless that even after David sold Ted out, it still took the feds another two months to decide whether or not that Ted was actually their man. Of investigators couldn't actually believe that Ted was the Unabomber because he didn't really fit their profile, despite the fact that every linguistic analysis of the manifesto and David's Archive of Ted's writings. Was a match. They had over 2000 tips on their hands that they thought were worth more of their time. Instead of investigating some helmet in the woods, compounding this sheer incompetence was one more problem that the feds didn't account for. One of the few parasites that can rival the feds. And their degeneracy. The whole thing had been leaked to the press, so not only was Ted's name out there, but so was David's because that's what you get for trusting the police. The leak forced the feds into action because they had to search Ted's cabin before the breakthrough in the case. Hit the peoples. And tipped him off on the 3rd of April 1996, two US Forest Service agents and a Fed were sent to bring Ted in. And they knew that they were gonna have to be smart about it. They couldn't just barge into the cabin and grab Ted in case he had a bomb in there. They had to lure him out before making their. Move and to draw. They simply called out to him with a loud hello, which drew his attention. They then introduced themselves as surveyors and they asked to come out and show them what the limits of his property were on the map that they were holding. Ted obliged and as soon as he got close enough. They grabbed him. They had them. Finally, the most expensive investigation in the FBI's history was over after some ordinary women managed to achieve in a few months what 125 full-time investigators from three different federal agencies couldn't and 17 years. Yes, it took the government 17 years to catch Ted. With Ted safely in custody, his cabin was searched and even considering how small it was, there was a lot of stuff inside. The cabin was full of bomb making materials, manifesto drafts. The typewriter that was used to write the manifesto. Journals are

completed, bomb that. Hadn't been mailed yet, and books lots. And lots of books. The authorities even found shoes with fake souls, which Ted had used to literally cover his tracks because. He just couldn't stop trolling the feds. All in all, over the course of Ted's 17 year bombing campaign, 16 pipe bombs killed 3 people and injured 23 more, many of whom suffered severe cuts and burns and lost their fingers, their hearing and their vision. This Ted was charged with 10 counts of transportation, mailing and use of bombs and three counts of murder. He was also arraigned in New Jersey and California, where the fatal bombings took place. Needless to say, the prosecution was very eager to pursue the death penalty. However, Ted's defence had a plan to make sure that that didn't happen. An insanity plea to really sell it. They cited the manifesto as proof that Ted was off his rocker, but all that really did was completely derail everything because Ted was not ***** happy about that. He refused to play ball with his defence. Because a plea of insanity would obviously completely invalidate his message, especially if his own defence touted his magnum opus. As little more than the ramblings of a madman, Ted was so desperate to avoid being declared and saying that he attempted suicide. Ted then tried to fire his attorneys and defend himself on the basis that his actions were necessary because technology is destroying. Humanity Ted then agreed to be tested by a Fed shrink, who, despite diagnosing Ted as a paranoid schizophrenic, did determine that he was competent to not only stand trial but also defend himself. Ending Ted's loyal's attempts to make him put pants on his head and shove pencils up his nose, however. He couldn't win them all, despite the medical green light, the judge shot down Ted's attempt to represent himself because he didn't want his courtroom turned into a soapbox. Funnily enough, the prosecution actually used the manifesto as proof that Ted was. Of sound mind your best when even the people that are trying to bring you down have to admit that you're on to something. In the end, Ted pleaded guilty on the 22nd of January 1998. He took the plea deal to prevent an insanity plea and the prosecution offered it so. That they weren't seen as trying to execute someone that was diagnosed as mentally ill. However, the plea deal took many months of negotiating because Ted. Kept demanding conditions such as maintaining certain rights on appeal and not being put into a federal mental hospital, but ultimately he took the deal, no strings attached. But while execution was off the table, Ted didn't really see that as a win, he is quoted as saying. I do not want to live long. I would rather get the death penalty than spend the rest of my life in prison. Considering how desperate he was to achieve true freedom and how far he went to get it. It you can understand why Ted felt this way, Ted was sentenced to 8 life sentences without the possibility of parole. In addition to being ordered to pay \$15 million in restitution and I have no idea how a man that lives in the woods that was supposed to pay that. With the trial over, Ted was whisked away to his new home in the Supermax prison, a DX Florence in Colorado, which contains A veritable who's who of people you've definitely heard of. Ted's block was dubbed bombers role because his neighbours had committed similar crimes. One such neighbour was Timothy McVeigh, who carried out the Oklahoma City bombing as revenge for Ruby Ridge and Waco,

which really do deserve their own videos where I will have to try really, really hard to not get a strike. But anyway, McVeigh and Ted were fast friends, and they talked quite a lot about philosophy and politics alongside Ramsey. Whose claim to fame was taking the first crack at the World Trade Center back in 1993, despite having friends on the inside whom he found to be easy to get along with and nicer than most of the people he knew on the outside, Ted isn't really the most sociable of inmates. One staff member at the prison. Said that, most inmates are so lonely that they would spend all day trying to talk to the wardens, whereas he couldn't get much more than a good morning warden out of Ted. Who was described as very quiet and reclusive. He spent 23 hours a day in a cell and most people would consider this an upgrade to his old cabin because it had a shower, toilet, electric lamp and a cigarette lighter. And inmates and a DX Florence are given small 13 inch TV's. As a reward for good behavior, but. I've got a feeling that Ted's TV would have gone unused, but at least he was able to order tons of books in several languages from the prison library and have them delivered to his cell, and he would read all of these books at his little desk, where he also continued his writing. Amongst these writings as a large number of letters. That Ted writes to a number of pen pals with the details of the correspondences being. Sealed until 2049, although a series of letters was released that show that Ted very often received letters that were a little bit spicy and not for their politically subversive content, it turns out that Ted actually had a great number of female admirers, and he received. Dozens of marriage proposals in the post? That's right, the unkempt helmet terrorists spending life in prison never to see the light of day again. Is a bigger hit with the ladies than you? As we can tell from some of the letters that were donated to the University of Michigan, one specific letter caught Ted's attention. In 1998, he became pen pals with a teacher named Joy Richards, who was impressed by his manifesto despite the.

Staff of their correspondence being platonic, the letters became increasingly romantic, and the two soon fell in. Love Ted would decorate his letters to joy with little hearts. He would compose classical music for her and generally be surprisingly smooth in his interactions with her. He even discussed marriage a few times and he cut off contact with any other woman that showed interest in. Handling his package a year after their correspondence began, she even started to visit Ted in prison, where they would talk for hours. However, the couple were always separated by. A sheet of. Nevertheless, Ted couldn't be happier and he gushed about her to all his other pen pals, calling her his Angel. And at one point he wrote, you don't see her Halo because she's too modest to wear it. She keeps it hung up in her closet, but she really is an honest to goodness Angel. However, this romance wasn't destined to last during a three day visit in 2003. He, Ted noticed Joy coughing up blood, and it was quickly apparent that she had terminal lung cancer. But even though he was locked up, Ted was determined to be with joy and spirit, and her final moments. In 2006, Ted had one of his pen pals pay her a visit. In the hospital to give her a parting gift. A set of headphones through which she could hear Ted's last ever composition for her, which he had performed on a synthesiser. Later that day, she sadly passed away. But life goes. On and Ted is still

writing and expanding upon his ideology and anarcho primitivist ideals. He even got into a bit of a legal battle over his writings in mid 2011 because a lot of his stuff was auctioned off to pay restitution. To his victims, which raised a total of \$232,000 several. Items proved to be very valuable, with Ted's typewriter being sold for 22,000 and three dollars, the hoodie and sunglasses from the famous police sketch going for 20,000 and \$25, and a set of 20 of his journals selling for \$40,676. However, Ted took great issue with what was happening to his journals and other documents which the judge had all. Called to be redacted, all mentions of Ted's victims were removed, which he challenged as a violation of his First Amendment rights. He even tried to offer a DNA sample to the FBI in exchange for his writing being untampered with, but this didn't work and the reason why the feds. Monty Ted's DNA is, I believe, in whatever state he's in. You actually needs the person's permission before you can take their DNA. ***** hell. Must be nice. And it was also because he was a suspect in a series of unsolved poisonings in Chicago back in 1982, which? Ted denied and they couldn't link him to, but despite the redaction and sale of his documents, Ted still had more than enough material left over to publish several books, including. Technological slavery, which includes the infamous manifesto as well as anti tech revolution, why and how, and these are compilations of Ted's more philosophical work. But he's also published a sort of autobiography called Truth Versus Lies, which was his way of trying to set the record. Trade after the media spent so many years in his view. Exaggerating things or just straight up lying about them. Ted insists that it's not an autobiography, but it does tell his life story and a fair amount of detail. As Ted remembers it, the book contrasts quite heavily with the accounts of David and the rest of Ted's family, as you can. Probably tell from our earlier discussions of Ted's mental state at the end of the day, you could argue that both Ted and David had reasons for potentially embellishing their accounts of their relationship. Life for David, having a terrorist as a brother must be an easier pill to swallow if he's off his rocker and a clean bill of mental health is obviously very important to Ted because everything that he's worked towards goes right out of the window. If the public just see him as some nut case. So do I think that Ted is mentally ill or perfectly lucid? Well, like most things, I think it's a little bit of column A and a little bit of column B. Ted obviously has a brilliant mind that. I think was working exactly as intended when he carried out his bombing campaign. Now don't get me wrong in this video, right? What Ted did was absolutely ***** right? It was ***** , no matter what way you put it in, regardless of how noble his motivations were. But despite the diagnosis of schizophrenia. I think that Ted is pretty much sane. However, I do think that he might have downplayed the emotional impact. Of his early. And his quasi autobiography, whether this was through ignorance or just coping, I don't know. But while Ted insists that he was completely fine with the solitude of his childhood and his time at Harvard, believe me no one comes out of that kind of loneliness unscathed. I wouldn't be surprised if it turned out that. Heads moved to the woods was at least partially a bid to escape further into himself and avoid the potential pain of struggling to connect with someone after so much time alone. But

that said, I'm not a shrink, so grain of salt and all that. I just can't help but wonder if things would have turned out differently if Ted had been allowed to just have a normal childhood. Ted also doesn't appear to have forgiven David for turning him in. He has said that if the roles had been reversed, he would have kept the damning evidence to himself. Fact Ted vowed to never contact any of his family again after he found out it was David that ratted him out, and he even went as far as to say that he doesn't have a brother. In fact, Ted's relationship with his family was so rough that Ted believes that his entire family. Would have been better off if he had just cut off contact with them completely when he was a young adult. However, this hasn't deterred David, who still regularly writes to Ted. He is still waiting on a letter back, though now I know that it would be very easy to all dog pile on David for selling out his own brother. But to be fair, it really was a horrendously awful situation to be in. And despite everything that had happened between them, David really loved Ted. And he kept all of the letters and other writings that Ted had ever sent him besides. What would you do if you found out that your own brother was a murderer, even after all that they've been through? David still fought in Ted's corner, doing everything he could to convince the prosecution not to pursue the death penalty. Even though his advocacy on mental health grounds. Best teared off even more display, having no regrets about tipping off the feds, David found it really hard to deal with the fact that he and Ted were now estranged from each other. However, he was going to keep trying to reach out because he promised his mother on her deathbed. That he won't give up on Ted. The only issue is that both of the brothers are getting on in years, so there may not be much time left for reconciliation and you may have noticed that I've been referring to Ted's time in ADX Florence in the past tense throughout this part of the video. And that's because he's not there anymore. On the 14th of December 2021, Ted was moved to FMC Butner in North Carolina. Or he's now in the same prison as Joe Exotic. This may have you believe that the system is giving Ted a break by moving him to lower security in his old age, but sadly that is not the case. And it's not just because there is no room for mercy in the prison industrial complex. FMC stands for Federal Medical Centre, and while the reason for Ted's transfer there hasn't been officially disc. It's not hard to figure it out. MC Butner specialises in oncology and behavioural issues, and since Ted isn't crazy, that means that it's not good news. And just in case you are still guessing, Ted himself has revealed the reason for his transfer in a letter. The letter says thank you for your kind letter postmarked December 23rd, 2021, which I received on January the 27th, 2022. You conclude your letter with get well soon. There is yet work to be done. There is work to be done. A lot of work, in fact, the work has barely started, but I won't be able to do much of it. I'm not going to get well soon or ever, because I have terminal cancer. I can't expect to live more than two years at the outside, and I may well be dead in less than a year, so the work will have to be done by younger people. What about you? What are you doing? I'm told that you've already paperback French and English Dictionary for me, for which I thank you. But seen in relation to the problem that we face, the matter of the dictionary is trivial.

Have you been following the recommendations in Section 28 and 29 of Chapter four of anti Tech Revolution? Have you made any efforts at organisation in accord with Rule 3 of chapter? Way if you want to organise but don't know where to begin, let me know and I'll give you some suggestions, but my suggestions will not be easy to carry out. We don't want die dilettantes who are ready to do only what is easy. We need people who are capable of total commitment and are prepared to take on a. Any task, no matter how difficult or unpleasant or time consuming it may be. Unfortunately, Ted isn't long for this world, but having turned 80 this year, at least he's had a long enough run to build up an enduring legacy. for. For better or worse, for the 50th reunion of his Harvard class in 2012, Ted listed prisoner as his occupation and for awards. He listed his eight life sentences. He's also he's also very well. Represented in media with a Netflix documentary about him titled Unabomber, in his own words, in addition to a. Mostly fictionalised drama starring Paul Bettany titled Manhunt Unabomber, Ted was also mentioned in goodwill hunting when Robin Williams character warns his colleague about pushing Matt Damon too hard towards a maths career. Then he went on to Berkeley, was assistant professor, showed amazing potential. Then he moved to Montana, and he blew the competition away.

Yes. Who was he?

While most see Ted is little more than a dangerous psychopath, those that take the time to look under the surface often find different things to take away from his legacy. To some, he is a tragic example of wasted potential caused by a lack of guidance and mental health support. To others, he is a textbook case off the. Some constantly ***** with a reasonable man that just wants to be left alone until he snaps and becomes a monster, and for others the eco terrorism is just too much for them to engage with his ideas in good conscience and a handful of insane insane. what this has been going on far too long. Just gonna keep going and a. Handful and a handful of insane fringe case he's an unambiguous hero. No, I'm sorry, but I've been filming.

For five hours now, it's late, it's late. This is another Crowley situation. I just really want to go home.

I'm tired of this, grandpa. That's too damn bad. You keep digging.

And apart from that last one, I would say that each interpretation is pretty valid. What Ted did was absolutely terrible, and I do not condone it in any way at all, but. But, but even if he hadn't done what he did, the whole point was to bring attention to his ideology, even if he didn't do any of that, I still think that a lot of people would be convinced by what he had to say. But unfortunately, Ted chose violence. So what you take from Ted's story really depends on your own mileage and your own values. But even if you can't stand them, you have to admit that he's still.

Though a lot.

Less cringe than extension. Rebellion over the years, this extra consideration has brought about something of a change of opinion on Ted's manifesto, and he has managed to gain some influence in online circles now that the Unabomber hype has died down, people are discovering his work and critiquing. It a lot more objectively, which

has led to a surprised cry. Holy ****, he was right. From very many people, especially those that are younger and don't remember the bombings, many zoomers are very quickly becoming disillusioned by watching modern society collapse before their very eyes, and they've managed to find a lot of useful wisdom in Ted's work. However, the fact that Ted killed multiple people to get this message out. They are can't be ignored, so most of even his biggest fans can't in good conscience support him unconditionally. The response to the elephant in the room ranges from disavowing Ted's actions despite his message to essentially saying, well, you can't make an omelette without breaking some eggs all the way down to. Ted did nothing wrong. Luckily, most of the latter statements are clearly **** posts because, well, it's the Internet. That's kind of what it's for. There is just one problem though. I doubt that Ted appreciates the irony of his message getting such a big second wind on the Internet. Overall, for better or worse, I think it's pretty safe to say that the man ended up being a bit of a prophet because he has predicted pretty much the entire 21st century. And I hate to say it, but we are more or less living through his worst nightmare now more than ever. Now I know that that sounds like a pretty bitter black pill to swallow, but just because everything keeps collapsing at an alarming rate doesn't mean that that all hope is lost. Life finds a way, and there is still plenty of Earths. Natural beauty out there just waiting for you to go out and enjoy it and at the end of the day, that's all Ted really wanted. Now the problem with using violence for A cause is it instantly villainize is your ideal. To the vast majority of people being a libertarian, yeah, we all fed post with our night vision goggles and they say things like every blade of grass and the tree needs water and whatever political group you're from. I'm sure you make a lot of the same kinds of jokes because yeah, that's what they are. They're no jokes. But the problem with. Actually, using violence for your ideology as it instantly turns everyone against you. It doesn't matter how correct or how good your ideology or goals are. In order to change society, you need society on your. Side and as soon as you initiate violence, usually against society. Well, that doesn't really win them over. Instead, you're actually causing your ideology damage. No one is gonna wanna talk to you. No one is gonna want anything to do with you. Name one person that's turned around and said, man, these people, these people that have been cowboying children sure have a good point. Nobody said that, right? So just you just don't do it, right? They're actually causing your ideology damage. In fact, you're setting it even further back, and that was the problem with. Ted's Wright Ted Kaczynski is right. Technology has changed society massively, and even though it's offered some perks, it has not changed society for the better. I mean, even me right now I'm being a massive hypocrite by going Ted Kaczynski is right. While being a YouTuber. Talking to you through the Internet on your telly screen being a surrogate as Ted would say. But even though Ted is correct, the fact that he resorted to a bombing campaign set his ideology back massively and that hot, innocent people. So if you are finding yourself inspired by Ted's ideals in a healthy and non destructive way, seriously, do not send pipe bombs in the post. Do not be a **** idiot, but you do not have the means to move to the woods and

return to monkey. There are still plenty of ways that you can be more in touch with nature. You can reduce wastage to save the trees. You can go for a walk among the trees. You can plant a tree. You can hug a tree, you can **** a tree. Just put down your phone and go and ***** touch grass. Silver. Oh my God.

Ah, I've been filming for ***** hours.

Thank you on YouTube, everybody.

Uncle Ted Has Passed Away

Source

Uncle Ted Has Passed Away

I know, 'what am I like?' I'm always early to the party on this channel aren't I? It's because I can only film when I come into the office and hen you've got a baby you don't have much time.

Ted Kaczynski: Unabomber died by suicide in US prison medical centre, AP sources say

The federal Bureau of Prisons has faced increased scrutiny in the last several years following the death of Jeffrey Epstein, who also died by suicide in a federal jail in 2019.

'Unabomber' Ted Kaczynski - who carried out a 17-year bombing campaign that killed three people and injured 23 others, died by suicide, sources have told The Associated Press.

The 81-year-old, who was suffering from late-stage cancer, was found unresponsive in his cell at the federal prison medical centre in Butner, North Carolina, at around 12.30am on Saturday.

The Harvard-educated mathematician has been locked up since May 1998, when he was sentenced to four life sentences, plus 30 years for the campaign of terror that set universities nationwide on edge.

He admitted to committing 16 bombings from 1978 and 1995, permanently injuring several of his victims.

Kaczynski was given the name 'Unabomber' by the FBI because his early targets seemed to be universities and airlines.

Emergency responders performed CPR and revived Kaczynski before he was transported to a hospital, where he was pronounced dead later Saturday morning, the people told the AP.

They were not authorised to publicly discuss Kaczynski's death and spoke to the AP on condition of anonymity.

Kaczynski's death comes as the federal Bureau of Prisons has faced increased scrutiny in the last several years following the death of Jeffrey Epstein, who also died by suicide in a federal jail in 2019.

He didn't, he didn't, but whatever.

He was awaiting trial on sex abuse charges.

In 2021, Kaczynski was transferred to the federal medical centre in North Carolina, a facility that treats prisoners suffering from serious health problems.

Like I reported on in the Ted Kaczynski video I did.

Kaczynski lived as a recluse in a dingy cabin ...

It wasn't dingy, it was homely and lovely. I liked his wee cabin

... in rural Montana, where he carried out a solitary bombing spree that changed the way Americans mailed packages and boarded airplanes.

His targets included academics and airlines, the owner of a computer rental store, an advertising executive and a timber industry lobbyist.

In 1993, a California geneticist and a Yale University computer expert were maimed by bombs within the span of two days.

Two years later, he used the threat of continued violence to convince The New York Times and The Washington Post to publish his manifesto, a 35,000-word screed against modern life and technology, as well as damages to the environment.

And like I said before, it's 35,000 words of the most based shit that you will ever read. And it is correct.

The tone of the treatise was recognised by his brother, David, and David's wife, Linda Patrik, who tipped off the FBI, which had been searching for the Unabomber for years in the nation's longest, costliest manhunt.

Authorities in April 1996 found him in a small plywood and tarpaper cabin outside Lincoln, Montana, that was filled with journals, a coded diary, explosive ingredients and two completed bombs.

Now, some things are saying he wasn't suicided. He wasn't. You know, he got Epstein and everything. Like, I don't believe he was because the man was 81 years old, right? And he was in the final stages of cancer, there was literally no reason to Epstein him what I believe? Because I've heard some cases of this happening is. When cancer starts to like proper ravage your body like you're you're absolutely fucked at that point, like there's no coming back and it starts to eat your mind a little bit like a lot of people, they don't, they don't really talk about this then they definitely don't show it in movies, but. Whenever people are in the final final stages of cancer like that, that's you. Pal, you've got. You've got weeks now. Days. Probably your mind's gone. You don't recognise anyone? You're babbling. You're seeing a bunch of incoherent rambling stuff is an extremely sad state of affairs, and it's extremely horrible way to watch someone go out.

Now Ted, as we know was a hyper genius, you know, he went to Harvard at like 1415 and stuff like that. He was an extremely intelligent person, his, you know, biggest thing he had was his mind and his thought. And I think that when he was getting into the later stages and he felt his mind going, that he thought, I want to go out as me. I want to go out as me. I want to still be me and here and not some, you know, drooling, mongoloid. You know, whenever, whenever the final curtain falls, which and so I'm

gonna go out on my own terms while I'm still me. Which I completely understand and respect. I would probably do the same thing. I completely get that.

So yeah, I understand why he did that. That's why I don't believe he was esteemed cause. I mean, there was no point like he was on his way out. There was definitely no point in Epsteinizing him.

However, it is very sad that it's sad in the sense of he should not have done the things he did to get his message across. But the problem is people would have just dismissed him as some. Looney maniac. But considering the things he did is why so many people are getting very interested in his work, apparently after his death, all the Zoomers and TikTok are now getting right into Ted Kaczynski, which I think is a good thing. No, not the bombing, you know, not the not the killing people part. Not that, but all the stuff he wrote, you know, technological slavery and stuff like that they were all correct. All good. And he's right.

He highlighted a bunch of basically, mankind is going down on unsustainable trajectory. We're becoming completely detached from the environment that that raised us dump any random human and the, you know, the forests out in the wild, you know where we lived and survived for like millions and then hundreds of thousands of years as Hunter. Others and all that stuff as well. Put any of us there and we'd die. We'd die in seconds, like even though it's where we're from, it's the it's, you know, it is it his, his mother's womb. It is where we're from. It is what raised us, it is the environment that created us. But dump anybody there now and they would fucking perish in a day.

Like and Ted was talking about that disconnect instead of trying to live within nature, we instead bulldoze it and live on top. Of it's cops, right? We are getting rid of nature even though all of the bounty that we enjoy so much comes directly from nature. So yeah, he was right and very, very many things. He was,

Trans people are trying to claim him now though. Well, sorry you can't fucking have them.

Nick Fuentes

The Nick Fuentes twitter space that got him re-banned

Source
01-24-2023

Can you hear me? Hello world, give me a 100 react if you could hear me right now give. Me a heart. Give me a 100 if you could hear me in this space right now. What's up, everybody? Yo, let's go. Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah. And we're back and we're back.

Well, good evening everybody. This isn't my show. I don't know if I'll do my show tonight on cozy. But listen, I got my Twitter back. I finally got my Twitter back. Let's go 100 react in the chat, 100 react in the chat 100 reactions in the space.

Man, it feels good. I've been waiting a long time. A long time. Waiting years to get my Twitter back, it felt like I was dead and honestly. I rather would have been dead in real life and alive on Twitter. Then alive in the real world and banned on Twitter. It's better than real life. So yeah, so I'm finally back. What's up, everybody? Smash the like and subscribe button for more.

Let's get right into the video. No, this is good. This is big. So you know, I want to talk about me and me being back on Twitter and everything and talk about the state of the timeline and the state of things, things are not good. OK, you guys really need me. I'm going to be honest, the timeline needed this. It needed right. Everyone nodded their head. Everyone's nodding their head. Yep, that's right. Yeah, you're damn right the timeline sorely, sorely needs me OK, the timeline sucks. The content sucks. And it sucks.

I pop on on Twitter every now and again, like I've been banned on Twitter since July 2021. One technically, but I've made my fair share of other accounts and I've been on, on and off again. I come on, I get banned instantly. But even even the few times that I pop on man, the timelines dead, the content is just not good. It's not funny, it's not fresh. So we'll get into all that. And like I said, I'm probably not doing a show tonight. Normally I do my show on cozy, you know? that's a new thing since the last time I've been on Twitter, I started a new website, calledcozy.tv. Check it out if you haven't already. Probably a lot of you guys already know about it, but that's

why I do my show now cozy.tv/nick. But anyway, I'm not doing a show tonight, but I am going to do this. I am going to do. This stream and. I gotta say it's just. Hey, it's good to be back, man. I honestly never thought I would see the day because I'll tell you, maybe some of you guys know the story, but I've been on Twitter forever, I've been on Twitter since 2014. And Twitter is really where I got my start. This is where I got red pill'd. This is where I got totally red pill'd about women and race and the Jews. And you know, all that kind of stuff. So I built my following here. I made all my friends here. This is like my spot. This is like my home. This is like my generation. Z is my. This is like my hometown. So anyway, not to get all sentimental or anything, but I and I've been on Twitter for a long time and I love the platform and I love the I love the medium, I love the 140. I believe now 280 character messages and the short form, the micro blogging. I really like that medium. I like that as a style. It was always my favorite and. I always thought that I would get banned on Twitter because I'm. I'm really edgy, you know? And I'm really funny and that's just sort of how it goes. And I survive. For a long time, a lot of people. Don't even didn't know at the time how I had survived for so long. I still don't know. But I had survived after grouper war and after the, COVID locked down and stopped the steel in January 6th and. I held on for a long time. I got banned in July 2021 and it was like the worst day ever. You know, I remember I had this fundraiser. I was going to. And I was in the shower getting ready. And then I get out of the shower, boom, Twitter gone. And I like, had never been suspended or I. I think I had but not leading up to it, didn't have any strikes. No, no, nothing like that. So it just came out of nowhere. I was like, what? It was brutal. And anyway, I never thought that I would get back on who could have seen it coming that Elon Musk would buy Twitter, let everybody back. I even thought we got all excited back in November or was it October? I got all excited in October and November when we all thought that Elon, when the deal went through and. We were under the impression Elon would bring everybody back and there was a period where we didn't know. Who was going? To come back or what the timeline for that was going to be, no pun. That's anyway, that's kind of boring, but I just never thought in a million years I get back on Twitter. I'm so happy to be back. I don't know how long it's going to last, but I'm. I'm not going to take any. Day for granted. I'm not going to take one day. I will not take one tweet for granted. I am back on the platform. I'm back on the. On the site. So anyway, that? Yeah, I'm back. I don't know what my first post is going to be. You know, I literally just sat around all day. Like what am I going to say. To say something funny, am I going to talk about the last two years? Am I going to talk about the future? What's the? So maybe tomorrow morning I'll have my first tweet. Or tonight if I get some inspiration

But anyway. Cell wow, what an incredible day. Incredible. I came back with 120,000 followers and I think I gained like 20,000 followers today when I got banned, I had 139,000. When I came back, I think I had 121,000 and now I'm at 144,000. So I think I've gained like 25,000. Followers just today. Pretty crazy. 2,000,000 views on my first tweet back. Everybody's loving it. Everybody's enjoying it. Everybody's well,

I'm feeling the love again. It's been a long time since your boy felt the love. I've been over there on ***** telegram. what, I. I hate telegram. OK, I would rather be dead than be. Well, I won't go that far, but I definitely don't want to be on Telegram. OK, I want to be on Twitter. And I'm on telegram. Just might as well just be talking to a brick wall. Basically, no offense if you follow me there, but where's the engagement, man? Where are the users? I think the biggest American account on telegram. The biggest American channel is like 2,000,000 followers or like 1,000,000 followers. There's like no, there's no user base and it's not even a social media platform. It's really like a. It's really like a sort of peer-to-peer encryption messaging platform as opposed to. a true social platform anyway. I don't know where I was going with that, but it's just it's good to be back here where the engagement is where the traffic is and I. Get to talk. To the global village and, and it's done, it's. I will say though it's not totally new because like I said, I've been doing these spaces. I pop up on Twitter, I have like. 2500 people listening now, but I had done spaces before. I was like bam. A bunch of times, I made like 20 accounts this year or something, and I would just get banned after like 24 hours and I'd do a space and like, 304 hundred people would pop on. So it's not exactly new for me, but it is new to be back doing it with my real face, my real name. It's going to be different though. I will say. I'm going to miss because I would come back and I would come back as like, Pepsi Nitro or like, I think one of them was like ***** incel which is like all jokes, obviously. Or, just all kinds of goofy stuff, because I was making, like, I would literally make like 5 accounts a week, so I was just you. Know throwing stuff out there. And I'm going to kind of miss when you're on an alt account, you can kind of just say whatever you want. I was talking to a friend of mine today and I remember I posted a picture one time of myself with like a face mask on and somebody said or something unrelated and somebody posted a picture of me with a face mask and. They said, oh, why? Are you wearing a mask in this picture? And I just replied with like a. Picture of my poo like. I went to the bathroom and just like hey. F you man. Yeah, I'm trying to. I'm over here doing my thing. You're getting on my case about a mask. You can have this picture of my pool. You know, what do you think about that and stuff like that is just totally crazy. And I can't do that on my face account. I can't do that on my main, so I don't know if I should make an alt or what. I mean I. I can't really go back to that, so I'm here. I'm here now with my check mark back and everything. I'm also, I have to say I'm also glad that I still have my check. Mark, because I. Was a little worried I was going to come back and I have a big problem with this new check mark. Thing, because people are engaging with my content, there's like the verified notification section and I'm checking my verified notifications and there's people with like 2 followers and they're verified. It's like, what the **** are you doing in my verified notifications? You have like 35 followers. who, even? I don't know if I'm really in love with that whole system. It used to be different. I know, Elon. he comes around. I don't like this class system of Lords and peasants. It's like, well, I do. OK. I like that to class system. I like being the Lord. I like being a. Not not like Jesus, but like, I the Lord and the peasant. I like being a check marked and deservedly so. I

enjoy having my check mark because it lets me know who's important. It lets me know like there's all kinds of people in my mentions. It lets me know who's important. If everybody can buy a check mark. Get every jamoke with, 30 followers in the verified mentions and defeats. The whole purpose. So anyway, so I don't know if I'm in love with that. And I also, I don't know about these changes to the timeline. I don't know what the story is with this like. For you timeline and this following timeline. It used to. I guess that's how it was. Do you remember there used to be that, like sparkle symbol in the top right and you could change it to latest. And whatever happened to that, so. I don't know how much I love all the new changes, but what? it's the micro blog. It's the place to be. You know, I'm just listen. I'm just happy to be here. I'm just happy to be here. I'm just happy to be back. Don't need to start off complaining about what they did with the place. I'm just happy to be back. Part of the conversation. Great day, very awesome. Everybody's enjoying this. Everybody's loving this. Like I said, I got all these replies. I was a little bit surprised because I didn't know if I came back if like all my followers would be gone or what, how that was going to work. But I come back, I post my first tweet. It says welcome back, in one unified voice, they'll say we love you. We're so glad you're back. And I want to get into like me. Back on the timeline, no joke. This is a total game changer. This is a big deal. And I'm going to get into that and kind of. To explain why we have to get into the state of things and the state of the timeline and everything, why? What's the significance? I was going to put out today like this? This is a bigger deal. Than Donald Trump coming back on the platform. And I you know, of course, Trump comes back and he's got, like, 50. Million followers or whatever. And he's running for president. So I mean, technically, it's like probably a bigger deal, but I was talking about this on my show the other night. I don't know that anybody is really excited for him to come back. You know, I mean, I shouldn't say anybody because there's a lot of boomers that are going to love. That, but in terms of the people that were here in 2016 for the original run, I don't know that anybody's all that excited for him to come back on Twitter and. Here's the thing, I'll preface this by saying this because I know like journalists are probably listening to this and everything. You know, I love Trump. I got, I really love him. He's my hero. Like always will love the guy. I always will think highly of. But this campaign is just it's not it. OK, it's not giving all right, this campaign is not given, like, apparently, he's got a whole committee now that writes out his tweets. And I saw, I think it was his Christmas tweet. Last month, he put something out and. It was so long and. It was on true social. And it was like. Merry Christmas, even to the radical left, Marxist Democrats and the do nothing. January 6th Committee and Shifty Adam Schiff. And then it's like it's like maybe want to throw up in my mouth, man. It ***** sucks. And like, this is what's happening to Trump, and this is what's happening. Trumpism, Trumpism used to be cool and edgy. And I said this after Afpac 3 and everybody got mad at me. Everybody took it out of court. Text I said, back in 2016, Trump was getting up there and saying, hey, guess what? We're banning all Muslims from America today. Like we don't want any more Muslims coming to our country and everybody was like what? You can't

say that that's and of course we were like hell, yeah. You know, keep them all out. He would get up there and. Say what? These illegal immigrants are rapists. We're gonna build a big ***** wall, and Mexico's gonna pay for. We're gonna keep these people out. They're ***** on everybody. And it was just a totally different it was just a totally different tone. It was a totally different energy. And I was young at the time. I mean, I still am. But I was like, 1718 at the time. And I remember going out there door knocking in New Hampshire, like, this guy's going to save Western civilization. This is going. To change everything, and I knew this was going to happen slowly but surely over time. Time him and like the entire MAGA Inc I call it Maga Inc like I think of Rick Grinnell, I think of Jason Miller. I think of these types. This Maga Inc, this industry, this cottage industry and politics built around him has just become like Fox News. And so the stuff that he now says on through social or that he will say on Twitter that he says at the rallies, it's really not that much different than what he says on Fox News or or rather. what Sean Hannity would say on Fox News? And it's not exactly surprising, because I guess Sean Hannity's like his closest confidante, apparently. Sean Hannity was the one telling him not to put down the BLM rights in 2020. And you know, the guy just doesn't get it. And so I look at that Christmas Post where he's talking about rattle left radical left Democrats and Adam Schiff. And the he's. He's doing these like boomers love the word, play like that. You know, they call him like the demon rats, like, that's not funny. OK. That's just stupid. And so there was something in there was, like the lamestream media and the radical left and the do nothing. And it was like. It was like bro, this sucks. This sucks. Like, who is reading this in 2023 and nodding their head like, yeah. Trump, 24, like what? Does that even stand for any? At least in 2016, it was funny. It was like Trump. It was sort of like giving someone the middle finger. It was like Trump 2016. We're kicking everybody out, Trump 2016 and we're building the wall, ***** and you're going back to Mexico. Trump 2016. We don't want any more Muslims, like, that was the energy. And now what? Like, what's the energy? It's like Trump 2024. We're going to provide jobs to African Americans. Trump 2024, we will protect the LGBT community, not the alphabet mafia, but the good ones. Trump 2024. No better friend to the Jewish state of Israel. It's like, dude, this is this is like Rubio. This is Sean Hannity. This just sucks, man. It's and I tried to tell him that. Well, it's so crazy all this time has passed since I got banned on Twitter. You know, when I had dinner with Trump back in November, I told him that I was like, I mean, and I wasn't ignorant about it. I was very respectful, and I was very polite because he's the President. And I said. Mr. President, and I said, I don't. I'm 24. I don't. I can't criticize you. You're the greatest American, like, I just love you. And you're my hero and all I was really gushing. And I was like. And he's like, no, no, don't be shy because, yay was egging me on to tell him my critiques or whatever. And I said well we just, we don't like the Republican Party. I'm like it was like a heartbreaking moment for me. I'm like it was a father son moment like Mr. We like you. We're here for you. Like we don't like Kevin McCarthy, we don't want. OK, we don't want any of these types like we're here. We would die for

you. Like you're the leader of America. You're the king. We want you. To be you. And I told them I'm like. The stuff about DeSantis was great. Like when he attacked him at the rally and he wrote that big post on true social. I'm like that's the same energy from 15, I said. I remember when you said you weren't going to pledge to support the eventual nominee and everybody hated that. I'm like, well, we love that. 'Cause, we don't care if the. GOP loses, we. Just want someone that represents us to be in power. And anyway, so I you know, I tried to tell him that I tried to get through to him a little bit and I think that, there were. Some things that resulted from that. Of course, he made that video about the January Sixers, and there were a couple of other similar developments. But of any host this big? Log Cabin Republican Party and the ZOG Party and all that and it's like. Yeah, I just don't know, man. And anyway, he's not even the worst defender. The problem is. Again, This is why it's such a big deal that I'm coming back. The problem is everybody else. It's not because he's, I think if he were left unmolested by Jason Miller and Rick Grinnell and Kushner and these types, I actually think his instincts are great. I think his intuition is great, and I think he'd be fine. The problem is that people around him, the problem is this whole like, disgusting thing that has propped itself up. This is the context of where we find ourselves. Trump comes in in 16. And just blows up the right wing consensus. That's what 2016 was about. And think about it this way. OK, 2016 was the first election. It was the first presidential election in American history when you had widespread adoption of both social media and the smartphone. It's very important if you look at the adoption, if you look at the percentage of social media adoption and. Option. I believe it double s from 2012 to 2016. Twitter only gets started, Facebook. All of them. They only get started in the late nights, early 20 tens iPhone comes out the late knots, so it's not until 2016 and they had said this in a little bit in 2012. But it's not until 2016, when there are enough people like there's enough adoption. Of both things, the technology, the hardware and the software before it has a significant effect on not just the election, but on the conversion. And so because of this, because this happens, and because Trump is a part of it, the effect of 2016 is it destroys the right wing consensus and what it means to be right wing and what it means to be a conservative. And this is so important because of course the right wing and the conservative movement is the. The opposition, they're the organized opposition to the. System the system is progressive. The system is leftist. The system is liberal to the extent that so-called conservatism of the Republican Party. To the extent that it lives up to what it actually is, which is kind of like the people from the hills and the people from the interior of the country. And it represents the historic race of America and the historic religion and faith and creed and culture of America. And so far, once again, because of course, we know in effect it does not defend any of those things. But insofar as it does represent those people, and does represent those things, the Republican Party. Conservative movement is the opposition now. It is a controlled opposition. It is a 100% and for the most part always has been a controlled guided opposition. That the system is comfortable with and what happens in 2016 is that in that opposition party. There is this total destruction of the

consensus and there's a total changing of the guard and all of the leadership of the controlled opposition and all the ideas of the controlled opposition and the magazines and the thought leaders. They are all discredited. They are all delegitimized by the existence. And success of the Trump candidacy. Because they all oppose. Fox News opposed Trump National Review opposed Trump. It was 17 candidates in the race, so 16 of the top Republican elected officials in the country, in addition to, like Carly Fiorina, Ben Carson and others opposed Trump governors senators. And so if Trump is able to defeat all of them, you have this, effectively A coup within the opposition. And so all of these elements that were really controlled by the system in bed with the same donors, Israel lobby in bed with the Gulf states or whatever, working with the Democrats, working with the to expand the federal government surveillance state security state, they are all like it's emperor has no clothes. We all know the story of 2016. Nobody predicted it, and everybody said that's never going to happen. And so that is what took place with the Trump election and really then on the outskirts of that, you had this battle going on on the Internet. This, this intellectual battle with. The existence of the so-called Alt. Right. And if you remember, if you recall in 2016 and 2015, the Alt right was not what we think of now at that point in time, probably from 2015 until 2017. All right, alternative right for I think most people just meant. And alternative to the establishment right, which at that time was Jeb Bush, George Bush, neo conservatism, free market, that that kind of thing. So at the time, people like Mike Cernovich would call themselves, all right, and Breitbart was all right, Steve Bannon was all right. If you remember, Hillary Clinton gave a big speech about this in August 2016, and she said that Vladimir Putin was the godfather of the Alt right and she was talking about the entire the troll. Army the me more veterans for Chan. All of that. It was such a broad thing. And so while Trump is disrupting. The opposition party leadership and institutions, and while the technology is changing the landscape at the same time, you've got this sort of intellectual revolution happening where the young people and it was a young person thing. It was like the cuspers like early millennials, late zoomers. They were all having a big conversation online about what it means to be right wing, whereas the previous generations were like Ron Paul Revolution and whatever this generation was like. I for me as an example, when I was in college, I was looking at everything I was looking at Jordan Peterson and Richard Spencer and Stephan Molyneux. And Jared Taylor and Peter Brimelow, and I'm sure you guys all remember the different personalities and things like that and talking about getting red pill and conspiracy theories, all this kind of stuff. And so, in short, this was like a total. There's this revolution happening within the opposition which, and here's, here's the prospect. The prospect is that the opposition can actually become real opposition, that the Republican Party, the conservative movement, can actually effectively oppose the system as opposed to being. Controlled by it as opposed to being directed by it. the prospect which was exciting, was that with Trump as a leader and with this cultural intellectual thing going on with this alt right. There is a chance that that there could be an organized resistance, organized political resistance to the

status quo and the. Status quo being. Yes, leftist, but also but also things that we don't even think about, like the war party. You know, this idea that we're going to have State Department, DoD control over the whole planet. And forever war and the surveillance state and mass immigration, which is again a consensus issue between both parties and on and on. And of course we saw and when I say that Trump got lame, I mean, yeah, he did get lame. He did get boring, but there is a weight to that as well, and the significance of this is that he just like the Tea Party, just like these other grassroots things, was assimilated back into the controlled. And so and we saw that in the White House and we saw that in this big split between the so-called Alt right and the Alt right. You know, there were a lot of people that were part of the broad Alt right coalition that decided, oh, we don't want to talk about Jews now or we don't want to. We don't want to hang out with anybody that talks about Jews. We don't want to hang out. With anybody that talks about race. Race realism, race and IQ. We don't want to hang out with anybody that talks about XY and Z. And so there was a big schism. Which started at the deplorable when Baked Alaska was disinvited and I think Richard Spencer was disinvited and Sam Hyde protested. And then there was the MPI conference with Hale Gate. And then there was, of course Charlottesville and that whole culture and all right really became ghettoized and. Problematic for other reasons, but in any case it seemed like the dream of 2016 was kind of destroyed and the most maybe heartbreaking thing was. When Trump announced that he was running in 24, I thought that I thought that the 24 campaign there still would be a chance that we could realize that prospect, that we could have Trump and bring in the real opposition, bring the groupers into the White House and all that. And that that was like the that was the Hail Mary that was like the last ditch. And, maybe it's still possible, but. What was so? Disappointing and soul crushing was, after all of that. After everything that has happened, of course a lot has happened since the schism between all white and all white and Trump getting elected after everything that happened. You know, the sabotage and the Trump administration by horrible person. So now the sabotage by the congressional leadership like Paul Ryan and McConnell, the government shutdown special counsel, the two impeachments, the COVID, the VAX deal, the stop the steal, election fraud, the January 6th, the DOJ, the rate of Mara Lago. After all that stuff. I thought that. Hey, like this guy's going to come out of Mara Lago and just go to war with the government. I mean, not literally, but you know, go to war with the system and he comes out and he talks about like inflation and gas prices. And like all this other stuff. And I'm like it's dead. Like the what started in 20. 15 What started eight years ago is dead. The hope is gone like he came out and said, I'm going to literally take this country and make it great again, and we see this guy come out with Rick Grinnell and Jason Miller and all the other goofballs, all the other Trump Inc, Maga ink goofballs and Mar-a-lago apple. And everybody's gassing it up on the timeline like it was the greatest thing they've ever seen. And I'm like, man, this is dead. And the other thing. Which has gone on. Concurrently, at the same time here. So that means the same thing, by the way at. The same time that all this is going on, people like me

are getting censored. There's like, oh, this war of attrition going on against me, I'm getting banned from social media. I'm getting D banked. I'm getting persecuted by the government and all this. And in the meantime, that's the real because I really possess, like the spirit of 2016, I really, because I was like a child of that. I mean, the people that were really involved were like in their 30s. I was like a child of that. I literally grew up with that going on. So I'm like a true believer idealist zealot. And so here I am, possessing the spirit of 2016, possessing the spirit of the meme war and the meme magic. And I am just getting ground under the heel of the system by the banks, by the big tech companies, by the Government, all the things that have happened over the last few years and in the meantime that Trump is getting controlled by the Zionists and everything, and Maggie ink is totally corrupt and he got guys like RC Maxwell hanging out at the DC hotel in his MAGA hat. Like, that's the biggest that. That's like the most. One of the most damning symbols of what Maga, how that fell. And while all that's going on and I'm getting censored at the same time, you have all these other people coming on the timeline and they're like, hey, I'm just like Nick Wences. Hey, I'm like the grippers. I'm like Nick winches too. I'm a Christian nationalist. I'm America first. Whatever, and This is why it's so critical that I get back on the timeline.

This this is the sort of historical context of where we are. The real battle is over what comes next and this next generation. And what I represent is. The true right wing standard, because I'm Catholic. I'm right wing. I'm an American nationalist. I'm very clear about where we stand on my Jewish power and what the story is with race and all these kinds of things. I'm like the right wing standard. OK, I captured the imagination of all the zoomers. Probably the entire Zoomer generation. The right wing, like. Zoomer generation was influenced by me, touched in some way by my influence, and I really do possess that spirit of 2016, but also is kind of like forward thinking like the next step after that. And I'm out here getting censored. I'm out here getting killed, basically. And in the meantime, he got all these people coming in while I'm sort of. I'm like Odysseus lost at sea. You have all these suitors coming in and they pop up on the timeline and say, no, I'm the. I'm like, groupism without Nick. I'm America first without Nick Fuentes. I'm America first without talking about Jews. I'm America first. Without talking about race. I'm America first without talking about how Israel did 9/11, whatever. And all these people saying, we're going to go into the system and infiltrate it. We if we just watch what we say and self censor and lie through our teeth and, work at these media companies or work our way up the ladder one day, eventually we can make color blind meritocracy a reality in the Tucker Carlson.

Pessimism and Ted Kaczynski

And it's like that's not going to happen, man. And that's not what we want to happen. OK. Because if Trump failed. And if Trump was assimilated into the establishment, if he was assimilated into Conservative Inc. and the controlled opposition. And it's, by the way, it's 2023. We ran out of time 10 years ago. The idea that we're

going to achieve incremental reform over the next 4 decades, so that one day we could get, I don't even know what somebody as conservative as Ronald Reagan. In the middle of this century, it's just too little, too late, too slow, never going to happen.

I mean, this is the time you look around at what's going on and yay said this to me the first time I met him, he said. We're all going to be living in an episode of Black Mirror if somebody doesn't just go. In and just say it. And he and I had been thinking that for a long time. And when I met him, he put it so succinctly. And I was like, that's exactly right.

I mean, Ted Kaczynski was writing 30 years ago about technological slavery. No, I'm not like anarcho primitivist or anything like that. I'm not like a Kaczynski believer, but a point stance. he makes a very salient point about how the development of technology centralization of the bureaucratic state. We can all see the writing on the walls. It is making human freedom impossible. It is making opposition. You see that with this drive towards the electric cars and the smart appliances, the electric stoves. They want, even things like BlackRock buying up all the homes and forcing everybody to be renters and COVID lockdown, making everybody wage slaves and debt slaves. It's like this is going on now.

Things are bad now and you have these. You have these people that are allowing themselves. To be tricked into buying back into the system, buying back into politics as usual, they saw what happened to Trump. They saw what happened to me and this is what happens in a war, people like Trump or me or Andrew Anglin or Alex Jones or whoever you run in. And like in any conflict, when you confront the enemy. You take some. Hits, you get attacked, you get ambushed. You get blown up some. Of your people die, OK, you run. Out of food. OK, we're in a war. And what we need are more soldiers. And again, this is an extended analogy. We need more soldiers to see what's going on and get in uniform and walk over the dead bodies and push on the frontline. Instead, they look at all the people that have been blown up. They **** their pants and they say, oh, we shouldn't have tried that wars over. They look at what happened to Trump. They look at what happened at Charlottesville, they look what happened on January 6th. They see the bodies strewn over the battlefield and they say, what, Uncle? You know, we surrender. It's not worth fighting. We're just going to surrender and be slaves and maybe our grandchildren will earn their freedom. You know, and then they can be the president or some. And this is an extended analogy. The point is, people got to look at Trump and say Trump was maybe never going to be the one to deliver the final victory, but he was the necessary first step. He was the necessary first, the beachheads, the first incursion, and rather than see the damage that was done. And see the casualties and turn away. You're supposed to look. At the progress he made and build upon that and take the baton from him and take it further and keep pushing. Rather than these people that say, well, we're going to go back and try what everybody was doing before. And that is what people are doing before, before this Trump insurrection. And I don't mean January 6 before this Trump insurrection in 2015 when he announced. And took it all the way. OK.

I mean, that's how it was with Romney and McCain and Bush and lesser of two evils, and hold the line. And Leffler and Purdue. I mean, it's like no different than what came before. They want to go right back into business as usual right back into playing politics, thinking that they're, taking three steps back to take four steps forward. In reality, they're taking three steps back and one step forward. And so that's why it's more important now than ever for people like me to be back on the timeline and back in the conversation, people like sneak, go out there, or Elijah Schaefer or yay, or everybody on my side, everybody on cozy. Andrew Anglin to be back on the timeline because. We're in the end game here, man. I mean, like, look around. I need to tell you, like, the way things are going, things are basically on the brink of collapse. I don't even think they're. Going to collapse? Because at least the collapse would provide some relief, actually. A collapse would provide a reprieve. Because the collapse would be a total disruption and the disruption would provide an opportunity for us to change course, I don't think we're even going. To get that. Everybody has this fantasy about, well, one day the lights are going. To go off. And then we'll be free. that they will be free. Then we'll be able to start a Fallout Shelter. You know, and get an energy rifle, get a plasma pistol and start our own feet dump. It's like, no, that's not going to happen. What is going to happen is that things are just going to steadily get worse and they're going to get worse for us. First, things will steadily get worse and it will become more and more difficult for the opposition to organize and rally. At the same time, both of those things will happen. And so the idea that you know, we're going to go out there and provide some kind of moderated resistance to what's going on and like, watch our words and mind our manners. And if we just be really clever, and if we just be really strategic and if we just be very, very quiet and careful, we will never have any casualties and nothing will ever go wrong and nobody has to take any risks. And eventually that will deliver the Tucker Carlson multiracial working class populist revolution. It's like not gonna happen. And even if it did not work. That we want a total transformation of our society. We want a total miracle and the only way we're going to get it is that people believe in it. The only I mean, of course belief is not sufficient on its own, but the only way that it can be fulfilled. The only way that it can be realized is. If people believe in it. And if people have the courage of their convictions to stand by it, and that doesn't mean, being reckless or crazy or anything. But it does mean that we have to look at what's going on and. Have some boldness and boldly confront the system where possible. So you know, I see that 2024 energy or that 2016 energy in yay. The same feeling that I got in 2016 and it's not like I'm just chasing a feeling. Of course, the feeling, the feeling is a subconscious response to the same thing that you're seeing and as the same qualities. I'm not saying I'm chasing a feeling I'm chasing, the edgiest thing to say. The feeling of progress, the feeling of the envelope being pushed and the feeling of provoking people making people uncomfortable, which means that you're changing the consciousness, you're changing how people think. It's the same feeling I got in 16 and I remember in 2016, when Trump came on the scene, not everybody. Liked it? I don't know if you guys remember, but when Trump first

came on the scene, he was only polling at like 10 or 15%. And he, of course, steadily went up. But all the same things that we heard then we hear now. And it was things like Trump can never win, and he can't win. He'll he'll never. You can't say that. You know, he had a good run, but then he said those things and now he ruined himself. And I'm not saying that, the Trump candidacy and the gay candidacy are perfectly similar. There's of course, major differences. But the point is about this attitude about dissent. When Trump came on the scene and totally provoked everybody and changed the conversation, people didn't just people didn't just say this is the most base thing ever. I'm totally on board. No, initially it was like a big fight. He had to win over all the hearts and minds. He had to go on there on the debate stage and rip Jeb Bush apart and do all these things. Because initially maybe people liked him, but they didn't think he could win. Or maybe they didn't like him and didn't think he could win. Or maybe they thought that, he had a bad temperament or whatever. You know, but when he came out there, now everybody of course is with him and everybody has a sort of sycophancy towards him.

"Israel did 9/11 and we love Hitler"

But at the time it wasn't like that. Everybody had these same concerns about. It's too extreme. It's too edgy. It's not, it's not electable. It's not pragmatic. It's not winnable. It's going to ruin peoples careers, blah, blah, blah. all this. And now here we are in 2024 or 23. And people say the same things about if you talk about Israel or the Jews, or you talk about race or you talk about all these other issues. A certain kind of way. Everybody's got a big problem with it. Go back to the drag Queen story hour protest, and I see these things. I saw a tweet the other day where somebody said, like, it's fine if drag Queens do a story hour, but just not in front of children. And it's like if I have to settle for that as the opposition to everything, Tucker Carlson the other week said that, we're OK with gay marriage. Everyone can love who they want. It's just these transgenders. It's like if that's what we. Have to settle for or. Trump going to the Zionist thing, Charlie Kirk going to his Jewish conference and saying that the Jews had chosen people. And if you don't stand with Israel, you don't believe in the Bible. Like, if we have to settle for that as opposition, that's no better. And it's no different than it was 10 year. Years ago, we are not moving forward. We are stagnant. If anything, we're moving backward and you need somebody like me to get on the timeline and say, guess what? ***** Israel did 9/11 and we love Hitler. What's up? You know, do you need somebody like me to get on the timeline and say? You know, we demand a little bit more actually we demand a little bit more for Marjorie Taylor Green than doing a lap dance for Kevin McCarthy and we expect a little bit more from Trump than hosting a big gay party at Mar-a-lago. And we expect more from Tucker Carlson than chilling for war with China and Gay. Courage and more from the Republican leadership. That's passing amnesty and passing all these terrible things. You know, but I'm the bad guy. I'm fine with that. I I'll be the bad guy. You want me

to be the everybody says I'm this pariah. Call following all this fine. You know, I'll be the outlaw. I will be the cult following in cell baby Hitler outlaw, prouder wants to call me controlled. It's like, dude, you're wearing makeup, you're wearing makeup, and you're still on YouTube, you *****. You know, I will be the bad guy. That's why that's why I'm back. OK. That's why we're back. Hopefully here to stay. Going to follow all the rules. I'm going to be chill, but I'm going to. Follow the rules. I'm going. To try to keep my account. But that's why it matters, because the timeline is just not it. And I'm not going to name any names tonight. But that like in the next few weeks, I'm going to war. OK, because there's been a lot of illegitimate suitors in my house, in my city. OK. This is my turf. And you got all these, frankly, they're all Jewish or they're all, like, shabas going. OK. And I've been naming names in other spaces. And while I'm gone, he got all these guys out here and again, knocking the name and the names. But they're like, hey, the real problem is actually liberals, the real problem is this. And I'll just you want a little taste, OK? The real problem is. God is real. Jesus Christ is God. We are Christians. We are the chosen, OK? We are part of the body of Christ. We are in a world that was created by God and so that of course influences everything that happens in the world. Right now we have a country that is not run by Christians. That's a problem. If Christ and God created the world and created us, and we have a country that is run by people that do not believe in Jesus Christ, that's a problem. If Jesus Christ said the only way to the father is through me, and if he is. The truth, the way and the life. How can we have a country that is good and decent if the laws and the laws, the instructor, the law, is the moral instructor? How can we have a decent and good and virtuous country if the lawmakers and the teachers and the media? In the economy for that matter and whole number of other things are not run by Christians, are not run by people that worship and believe in the only true and living God. How could it be? It can't be. And what if instead it was run by people that not only don't believe in God, they don't simply refrain or abstain from believing in God? They're not agnostic, they don't have a belief that there is no God, but they hate God. what, what do you think the impact of that is? Because that's the situation we're in and I said this on Alex Jones. You know, Christians, of course, have got it right. Muslims believe that Jesus Christ was a prophet, so you know. They're they're not, they're not. Where they need to be, but that's OK. Well, it's not OK, but it's better. It's better than some other things. Hindu Buddhists, they don't see Jesus Christ as God, but they see him as a teacher and they, they talk about his teachings and things like that. Jewish people literally think that Jesus Christ is a blasphemer, then he's a rebel, that he's in hell. They write in their Talma that Jesus Christ is in hell and that his mother is a *****. OK, and the Talmud, for those that don't know, is the Jewish holy book. The Torah is all of the you know, that's their Bible. That's all their commandments. I believe it's 613 commandments. And the Torah is how they apply the law, which is their religion. It's based as a legalistic religion. The Talmud is the rabbi discussion interpretation application of the law, which is given to them. In the Torah. And their talmond, which is their holy book, that is what they consult when

they do their rituals and they consulted. For the you. Know how they're supposed to live their lives? That's in their holy book, that Jesus Christ is in hell. He is mocked, he's insulted, and although, and people say, well, there's this thing about religious and secular Jews. Whether religious or secular, they all came from that culture. OK, all their grandparents are like that. All the all the Jewish immigrants that came to America came here believing that being rabbinical being Talmudic Jewish people and whether there are children, grandchildren, great grandchildren, don't believe that they all grew up in that. Household they all grew up in those schools in those communities. and there's there's a significance to that. And if you believe in the Bible, if you believe in God, this stuff matters. You can't hand wave it away and say religious differences are, they're not real like that doesn't matter. We we respect everybody's beliefs. Not all beliefs are created equal actually. There's a difference between believing in God and not believing in God. It just might save your life, actually. And so when it comes to the leaders when it comes to the leaders who are role models and they write the laws and create the systems that influence all human behavior and the society, it matters what their morality is and if their morality is not anchored in the love of God, you're going to have problems. That's why we are where we are today and don't let anybody tell you it's about anything else. They have all these other people who get paid to tell you that it's about something else. They get paid to tell you it's about Klaus Schwab or it's about the World Economic Forum or it's about Bill Gates, or it's about the Georgia Guidestones, or whatever. Or it's about black people or something. And don't get me wrong. You know, black people are out there committing a lot of crime and everything. But you know, it's really irrespective of whether the. Black people are. The problems with the leadership. So anyway, that's the kind of thing that's permitted to go on on the timeline. that's the consensus that is being forged when people like me are not allowed to participate on the timeline. So that's about to change because I'm back now. So that's it. That's all I have to say. That's my show.

That's my first space. Wow, we got a lot of people in here. Hey, what's up everybody? Should I take callers? Let me see who all is in. Here anybody cool? Let me take a look. DM me, DM me if there's. Anybody cool in here? My phones slammed on. Let's say some old. Some old favorites, some new favorites. Bryson is in here. Charles Johnson's in here. All right, let me bring in. Let me bring in... I'll bring in Bryson 1st and I'll bring on Charles Johnson. He says have me up, Nick I. I mean, you're a little. You're a little suss. You're a little sussy.

Charles Johnson little bit sucks. Know I mean. As Bryson requesting let me drag him in first. Drinking a monster. What else? Is there any other content? Send me some content here. With a lot of DMS. Anyway, I think that's all I got. That's all I got to say. I bring your calls. I don't really want to hear any callers. I'm kind of over it. You know, capitals DM me, Capitals says. Would you like to live on my cowboy ranch? Very funny capitals. Yeah, that's great. Let's see what else? We got going on. Somebody Lance videos is high, clips is in the space. No way high clips. Hey Lance videos I heard you were throwing me under the bus. On some other space. Yeah. All

right, I. Kind of kind of all the thing. How long has the space going on like hour two hours? I'm not doing a shell, this is my string for the night. We check the TL, let's see anything. New the TL, I'm not really. How the TL is curated. I'm getting tweets from like 6 hours ago. Not really helpful.

Alright, let's take a look at this. Any of the following section licenses bra Nick Wentz this is so. He's going off right now. Hey, thanks, king. Yeah, yeah, I'm having a good time. I'm big chilling. I'm back, man. I feel good. I'm back on Twitter. This is different. I'm just going to do Twitter spaces more often. I can't wait till something actually happens. You know, today I'm just back. So I'm just kind of saying what's up and everything. But man, when something actually happens, I'm going to jump on, everybody's going to be with me. Hey, what's up? Yeah, we got some good stuff coming. Like I said, here's another big thing. I got banned on Twitter and then everyone's just allowed to, like, lie about me like. You know, over the past couple of years, all kinds of things have transpired, like even with Mar a Lago, everybody was lying about Mar-a-lago, like, first. They said I wasn't.

There and then, they said making all kinds of clips about what's going on in the A 24 world and things like that, and even like the in and out thing, when I got in that food fight and in and out and everybody said something like oh, he threw his coke on his bodyguards. It's like those are my bodyguards. Those are just two random people that got blasted with. But so that's the other thing. I'm so glad to be back because there used to be that people could just lie for the last two years. People just get on here and lie about me. And I just have no right of reply. Now my turn. OK now.

You know, people had a lot of fun making stuff up about me. Now it's my turn. OK to not make stuff up, but. Shed some light now. Tell the truth a little bit. The pricing request and who else? Not a lot of requests, right? I think that's it. What else anything else I'm trying to think. Do I got anything else to say? I still don't know what I'm going to tweet so. I might save something for later. For my first tweet. Back and then you know, I got to. Get into it. OK, let me cook. If my if my tweets aren't hitting right away, you got to let me cook. I've been away for two years.

You gotta work back into it. You got to work yourself up to it, get, get that rhythm back. Get in the zone a little bit so you know, let me cook a little bit. If it's not, it's going to be hitting. I mean, I'm definitely going to be hitting, but if it's not hitting quite right right away, let me cook. OK, I got to cook over here. But yeah, I think that's all I got. But yeah, follow me if you haven't already. Juice my juice. Juice this if you haven't already. I guess you don't. Really need to because it's kind of blew up already. But yeah, juice this. What else we got and that's it. Follow Andrew Anglin follow Baked Alaska. Follow Laura loomer. Follow **** guard. Ralph, follow Daniel Schmidt. Can't think of anybody else.

I am a little bit confused, I don't know. Why here, here's something, I'll. Give you this, OK? Now I want to say first, OK, let me just say this. I like Scott. You know, I like Scott Greer. He's a friend of mine. And everything but this. Is just like a perfect example of why you need me on the timeline. You know, love Scott. Been friends with

them for like 5 years. OK, we're totally cool and everything before everybody tries to create drama, but he puts his tweet out the other day where he's like don't. Don't call it Zog. Zionist occupied government don't call it ZOG. Call it the globalist American Empire. Maybe that'll be my first treat. Maybe that'll be my. Should I treat that out? I'll do like the nerd emoji.

Well, the last American empire and then Zionist occupied nerd face Zionist occupied govern nerd face fingers out. Because I guess I already put on my first tree, but that's a banger. Almost every Zionist occupied government fit should it be the fish? Or the middle finger. Middle definitely middle finger. I think that's the right energy.

Let me cook. Let me cook, let me cook. Welcome back, *****. Welcome back, Jews. Welcome back, Jews mad. Globalist American empire. Zionist occupied government, *****. I'm trying not to swear as much, but it's just punctuation. That's the globalist American empire and can call it the. Zionist occupied government and that's self generalizing and technically actually not correct. Don't care, *****. Jews run the news, ***** suck. Jews, run the news. Are you going to do about it? What do you do?

About it, red media Jews run the media back on Twitter. Let's ***** go. You know, take the fund De Santis. Shut up, OK. Gay, 24, let's go. It's Lincoln Gomers American empire. Get it? It's gay. Get it? GE. And sounds like gay. You're ***** gay Zionist occupied government. Let's go. Anyway, so yeah, that's one thing I wanted to address. Like I said, like Scott, I like Scott, friend of mine, good guy and everything and all that. he's.

But I was like I don't think so. I disagree. No, no, no, I disagree. OK, I disagree. I'm going to the mat saying Zog. So hey, let me cook. All right, let me cook. Like I said, we like them. This is not an attack, not an. Attack just a. Just a friendly little. You know, just saying, hey, what's up, player? Anyway, and I like Darren too. Don't get me wrong, I love Darren. But yeah, I've just kind of been sick of that **** for the last two years. And there's the globalist American empire like no dude? We already got. We already have an acronym. No, no, I think we already have.

All right, what else? I've been away for too long. Been too long. Ohh it's been too long. Man, man, that's good. We are cooking a night. We are cooking something up. Else we got. That's khaki. See this one. I do not. OK, I do not endorse this. Look at how wrong this is sick? This is sick I. Hate this why would anybody post this? I just pinned a tweet in the top of the space. I do not endorse, this is sick. This is wrong. This is just I. Can't believe anyone who endorses that. It's kind of funny though. Little bit funny. Ah, that's good stuff.

What else we got? Let me check my mentions. What we got? Oh, here, let me. Let me do this. Oh, never mind. I don't know if. I could find them. What's this handle? I don't even know the handle. All right, what else? I think that's all the content. I got for you tonight. I just wanted to. Throw that in there. Now that's, that's. That's the kind of content we need, OK, it's 2023. That's the. Kind of content we need. OK, I see people saying broke broke bespoke. In 2023 I broke broke bespoke 2023.

Are you kidding? Are you kidding me, right? And brunch welcome best elk. OMG, I don't. I don't know. How it's like. We've been lost in the wilderness for the last 10 years. We're crying out loud. You just discovered the expanding mind. Mean just discovered Uganda knuckles. You know, a little behind over there. Just discovered that. What's her name? Hit or miss? He just discovered hit or miss? I guess they never miss, huh? Everybody goes out, boy, oh boy.

Number hit or miss? Hit or miss? I guess they never miss. See, it's all coming back to me. It's like I never left. I never left. It could be just like it used to be. Well, we'll see how long this. I could tell this. Is maybe not going to last forever this is. Basically how things. Are going already. I could tell. Isn't going to last. But you know, make it last for as long as. We can never take a tweet for granted a day. But hey, I'm on true social. Still. Follow me on Telegram, just in case dot me slash Nick J Fuentes follow me on cozycozy.tv/nickjust. What's up? It's based. what's interesting, though? Hey, what's interesting? So there was a time a couple of years ago. When people are making memes about like salmon rats and everything, and I was like, oh, that's Pagan. Like, we don't want that. We want the cross. And there were a lot of people who are about that. And then now that this yay thing is going on, they like, don't want to talk about Jewish influence. It's very suss. Little bit suss.

Anyway, what else? What else we got? I love the I love the finger and the nerd face. That's so good. Yeah, I think that's all my content I got my voice back. How about this Rick and Morty thing, huh? Of sucks low key. Cancel culture ruins something else, and I like Rick and Morty. I'm not going to lie, it's a little cringe. It's a little Reddit I. Like Rick and Morty and.

You know, now the main guy is not going to be there. Women ruin everything, wasn't it? Would he blessed a woman or something? I don't even know how that like, what the story is there, but either way I, we want Rick and Morty. We don't care, it's. Just like when they ruined House of Cards, it's like we don't care. Finish the series, then go to jail. You know, finish Rick and Morty. Then you can, finish season 10. Anyway, it was funny. The other day called me up and he was he had this idea for a. And he was like, we couldn't get season 5, whatever the new season is. Just like we couldn't get. We're trying to get season six of Rick and Morty. We couldn't get it to work, so we. Had to watch this other episode and it made me think of the.

And he's like, maybe it was meant to be. I was like, yeah he's a big believer in science. That's why we get along so well, because we both believe in signs like. That like we. Were at Mar-a-lago, and he was going to put out the Mara Lago tweet before the dinner. But then we got into the lobby of Mara Lago and let it be started playing on the radio. And he couldn't. She sent the tweet out, but it failed because the connection was bad and he heard. And then he looked up and he heard the song playing and said let it be. I'm not gonna post the tweet and it turned.

Out being it turned out, being better that he didn't post it before, so I'm a big believer in that too. I'm a big believer and I'm like a magical thinker. Like, I believe in signs and. everything. Happens for a reason, so.

Anyway, that's why it's a perfect fit, but. I killed this cricket. My house is filled with crickets right now. Here in LA. All right, I'm getting sweaty in this. I got my I got my Balenciaga boots on. I'm getting sweaty. Yeah, we got the Balenciaga boots on walking around. Got my Donna dog hoodie on. Now I got the fit. I got to post a picture. I got to get sort of like an iconic picture with these. On and I don't. Want to debut them until I get?

A good photo but.

I think that's all I have for you.

Any other good content? Each of them are verified notifications.

What have we got here? I think that's I. Think I'm out of content for the night. I'm getting tired. I'm warm, too warm. Been cooking too long. It's getting too hot.

Check the DMS running good DMS. Keep going, brother. We're here.

For it all night. Hey, thank you.

Thank you, brother.

Role us and Israel launched joint exercise to send message to Iran. I support Iran, by the way. I support Iran. Maybe North Korea, maybe not, I don't know. That's all I got for you, unless unless.

Hey, Courtney, replied Courtney.

I was hanging out in the destiny group chat a lot back when I was back, when I was slumming it with all these alt accounts. I was hanging out with the destiny group chat. I was in the DGG Destiny group chat. It was interesting. They're all they're all little degenerate. But there were some cool people in there. Courtney was cool. How about that 5? 30 song, huh? That's good stuff. Yeah. All right. Oh, yeah. The Crowder thing. Should I talk about the Crowder thing? Give me a 100. If I should talk about the Crowder thing.

Give me a one.

100 in the space, if I should talk about the crowd or daily wire thing, give me a 100.

What do you think? Should I give?

You my hot take on. The crowd, or Ben Shapiro, if you'd.

Yeah, how about that? It's.

You know, here's the thing. Hey, what? Shi tag Crowder. what Steven Crowder is kind of full of ****, and I'm really sick of this whole self-righteous routine. And here's why. when. Yay came out against these contracts in the music industry and in the entertainment industry and in sports. Steven Crowder went with Alex Jones and said that we were gay for Hitler, and we're real white supremacists and real anti Semites and all this controlled opposition. And now he's going to make a big stink about his \$50 million contract with daily wire. He didn't even make any sense. You know, I saw his appearance on Tim Poole. It doesn't even make any. Sense what he's saying? And I said this on my show last. Night. You can't. Do this self-righteous integrity play when you're a liar and he is like if he wanted to ignore me, fine. If he wanted. To criticize my viewpoints and disagree with me. But when everything was going on with yay. He went out of his way to. Not not like, criticize me, but to like smear and lie about and

attack me. And he's going over like, Shapiro and all them are totally in bed with big tech and hypocrites and all that, apparently. But he won't. Say a negative thing about.

Them Ben Shapiro is the smartest guy. No. Andrew Klavan's smartest guy. No, I love everybody there. So he's got.

Nothing personal or critical to say about them while he is slamming their company for being in bed with big tech, which they are, which they. They're totally in bed with big tech. They're totally in bed with YouTube. They're totally in bed with Facebook. How do you think they became the most lucrative publisher on Facebook? While every other conservative was being censored, it's because they made a deal with Facebook probably and same.

Thing with YouTube. As a matter of fact, somebody told me they made a deal with YouTube. So and it goes without saying. How could they maintain their platform without? Without having a one single strike, one single reprimand on their account if they weren't in bed. If they weren't cutting a deal. So in other words. Big Tech is the enemy. And daily wire as a business is in a. Parasitic symbiotic relationship with big tech, but they're all fat. They're all fine, fabulous people. They're all just so perfect and great and small.

Now me, I'm censored from everything except for now. I've been banned on YouTube for years, been banned on Facebook, Instagram. I'm banned from airlines, I'm banned from banks, I'm banned from all payment processors. I'm banned from all credit card processors. I mean, I am straight up banned from everything. B&BD live Twitch, PayPal, stripe, e-mail, octopus, you name it, even like CDN services that Infowars uses, I'm more banned than Infowars. I'm more banned than than really almost anybody. And I'm just like a 24 year old independent creator is what I am. I'm independent. I have my own side. I have my own show. I am a victim of censorship. I've been banned from everything. I'm a January sixer. And so you got daily wire which is in bed with big tech and compromising their ideals for money. But they're all, but he's got nothing negative to say about them. As I said, they're all. They're all upstanding genius. Says for me an independent guy who's been victimized by Big Jack and young too, 10 years younger than Crowder, when all this stuff is going on with. Yeah, he goes on the attack and says that I'm taking advantage of yay and says that that we're gay for Hitler and says I'm a real white supremacist and I'm a real Nazi and I'm a despicable. Human being and I'm controlled opposition and all this and it's like, OK, so like you're just full of **** then. I mean like the whole gets on the show and says I'm not going to go personal, that's just an act fact like, that's not sincere. That's just you're just. Full of that. This whole thing, this self-righteous, I'm just doing it for the next generation. I'm just doing it for all these young creators. No, you're not. And you're not not attacking them because you're a nice guy or something, clearly. And the point is, if you have all these double standards, it means that you're lying. You know, if you're contradicting yourself in that way, then that doesn't mean that you forgot. When you're hypocritical like that, it means. You're just full of it. And so I initially supported Crowder, like a week ago, but then he doubled down on Tim Poole the other night, he said, oh, all

these controlled opposition talking about all these controlled opposition, anti Semites, which of course he's insinuating. Who is that supposed to be? And it's like, OK, so Shapiro is literally pro VAX, doesn't talk about election fraud, doesn't talk about the capital once the January Sixers in jail, he's totally Israel first, like, traitor, not even a Christian. But no, but he's this great guy, even though he's like sending people to attack Crowder, I'm with yay. And by the way, yay is my hero. Like, yeah, has been my hero since I was a kid. You know, it's not like I'm not like all these other grifters who latched on to yay when they had something to gain. And then when he started talking about Hitler and everything, they they ran for the hills for fear of their careers. I'm ride or die for. When Jay walked off Tim Poole, even though I had been trying to get on Tim Poole for years, I got up and I walked right out with them and didn't look back and we left. Because I'm lied or die. And when he was on Alex Jones saying I love Hitler, I was right there saying, Yep, I agree. And Alex Jones was like trying to get me to be, like, the voice of reason, like, well, what do? You think about all this? What do you like? And I, and I'm like I'm with him. Dude. I work for him. He's my hero. He's the leader. Yes, 100%. And I think Alex Jones probably doesn't like me after that. You know, he kind of got a little. ***** with me. You know, because of course, after the Alex Jones yay stream, Alex Jones goes on Crowder and kind of trashes both of us. And then I did a stream trashing him. I said, he got the call and everything, and Alex Jones gets on the follow me and says, I didn't get a call. And blah blah blah and like it's real. I don't want to say got nasty but. He was a little. ***** with me. And then we did that debate. But I think probably our relationship might not be good because of that. And I was like, I worked for yay. OK, he's the leader. So I'm willing to do that. And anyway, the point is like for him to insinuate that I was taking advantage. It's like #1. You don't know what you're talking about, OK? You're not there. You're not in the room. You don't know him. You didn't meet him. You have no idea what's. Going on, but yeah, no problem, just like inferring that and why exactly? Because we were saying something that was politically inconvenient. He's like, Oh well. Mick's taking advantage of him. It's like, what do you know? You're not there. How? How would you even know? You're not there. You don't know what's going on. And by the way, that is impossible. OK, as far as the and you know, I don't want to get into because of course I have to be somewhat discreet because I you know. I don't want to give out everything that's going on behind the scenes, but believe me when I say this, nobody can control yay, OK, and just to correct the record on that. I know I've said that before, but when all that was going on, there was a small chorus of people saying, oh, they wanted to blame me for it. They they wanted. They didn't want to bring themselves to blame. Because, they were all cheerleading for him when he was on Tucker Carlson talking about abortion. But then he started talking about Israel, and then they wanted nothing to do with it. So their cop out their way around that their hypocrisy. You know, they supported him one second. Then he said something they don't like now they throw him under the bus to get around that. They say, oh, well, he's just struggling. And Nick went, this is just a bad guy who took advantage

or something that is not true. That was never true. And we arrived there. Yay was talking about those kinds of things. Of course, the Defcon three thing happened before I showed up, long before I was in the equation. And as far as the you know, the Hitler remarks and all of that. And by the way, it's not like I don't agree with that. I'm not. It's not like I'm saying that was him. It's like, don't get me wrong, I totally stand by that 100% and I'm totally with that. But the idea that that came from me is ridiculous, yay is a creative genius. He comes up with all his own ideas. He comes up with all his own with his.

Who? Who could come up with you think I came up with a motocross jacket and the mask? That was his. Idea and it was awesome. I would never think of something like that and I loved it. And I'm and I'm trusting the process. I'm willing to go with it because he's the one that made graduation. He's the one that made life of Pablo. One that made. The YEEZY and the hoodie.

And he's he is the visionary leader so anyway, and that's just to sort of answer that like #1, you're talking about #2, that's not true at all. If you did know anything about it, if you talked to anybody that was involved, you would know it's not like that. But he, but again, when it comes to me, it doesn't matter when it comes to me. You know, people just say whatever they want because I can't fight back. And that's ***** that that shows a real lack of integrity when you attack me. Because I am defenseless in a certain sense because I don't have an institutional backing.

You know, I'm under investigation by the FBI. I was subpoenaed by the committee. A banned on all major social platforms, including YouTube. Up until today, Twitter. You know, I'm banned from literally having a checking account. Like I'm in the process of moving banks for like the third time in a year. and of course I'm blacklisted from. From everything I'm blacklisted from blaze, I'm blacklisted from CPAC, daily wire or Fox News Republican Party. And so it shows a total lack of integrity that when you're able to lie about somebody, when you can get away with lying about somebody and it's convenient for you to lie about somebody, you do it. But when it's comes to somebody that you know, when it comes to, Ben Shapiro has a big following and has a lot of money. And you say, well, I'm not going to say anything personal. It's like that shows a total lack of integrity because clearly your actions are dictated by. Benefit by interest. what? What's beneficial to you? you can't attack me. You can't really attack Shapiro in that way. So it's like. that I just really I think that is so low class and that was only one of the things of course he brought on Alex Jones to yuck it up and do his stupid. You know, he wears makeup and he does this, like, big tough guy routine and everything. And, yeah, he's bigger than me. He could probably beat me up or whatever, but at the end of the day, it's like you're an actor. Man, anybody trying to do a tough guy routine? It's like, you're an actor, you're a performer. Don't get it twisted. You pretend to be, I don't know, some kind of like, comedian, pundit. You know, I'm I really don't like this fight like hell. Tomorrow is war. It's like you do a talk show. What do you mean? Fight like hell, you do a talk show. What are you gonna talk more? Talk like hell. I'm gonna tomorrow. I'm gonna go on the biggest

ranch ever. It's war. Tomorrow I'm going on a rant and no one's going to be ready for this. No one's going to be left standing when I, after I say my Biden fart Joe. After I make another joke about how Biden is dumb and how, like the Second Amendment rules, there's going to be nobody left standing. People are not ready for this because guess what? We're pro-life Pro 2A patriotic Americans, baby and the like. The whole millennial like. 80s throwback the. The cigar and gun thing, it's just like. Gay and I hate it. And I don't even know where I'm. Going with that, but. You know, he does this whole, fight like hell and I'm this big, tough guy and I, hey, Nick went to and he's like gay for Hitler or something. It's like, do you think you're.

Do you think that he said that Alex Jones ran about Hitler was the best rant he had ever heard. What do you want? A round of applause. You want a cookie because you don't like Hitler? Wow, I don't know how you could say something so brave. Wow, that was so cool. Well, he's really fighting like hell. Yeah, I think he's fighting like hell. He's really going off about how bad of a guy Adolf Hitler was. Whoa, can he say that? Is he going to be OK? I hope he's OK after this, go off. Hope he's OK after he fights like hell against checks. No, it's Adolf Hitler. And basically and that like that really bothers me because both me and yay and yay more than me, we're in the situation where we were being targeted by very powerful people, at that time.

Yay, it went to this day, of course, Yay's life changed after that. Like his he his wealth. They went to war against his whole life, his family, his business, his personnel, his finances like then how it goes. If you've been following me, when they go to war with you, they you know, it's all fair. It's all fair game to. So when you start to talk about Jewish power, they come for everything. They hate you where it hurts, they hit you, where you don't even expect it. And there's no scruples. There's no rules. And so they were going hard, and they still are against yay. Adidas is suing them for \$275 million. They froze his money. They won't let him publish his music. They won't let him perform in a stadium all this. And the same things going on with me, of course to on a much smaller scale. But people are threatening my family and people are going after my parents and they're going after me and all this. And again, we're just two guys. Like when you look at the yay camp, people are saying like, oh, he's doing this to make the right wing look, that it's like it's just like when people are saying Q Anon was behind every Trump action. It's like it's not like that man. It's literally just it's gay. OK. Gay is leading the whole thing and. For him to go after our little team like that, our small team of Christians who are telling the truth against all odds, fighting the entire ***** world. For him to go on a show and put on that smug ***** makeup face with this stupid *** pompadour and make a ***** face, make a silly smug face.

Maybe you're gay for Hitler, while you pocket money from the Jews or whatever, it's. Like and I just have no respect for. That I I. Just listen, I know that people got to do what they got to do to make their money, and I know that some people have taken this track of they want to say less to more people. they want to self censor so they can retain platform access and they can have a large audience and spread. A

softer message to a mass audience like I get that, but there's no excuse for that. Like, complete lack of character, low integrity behavior. You know, because here's what I'm not saying. I'm not saying Crowder has to agree. I'm not saying Crowder has to like it. I'm not saying has to be my best good friend or I'm entitled to his platform. I'm not saying he. Has to agree with. Me on one thing or on anything. That's what I'm not saying. What I am saying is to be smug and glib. and just kind of like a punk. About it to attack two people that are to kick two people while they're down and not that we were down, but to pile on and join in with objectively terrible people and not even in a way that is critical like objective and critical, but to jump in and just kind of like a snarky and smarmy way. It's just like the easiest. And just lowest. I've never had any respect for that if.

He had went on a show and said something like, I don't agree with that. Like I don't like Hitler, and I think he's wrong about that. And maybe that's not good politics, and it seems like he's having. A hard time, you. Know that would be one thing. But to go on there and say, to yuck it up and say, oh, they're they're horrible people and it's taking advantage of him and like they're gay for Hitler and this and that. It's like. And then and then he's going to go the next day and do a show about what exactly? Like low taxes. He's going to the next day. He's going to have another. Revolutionary show about. And at the end of the day, maybe that's the problem is these people are just producing objectively just garbage. I mean, what is the? What is the value there? He was saying something on Tim Poole and I laughed out loud, he said. You know, I'm always thinking about the value that we provide to the consumer and I'm thinking what exactly is the value that you're providing to anybody? What is the value that you're providing to mankind by churning out video after video after video? With these partisan talking points, like, what's the value you're telling people what they've heard before telling people what they want? Here about the same stale issues. Guns are good. Abortion is bad. America's great leftists are crazy. Joe Biden's demented. Let's go, Brandon. You know, to this choir, you know? Or this. Peanut gallery that he's got in his studio of other, goofball, millennials and glasses always. All these like 30 something millennial men with their glasses and their quarter zips chuckling it up. He said he likes Hitler as one does, and then he said that he likes Hitler. perfectly normal stuff. Am I right? Shut the **** **. Shut the **** **. We need to make another Biden fart video. Yeah, we love Hitler. OK. We're wearing masks and we're wearing rain boots, and we ***** love Hitler. And it's way cooler and way more interesting and way funnier than anything you have ever made in your entire life. Cause Jay is a fearless, visionary leader of America. So yeah, that that just kind of bothered me. You know, he's on the show with this makeup on. He's doing this passive aggressive. You know, whatever. I don't like people that are passive aggressive. I'm just aggressive, OK? I'm just straight up. I don't like passive aggressive, just, just saying. And the whole feud is basically fake. I mean Crowder and. Shapiro are two sides of the same coin, basically.

You know what are they saying? I'm prouder that they're not seeing on Shapiro. Is my point. what's the difference? He's like, well, we gotta fight like hell to make sure that the next generation can make it without being censored by big tech. It's like you're not being censored by big tech. And what are you saying that's so edgy? Like you have on Alex Jones to talk about the Illuminati or something. Or trilateral Commission. Hey, man, there's just two sides of the same coin, and the Republicans and Democrats are working together. Man, we're just trying to turn US against each other. Man, trilateral Commission. Builder bird bro. It's divide and conquer. The real red pill is that it's the rich. It's the rich turning US against each other, man. It's like, whoa, whoa. You ready for that truth bomb?

The Georgia guidestones. Whoa. What? Boo lame not based if that was based, the ADL would ruin your life for it. So anyway, but they don't. All right, what else? Yeah, that's my take. On the whole. He's not funny. That's the most offensive thing about Crowder is he's not funny. All his skits and the like, the 80s theme. I am so over the retro 80s theme. It is so played out. And it is so millennial it's like, listen man.

I didn't grow up. I'm not an 80s kid, OK? That's that does nothing for me it is self indulgent. It's not cool. The 80s retro vibes, pure millennial self indulgence. So at the end of the day, the show was just criminally bad. I remember I watched like one episode of it on stream. I want to say a few months ago and I.

Was like, strangely, people break up and watch this bug Club mug Club mug club. That's not even a good name. The consonants right next to each other mug, club, mug, Club, mug, Club, mug, club, all. Have to say like one word Mug Club. I'm a mug club subscriber, did you see that episode of Crowley yesterday? He said that Biden is mentally ill. He's so funny. I don't know how he does it. Did you see that? Yay appearance on Infowars. That was really troubling and problematic. That was so crazy, bro. I don't know. That's too crazy for me anyway. Yeah, I'm just as always. I'm just to kind of go over that whole deal. I think that's all I.

Got smug clubs? Club. Yeah. Facts. And so I'm not really taking the side. I mean, if any, I'm probably team Crowder. If I had to pick a team, I guess I'd pick team Crowder. But I still hate them. Don't. Well, we don't. Hate anybody, but not a fan, OK? Not a fan. Obviously, we don't like Shapiro.

I love how both of them pretended not to know me for years. That that's just like obscene. They if you asked them who Nick wants this was, they would have said with. A straight face. I don't know who that is. I don't know. You're talking about, but then when the yay thing happened, it was like they could literally like at that point, just stop pretending they were like, yeah, Nick Fuentes was, and it's like, OK, really.

But that's what they say. First they ignore you, then they laugh at you, then they fight you, then you win. Then it's day 24. So all right. Well, I think that's all I got. I'm, I'm too hot. In here I'm sweating. In these boots, how long have I been live now? When did this thing start? Been live for hour 40. Yeah, that's my first space. How did I do? Give me a thumbs up or thumbs down. How did I do on my first space? Thumbs up, thumbs up, thumbs. Up if I did a good job, thumbs down if I. Did a bad

job. Let me know. How's my driving? Let's see the spam you got to spam it though. Otherwise I won't see you got. A spam thumbs up or thumbs down. Pay while rave reviews universal acclaim, universal. Commercial and critical success. Great.

Well, well, well, yes. It's been fun. So I think that's going to do it for me on the space tonight. My first space back, the first hopefully of, excuse me, first of many I hope. But that's all I got for you tonight. Good to be back. Back on the. Timeline. Let's go. Follow me. Follow me here on Twitter. Check me out on cozy and telegram because you know, I don't know. What if I just get, like, banned? I mean, I don't want to jinx it. I hope I don't or whatever. Make sure to follow me cozy.tv/nick. T dot me slash Nick J Fuentes on telegram in case anything happens, but I hope not. I'm here man. I'm on Twitter. We're on the timeline. We're not here to spread. We're here to spread love speech here. To love everybody. Yeah, I know. I get ramped up, OK. I'm a little heated sometimes. I'm a little intense, you know? And I got to watch the language. But I'm yeah, but I'm here to love. Everybody, I'm here to. Make America love again and all that and. that's what it's about, so.

I'm not here to break any. I'm here to be cool. and and all that. So that's all I got. Thanks for listening. Hope you enjoyed but. I'll be back for many more and I'm here. OK, I'm on the timeline. Check my timeline every day. They might try to shadow ban me, so it's very important that you check my timeline whenever you can. Whenever you get a moment, bookmark it. Out because they're going to try to. They're going to try to. Take Me Out of the, they're going to deify me. Freedom of speech, not freedom of reach. How about I reach across? How about I reach across and give you a big hug? How about I reach across and give you a hug and ask you? To reconsider because that's. That's pretty dumb. They're going to they're going to try and emplyfy me, the ADL is. Going to pick up the phone. Hey man this Twitter space.

This is odd. Tweet, not cool. You know, they're glass. Erm, this dog tweet. So yeah, so. All right, check me out. Check my page everyday. Bookmark it, retweet like it up. But that's it. That's it for this space. And I will see you later. I will not be doing a well. I got a. Yeah, I should do a show tomorrow, but I have something tomorrow, so maybe I'll do an early show. I'll let you know. I'll keep you posted on Telegram and Twitter. OK. Great to see you all. It's great to see all your beautiful avis again. And your content and I. Love all of you. And I'll see you around. OK. Great to be back. Great to be with you. We're all friends again. Back on the timeline. All right, see you later. Have a good night.

Sneako vs. The Serfs

How I Learned to Love the Unabomber

Eventually, what people will realize their entire ideology was invented by billionaire satanists to keep them depressed and poor. Unfortunately, the leftist virus is infecting. Even the Arab world. But here in Morocco, you won't see their flag being ripped down and replaced with rainbows. To understand the fall. Of the West, you must go. East and the east. People are united by. God, you. Feel a very important emotion that's ignored in industrial society. Shame is a good thing. It prevents people from stealing and performing. Drag Queen story hour it lingers in the back of the mind, forcing you to be considerate and respectful. It was actually all the way Far East of Japan, where I first read the Unabomber. If you've seen this police sketch before, you might know Ted Kaczynski as the man who mailed bombs to university professors and scientists. He killed 3 people and fatally injured two dozen more. Shame this terrible person lived off the grid in the woods of Montana for two decades in complete solitude. All he did was seed. Off the land and make bombs in his cabin. The most extreme example of incel rage. But like almost all serial killers, if you dig a little deeper, you find the fence. The Unabomber had a genius IQ of 168 and was admitted to Harvard at 16, where the CIA conducted a mind control experiment called MK Ultra. For two years, they said, teenage Ted psychedelic drugs and brainwash. They strapped him to electroshock machines and interrogated him behind A2 way mirror, sitting there under a bright light in the camera. He would explain his worldview. So federal agents and scientific experts could humiliate him for coming up with ideas so *****. The CIA? Very. Deliberately picked the most vulnerable and bright minds to discover the best way to destroy them. What makes you think they stopped? Technology has only exponentially improved since 1958, when Ted became the Unabomber. Imagine what the CIA is capable of now. Stories like these make you reconsider why the CIA are in discord. Calls one week before a civilian becomes a domestic terrorist. How much of your worldview is your own, and how much of it is really part of an elite, sinister psychological operation? I've been live streaming for one year now, and in this time Western culture has shifted to reflect the worldview of. The biggest streamers. Ownership of the zeitgeist was handed from Legacy Media in late night talk shows to gamers and gamblers in this time amongst the talking head degenerates that are now signing \$100 million. I began to understand the Unabomber. It's ironic how the same federal agents that brainwashed Ted. Could never catch him. It took the. FBI 20 years and \$50 million before the Unabomber

essentially turned himself in, demanding they publish his manifesto Industrial Society and its future, which eerily predicts. Just how much technology will control people to this day? But a couple of decades ago, leftist professors were vigorous proponents of academic freedom, but today they have shown themselves ready to take away everyone else's academic. This is political correctness. The same will happen with leftists and technology. They will use it to oppress everyone else if they ever get it under their own control. The Unabomber Manifesto was published in 1995, when the Internet was still dial-up 3 decades before the hasanabad is could stream from a mansion pretending to be a communist. Many leftists have an intense identification with the problems of groups that have an. Image of being weak. Defeated repellent or otherwise inferior, the leftists themselves feel that these groups are inferior. They would never admit to themselves that they have such feelings. But it is precisely because they do see these groups as inferior that they identify with their problems. Everything I said about Biden is true. Unabomber helped me understand why the pokemans of the world find power and victimizing themselves, why people support pedophile politicians just because they're women are 10. I hope you get banned off this whole. Platform my guy. Why there are? So many identical low testosterone streamers using leftism because. Of their white guilt. If a brainwashed in cell could predict how ***** leftism would become alone in the cabin, what? Is the solution. Bam, Islam makes sense to me because in the mosque race is not a part of the conversation like in Christianity, and especially not with the ethno religion of Judaism. A Jewish person can reject the existence of God. But still be a Jew. Hollywood consists of all these atheist Jews, but there's no such thing as an atheist. That doesn't make any sense. Muslim simply accepts that there's one creator, and culturally it fixes all of the damage that feminism has done. Feminists are desperately anxious to prove that women are as strong and as capable as men. Clearly, they are nagged by fear that women may not be as strong and as capable as men. Why else would an? XQC have such a hard time arguing. That women could drive cars as good as men. You *****. I got unhinged because. Deep down, everyone knows men are stronger, mentally and physically, but we ignore basic reality for feminist feelings when in Aiden, Ross says there are two genders. It's a culturally bold statement only when everybody else is playing pretend. What the? Not for the cause of social justice, but for feelings of inferiority. It's clear society's faults are not the leftist real motive for hating America and the West. He hates America and the West because they are strong and successful today. Every man that embodies strength and success faces scrutiny. Culturally, politically and legally, that we've never before. In the east, masculinity is celebrated and encouraged, but in the West, even when just the streamer like Kai, Senator Eye shall speed become accomplished. Immediately the woke virus brings them back down and now starts dancing and they say he's defending A *****. Speed is in high school and they call him a ***** , right in time for them. To level up. His feelings of inferiority are so ingrained that he cannot conceive himself as individually strong and valuable, hence the collectivism of the leftist. He can feel strong only as a member of a large organization or a mass movement with which he identifies

himself. The reality is people will always need to attach their identity to something bigger than themselves. The new religion is climate change and being gay. That's why I believe Genius IQ individuals like the Unabomber never find God. They see religion as a coping mechanism for normies, who can't find morality themselves streamers. The destiny will look down at religion for being collectivists, but end up battling their own minds by worshipping the self instead of God. There's nothing, I mean, like, it doesn't. I mean, it makes sense. Like you're Islamic. Like you believe in conspiracy. Notice the masochistic tendency of leftist tactics. Leftist protests by lying down in front of the. They intentionally provoke police or racist to abuse them. These tactics may often be effective, but many leftists use them not as a means to an end, but because they prefer masochistic tactics. Self hatred is a leftist trait. Remember this was. Published 30 years before Black Lives Matter blew up police stations and climate change. Dorks ruin artistic masterpieces. Back when Greta Thunberg's ideology was still being written by New World Order agents on Epstein's Island was a serial killer really able to debunk? An entire idea. If our society had no social problems at all, the leftists would have to invent problems in order to provide themselves with an excuse for making a fuss. If a deranged in cell could predict the future of technology this easily. What else is in? Store formal regulations will tend increasingly to be replaced by psychological tools that make us want to do what the. System requires of us. Propaganda, educational techniques, mental health programs. Let me tell you. Heiko Zinski was living evidence of sickness in Western society. If social media is a drug, then the Unabomber manifesto is his warning label. His solution was finding refuge in the outdoors. He wanted us to ditch technology and find happiness in small communities. Yes, he also threatened to bomb a commercial flight and kill some teachers. But is that so bad for a guy who survived? CIA mind control after MK Ultra, the Unabomber was so messed up mentally, he nearly became a woman before becoming disgusted in the hospital waiting room and running out. Even in the 60s, the mentally deranged were coping with transgenderism. It is true that primitive man is powerless against some things that threaten his disease, for example, but he can accept the risk of disease stoically, it is part of the nature of thing, but threats to the modern individual tend to be man made. They are not the results of chance, but are imposed on him by other persons who decisions. He as an individual is unable to influence. Consequently, he feels frustrated, humiliated and angry. If the Unabomber can find happiness with just a bike in a cabin after being brainwashed by the CIA, we have no excuse. Just accept that 500 to 1000 people, we will never know the names or faces of make decisions for the rest of the world and there's nothing. We could do about it.

Sneako PRAISES The Unabomber in BIZARRE Hate-Filled Video

Preview

Sneako: When Aiden Ross says there are two genders, it's a culturally bold statement. Only when...

Lance: No, it's a scientific nonsense, and he's just saying it to be edgy and it's not even edgy. Can't even do edgy right anymore.

Sneako: The new religion is climate change and being gay.

Lance: Yes, he did get us. It's true. That is what the left wants. We want to end climate change and be gay.

Video Begins

Lance: Hey, you probably know Sneako as this like you know one time, pretty centrist YouTuber, maybe a little center left-leaning. Who has recently gone on a Andrew Tate scale of Red Pill Mig Tau? You know, kind of fashion ****. It's been sad to see, obviously, but also deeply embarrassing for him. Because you know, throughout this whole process, he's also been exposed to someone who's trying to pick up 14 year olds. Yeah, he got caught on camera trying to pick up a 14 year old. Also he has stated on camera the cuties is one of his favorite. So Sneako not a great guy trying to really basically copy Andrew Tate in every way, shape and form like he's got his own sneaker style courses. He's got his own sneaker style ***** MLM oriented men's ***** empowerment course. A lot of crypto courses as well. All that kind of ****. He's really pushing the whole ***** like I'm become super religious and I realize that, you know, the fundamentalism of what is a man and what is a woman is so essential, all that kind of ****. He's posting tons of anti LGBTQ plus stuff all the time, usually getting ripped up on it right, you know, banned **** on Twitter. The KKK is better than LGBT. That kind of ****, bin Laden, is better than Joe Biden. Pride Month is gay, edgy, lull, and now he's got. I assume this is a Twitter exclusive show called how I learned to love the Unabomber. OK.

Sneako: Eventually woke people will realize their entire ideology was invented by billionaire satanists to keep them depressed and poor.

Lance: Like you know, it's unfortunate, because you do have, I'm sure, a particular set of skills, right. Like a person like Sneako, you get to be as famous as Sneako is by there's something about you. There's an entertainment factor. Whatever it is, you've tapped into a large set of people who are like, yeah, I wanna watch this guy. I like his vibe. Let's see it. So there's. That so you got some skills. But to see you ***** transfer them all into something like this where it's just like, yeah, so billionaire pedophile, Jewish satanists, cabals, queers, run the world and program us to be woke.

Sneako: Unfortunately, the leftist virus is infecting. Even the Arab world, but here. In Morocco, you won't see their flag being ripped down and replaced with rainbows. To understand the fall of the West, you must go east and the East people are united by God. You feel a very important emotion that's ignored.

Lance: I guess it is. Kind of biblical to try and pick. A 14. Year Olds, then right. So. That you may know them.

Sneako: Industrial society change shame is a good thing. It prevents people from stealing and performing. Drag Queen story hour.

Lance: The two biggest crimes known to society. Well, you know, back in the day, we used to have shame and then people didn't steal at all. There was 0 stealing and then we lost our shame and then steal. We can start it up and then also drag Queens around the same time. I think that's history, yeah.

Sneako: It lingers in the back of the mind, forcing you to be considerate and respectful. It was actually all the way Far East in Japan, where I first read the Unabomber manifesto. If you've seen this police.

Lance: Wait, sorry, this is. This is unironic. That wasn't clickbait. You're actually doing a segment on ***** how the unabomber's base.

Sneako: Sketch before you might know Ted Kaczynski as the man who mailed bombs to university professors and sciences, he killed 3 people and fatally injured 2. Does more shame. This terrible person lived off the grid in the woods of Montana for two decades in complete solitude.

Lance: OK. OK.

Sneako: All he did was feed off the land and make bombs in his cabin. The most extreme example of incel rage. But like almost all serial killers.

Lance: He he. No, that's not what he was doing. What he was doing. That was that wasn't his reason. He didn't deep down, believed that he was owed sex by women and that women are keeping sex from him and therefore that they are evil because of it. That's in cell ideology and that's no no, we know what the Unabomber. Believe because he had a manifesto that you claimed to read. Like 25 seconds before.

Sneako: If you dig a little deeper, you find the fence. The Unabomber had a genius IQ of 168 and was admitted to Harvard at 16, where the CIA conducted a mind control experiment called MK Ultra. For two years. They fed teenage Ted psychedelic drugs and brainwash.

Lance: Here we go. You are combining different things but now they're all fused together. Hey, by the way, you know that there are people that can have a variety of mental health issues and those mental health issues can manifest themselves in a variety of ways. And while. People can be, yes. Unbelievably intelligent in one capacity. In this case, if someone happens to be a brilliant mathematician, for example, yes, that that is something someone can be well at the same time, perhaps having delusions or paranoia about the world around them simultaneously.

Sneako: They strapped him to electroshock machines and interrogated him behind A2 way mirror. Sitting there under a bright light. On camera he would explain his

worldview. So federal agents and scientific experts could humiliate him for coming up with ideas. So ***** the CIA very deliberately picked. I like how serious.

Lance: This is supposed to be too. This is supposed to. Be like for your base, right? So it's just like. OK, I need to tell all of you about the real world and how it is. OK, this is how the entire world is. Basically, we used to have a thing called shame, and when we had shame they brought us closer to God. And no one stealed and there was no such thing as drag Queens. Then we lost shame. OK, Bros, when we lost shame. And then we fell away from God, Drag Queen started to appear. At which point, I gotta tell you why. I actually love the Unabomber. Alright, now hear me out. He did bad things. Yes, but if we are to look at it from a different angle. MK ultra CIA. Let's think about it.

Sneako: The most vulnerable and bright minds. To discover the best way to destroy. What makes you think they stopped? Technology has only exponentially improved since 1958, when Ted became the Unabomber. Imagine what the CIA is capable of now. Stories like these make you reconsider why the CIA are in discord. Calls one week before civilian becomes a domestic terrorist. How much of your? Worldview is your own. And how much of it is really part of an elite sinister psychological operation?

Lance: Oh my God. It's it's just like. It's it's just non-stop *****. Let's just feed you a whole bunch of ***** buzzwords. Hey bro. You ever thought about this? You ever thought about maybe how your sleep, how the real world like you have to awaken yourself from a dream, as it were, to be able to understand how we're all programmed, how we're all controlled by things around us, beyond our control. You ever think about that, bro? Everything about how you could be a psychological operation right now, bro, not even. Know it well. That's why you got to subscribe to me. And then you also got to buy my course. If you buy my course, I can unlock. Let's not call it the matrix display. You're you're you're trapped inside the display tricks right now. So we need to break you free. You need to have the mauve pill. So if you take the mauve pill. Trust me, I'm not infringing on any copyright here. These original ideas that will wake you up to way the world really is. But if you take this little, you know, let's just say golden **** pill, then you'll remain in this plate tricks and then no one will ever escape. So that's your choice, bro. If you want to break free, that's it. The reason why? We know I'm called to exists is because it didn't work. Yes, I mean, I'm not trying to deny that he wasn't experimented upon, right, like he was part of a psychological study and his second year at Harvard, cuz he participated as study described by author Allison Chase as a purposely brutalizing psychological experiment led by Harvard psychologist Henry Murray. Subjects were told it would be personal. With fellow students were asked to write essays detailing their personal beliefs and aspirations. The essays were given to anonymous individuals who then confront and belittle the subject and want marry himself. Called vehement, sweeping and personally abusive attacks. Using the context of the essays as ammunition, electrodes monitored the subject. Psychological reactions these encounters were filmed and the subjects, expressions of anger and rage were later played back to them repeatedly. The experiment lasted 3 years. Someone

verbally abusing and humiliating Kozinski each week because since he spent 200 hours as a part of that study, I am in no way going to say that that didn't affect. Him, but not in the way you think. I think this is not as if he was suddenly through this really brutal and I would say almost torturous ***** program for hours and hours and hours and years of going through this to monitor the results not affected by it somehow. Sure, it definitely would have. I would say just broadly. Speaking the net. Negative effects on your mental health. You know you. Have to go through some like this positive. Outcomes I would not. Expect to be the first thing. All that being said, that doesn't mean that he was programmed by the CIA to suddenly promote, you know, some kind of MK ultra program, because his lawyers later attributed his hostility towards mind control techniques to his participation in Mary study during the Second World War had been with the Office of Strategic Services he conducted psychological. Frances, some sources have suggested that Mary's experiment were also part of Project MK Ultra, the CIS program to research into mind control. Chase and others have also suggested that this experience may have motivated Kozinski's criminal activities. Kozinski stated he resented Murray and his coworkers primarily because of the invasion of privacy he perceived as a result of their experiments. Nonetheless, he said he was quite confident the experiences with Professor Murray had no significant effect on the course of his life. Like you could make an argument that yes, that may have increased paranoia, but I would say that this isn't a single factor in towards what eventually drove him to his acts of extreme violence.

Sneako: I've been live. Streaming for one year now and in this time Western culture has shifted to reflect the. Worldview of the biggest streamers ownership of the zeitgeist was handed from Legacy Media in late night talk shows to gamers and gamblers in this time amongst the talking head degenerates that are now signing \$100 million contracts. I began to understand the Unabomber. It's ironic how the same federal agents that brainwashed Ted.

Lance: This is not good, I just I don't mean technically. No, it's terrible from a technical standpoint.

Speaker 4: It's it's.

Lance: It's absolute trash. I mean, it's not good as in where? His philosophy is heading. To be totally honest with you. There's like some little crumbs of truth all over the place, right? There's obviously a massive shift towards legacy media towards digital media, and that shift has been very palpable in a lot of different industries. You can see which ones have evolved and which ones have adapted and which ones are following and lagging behind. There's certainly something to be said about the rise of Internet celebrities. Yes, and the detachment that maybe mainstream celebrity culture has from Internet. Liberty culture, you can see that look no further than anytime PewDiePie goes on a late night talk show host and everyone's. Like, who is this little? Weirdo, you know? And then, like, you know, PewDiePie is at a ***** a gamer conference. I would do anything to be within 20 feet of you kind of ****. And yes, there are massive contracts being signed by really big streamers. I think a

lot of this might be a little bit diluted or perverted, if you will, by the very act that you are directly involved with a lot of these same. Circuits, right? The cryptocurrency gambling streamers, the cryptocurrency gambling promoters signing on to the Free Speech platform that is Kik AKA this is just a casino promotion vehicle. That's what it is. It's a marketing tool for stake.com cryptocurrency gambling. So yeah, they have deep pockets, casinos. Do because he knows have very deep pockets and I guess yes, you are also right. Instead of hiring Céline Dion, they want X QC so that is also correct. Outside of that I don't know why that made you love the Unabomber.

Sneako: Never catch him. It took the FBI 20 years and \$50 million before the Unabomber essentially turned himself in, demanding they publish his manifesto. Industrial society and its future, which eerily predicts just how much technology will control people. To this day. A couple of decades ago left his professors were vigorous proponents of academic freedom. And today they have shown themselves ready to take away everyone else's academic freedom.

Lance: Mills really recognized the **** handwriting. So I was hoping there'd maybe be a little bit more to that, but yeah. If you don't know the story already, he did end up publishing his manifesto. And the New York Times agreed, obviously under duress, and it was through reading his writing that his own brother recognized that this was, in fact who he was and was like. I think I know this guy, FBI. I'm pretty sure this is my brother. I've seen this kind of, let's just say ideas before.

Sneako: This is political correctness. The same will happen with leftists and technology. They will use it to oppress everyone else if they ever get it under their own control. The Unabomber Manifesto was published in 19.

Lance: What no theory does to a ***** when your worldviews, conspiracy theories, and ***** memes, then yes, this this would all make sense to you. It's like, yeah, if the left gets power, they will control the social media and they will turn it into politically correct woke ideology in order to take us further away from God. And you're like, actually we. Live under capitalism? And so a lot of these companies work under capitalist models. Some of them are publicly traded, so they obviously have a fiduciary responsibility to their shareholders and they want to turn as much profit as possible. And they are in direct competition with each other and because a lot of them have dominated and eaten up any of the competition that yes, they do have pretty strong monopolies in their respective fields. And that is a problem that, yes, anyone who is a critique of capitalism. Would tell you is a problem. I'd be like. Yes, I agree with you. There's a huge discrepancy between the owning class and the working class. But that doesn't mean that there's a massive conspiracy to program us and keep us in display tricks.

Sneako: 95 when the Internet was still dial-up 3 decades before the Hasanabad's could stream from a mansion, pretending to be a communist many leftists...

Lance: Fuckin' mic drop. I dropped a nuke, eat it Hasan. Bodied.

Sneako: ... have an intense identification with the problems of groups that have an image of being weak defeated.

Lance: You ***** racist *** racist. Holy ****. Racist like one after the other that have a ***** tendency to act weak. Bra. Bra. My experience, especially dealing with a lot of these ***** big, tall red pill types, is that I have not met more insecure men in my ***** life than dudes who have to sell the idea of masculinity to other dudes.

It it's like I I've never even... the IRL when you meet ***** people who are just craving cowards, they don't have this kind of ***** weird arrogance where just like, yeah, well, I mean, women are weak. They try to manipulate us with their *****. ***** are gross, by the way. They're just, like, gooey weird ***** gross things that I never want to get around. But either way, yeah, the masculine man does smash as much as possible while closing their eyes and just hoping he gets over. Quickly and and basically, that's why they're weak and we have to dominate them. So by my course. Defeated no Indigenous people are still around. Yeah, no. No. Yeah, that's just. This is just racist. It's just racist.

Sneako: ... repellent ...

Lance: Repellent bro, I'm so straight bro bro, I'm so straight that obviously the ***** they all want to touch me. But guess what? I repel them. I I repel them, bro. With my straightness, you know? Because I'm so ***** Strait. Hey bro.

Sneako: Otherwise inferior.

Lance: What a ***** bigot. Holy **** man, it never used to be like this. This is. What, like going full Andrew Tate? Does to you, by the way. Like you know cico, I I was never a fan of Sneako and even his ***** centrist ****. It's kind of like, uh, he's on the street. He's asking people questions, but it's not exactly coming at it from a right wing perspective. He's kind of like, I just want to have a conversation. To you and uh, it's kind of seeing like the more stuff I do in the street and the more times that I talk to women who are physically attractive, generally speaking, it seems there's more people popping off in my comments being like, oh, she's a *****, bro. Ohh yeah, she's a ***** she's just flat. Oh, what a ***** *****, bro. Don't talk to her, bro. She's just trying to ***** manipulate you, bro. And then like, well, a lot of you are watching my videos now. The numbers are going up. Maybe I just keep doing these things. Hey, let's have more conversations on the street and figure out what we find out. And then you start defending people ***** like. Aidan Ross. Nick Fuentes sucking Andrew Tate was not a long time like he was already moving into this ***** anti-Semitic conspiracy stuff. So you know all he needed was Nick Fuentes to like, ***** push him right in that direction. But all the rest of the stuff, I mean, like I've told everyone before, a lot of this **** we all have programmed inside of us because, broadly speaking, society is sexist. Homophobic, racist, all that kind of stuff, right? So we're always trying to deprogram the stuff and get better about it. And as you see culture change and try to adapt as well, people will push back against that. That's why you get so many. People be like. Oh, they're becoming woke. How is it woke? Well, there, there. Was a main character who was black. It's like. That's OK. Well, there was also a woman, a woman main character too, but that's also OK.

No, we're gonna be fine. We're gonna. We're gonna be totally fine. Yeah, there's still probably gonna be some white people in there. I promise. You just probably some white dudes in the movie. Just just wait for it. Yes, he told you that that a lot of white dudes, they they popped up. We're gonna be OK. We're gonna be. You know, it's just maybe not every single movie should only. Have straight white sis dudes as the heroes and the then the hot strong muscular types because there's other people that exist in the world and it's not necessarily. Us trying to **** all over white people by not featuring every character as the white person because again, there's a lot of a lot of different people than just, you know, straight CIS white dudes on on the planet. There's game ones too.

Sneako: The leftists themselves feel that these groups are. Inferior, they would never. Admit to themselves that they have such feelings, but it is precisely because they do.

Lance: *** ****, no. No, I'm not like living a lie. I'm not like, well, deep in my heart. I know that women are inferior to me and then blah blah. Honestly, the more I become or gone down this journey of like learning reading theory like *****, you know, trying to understand gender theories, the history of feminism, the history of black feminism, and you go down all these ***** book rabbit holes, the more I'm starting to realize. Well, *** **** fragile. A lot of aspects of modern day masculinity are and how fragile men are, and that is actually a ***** it's a massive tragedy because we've got this weird version where dudes have been raised and conditioned in such a way that it's deeply damaging to them. It doesn't allow them to actually be emotionally available or emotionally in tune with their own ***** self. Elves and they can't talk to anyone about it, so they're all in these ***** weird *** little cages and boxes of this hypermasculinity where they're looking for answers. And lo and behold. They'll find a sneaker online, Hussain ship like this, that kind of resonates because they've been, you know, raised in a lot of ways to be conditioned this way. And then all of a sudden, like, OK, well, maybe this person has the answers, but really it's like it's deeply sad that you cannot even tell one of your best guy friends that you love. Or vice versa and and then know and be affirming in both directions, so that is. A real thing. That's tragic. That's sad. And there's a deep, deep, deep. Profound *****, almost melancholy horror to the entire thing, especially because it's getting reinforced by these *****. These same *****. We're gonna do these videos. We're just like. Yeah, they're inferior women who are weaker and pretend to be weaker in order to control us and manipulate us. There are the repellent, disgusting deviants. One is the homosexuals, and then there are the defeated people who we successfully genocide in, you know, the indigenous peoples. So that's basically the categories at the left of fixates and associates themselves. With and it's like. I see fragility. Body of the highest order, especially my line of work covering all this kind of **** coming from white conservatives and also from men. They don't have to be white, but from men who are very, very big on reaffirming all of these traditional values. Yes, time and time again it is a massive. Massive cope. You can see it in the way that they act

as soon as they leave their safe spaces. It's no longer a comfortable area like look at every single one of these dudes. All these Mig Tao ***** red pilld dudes when all of a sudden they're they're confronted about some of their beliefs, they just ***** melt. Andrew Tate is supposed to be the most dangerous man alive and ***** a 25 minute conversation with Assan, and he looked like an absolute clown bozo. You know it it it was like 25 minutes into that. It was just like. You know this this dude is deeply unserious. They all are and it's. All to mask that insecurity that we all have. You see, here's the thing like. Even if you you're aware of all this, you can still like myself. You can still battle with that all the time as a dude, because we've been raised in this weird way where you obviously default to a lot of these settings all the time. Can be in a social setting where all of a sudden it's like oh wow, this person seems like having a really bad time. I gotta help them. I gotta fix this. What do I do right now? How can we fix this situation? What can I do to help you? Don't worry. I will remain calm. I will not. Show any emotion in this moment. What can I? Do to you like. All this kind of stuff it. Deeply, deeply difficult to unpack on a regular basis, and the sad thing is, is they're going to go down these holes because. The alternative is not there in an adequate way for for them to find that pipeline where this is a ***** industry. It's it's a multi level marketing industry that has so many players that are making so much money and they have strategies that pull in people. Hey, did you want to get a bunch of viewers? What should we do? Why don't we get a whole bunch of hot women? Doing what? We'll just give them lots of booze. Just get like, a table of hot women. Really hot women. We tell them dress as hot as you want. You do whatever you want. Blah, blah. We're not gonna judge. Don't worry, baby, this is not blah. We're not gonna slot. Shame you dress as hot as you want. We wanna see everything. Blah blah. Then we're gonna give them tons and. Tons of liquor. And then we're just going to be really sexist to them for about 3 hours straight. And that's the show. That's it. It's like, wow. And that'll work, yeah. That'll work. No, people are gonna love. You know, and honestly, we'll never lose, because if anyone actually starts speaking back and it's actually like a proud, you know, strong, intelligent, very, very powerful woman will either edit that out or we'll just kind of ignore them and then try to turn everyone against them. Do that whole thing or like, oh, wow, she's a feminist. She thinks she's better than all of us. Make fun of her, everybody. And everyone's gonna. Loser, get off the show. It'll make ***** tons of money.

Sneako: These groups as inferior that they identify with the.

Lance: Unless it's subscribing 90s MTV shows. Yeah, that too.

Sneako: Everything I said about Biden is true. The Unabomber helped me understand why the pokemans of the world find power and victimizing themselves.

Lance: This is all deeply unserious, because like you are trying to relate the philosophy of the Earth in relation to streamers. I mean, this is a very POV syndrome Sneako I feel this is the way you see the world and I understand it because I too am a streamer. I sometimes have streamer brain we all do, but I wouldn't make a grand thesis about the universe and then center streamers at the very middle of it.

Sneako: People support pedophile politicians just because.

Lance: Yeah, main character syndrome.

Sneako: They're women are 10. Speaker I hope you get banned off this. Whole platform, my God.

Sneako: There are so many identical.

Lance: I love how You're still doing this. Yeah, look at all the soy. Look at this. Look at all these boy individuals. You can tell by the cuckoo meter. They go from least to most **** the very end. We got a veritable living **** cage. Is that even a human, or is it a ****** cuck cage? Hard to tell. ****** chastity belt. All of them. First off, OK, I just wanna be the one. That say this. Ohh all people are beautiful. Alright, all the men and non binary individuals you see before you in their own way are uniquely beautiful. Yes, there are traditional forms of beauty that. I'm sure people would point towards but why would you include people who you also tried to idealize? Like this is an amateur athlete, not pro, but was in the amateur leagues. No Samson, and this is a son Piker. the the ****** the one who's always. Made fun of for being a him boat and. A dream boat. And like, aren't these supposed to be what men are supposed to be? I mean, if anything, this is a beautiful. Thing, because like outside of the fact that it's, it's pretty white. It it it shows you that there is a variety to both men and non binary individuals and how they present and look and and in that there is not one-size-fits-all for beauty there are many varieties of it but you just keep pointing to. This photo and be. Like, well, if this is sorted then **** is. Everyone soy or we also who amongst us has not soiled or is not saying. Right now.

Sneako: Low testosterone streamers using leftism because of their white guilt. If a brainwashed. In cell could predict how ****** leftism would become alone in a cabin. What is the solution? Islam makes sense to me because in the mosque race.

Lance: OK, so the the greatest thing about both Andrew Tate and Sinco now turning to religion is that I've seen multiple, multiple, both interviews and debates with them where a simple question is posed. And in this case, I think destiny was the one who asked it Sneako. It's like, what's your favorite? Verse from the Koran. What's your favorite line from the Koran? OK, what's your favorite parable from the Koran? Ohh wait. As you can probably assume, there was number answer, you can probably assume there is no verse parable page reference because again I don't know how much of the T has ingested at this point, but it's more of a let's just say. It's more of a vibe than anything else. Now. I'm not here to take away anyone's own personal religious beliefs. Please if you wanna go practice religion, do so. If you wanna turn religion into part of your brand and your marketing and and part of why you tried to you know excavate money from people who watch you. Well, I mean that's you, that's your own personal decision. All that being said, I don't know if it's very genuine. Say that like you have. Of deeply theological answers based on a text that you intrinsically end have categorically understood in great detail.

Sneako: This is not a part of the conversation like in Christianity and especially.

Lance: Oh yeah, no, this happens all the time. It doesn't just happen to people who want to move towards, you know, a lot there. There are people who are born again Christians, for example, who at one point or another were super. He did a ton of sucked up. Stuff and then all. Of a sudden like loose roof or whatever that he took the God pill. This was a dude who said that, like, rape should be legalized and be like there are legal. Cases and legal merits to rape and stuff like that. And now he's like, oh, so I took the God pill. I'm super like, you know, Jesus. See now and you know I only walk in the light. Of the Lord. The Holy Ghost is moving through me. All this kind of stuff, and that's basically where I'm at, you know.

Sneako: Not with the ethno religion of Judaism. A Jewish person can reject. The existence of God.

Lance: I'm sorry to tell you by the way, if you happen to hate Jewish people, but like all three monotheistic monotheistic religions are pretty much a trilogy. They all build upon one another. You know, it's it's very weird, but still.

Speaker 3: Be achieved?

Sneako: Still be a Jew? Hollywood consists of all these atheist Jews, but there's no such thing as an atheist Muslim. That doesn't make any sense.

Speaker 3: What I I I know like I.

Lance: I I have. Friends who are both Muslim and also kind of agnostic. Yeah, there are people who are religious who don't have to be orthodox or completely ***** ideologically driven with their religious beliefs. They can do it because they enjoy the ceremonies, they enjoy the family aspect, they enjoy going to temples, they enjoy the fact that it brings them closer to community. They can enjoy the charity that a lot of these organizations. Do I mean, you know, one of the great things that you know, members of the sick village and. Who have you know, immigrated in really large numbers from India here to to Vancouver do is they do feeding programs they they will hold delicious meals where they feed as many people as they can and that is the idea is that they have to be able to feed as many mouths as possible. Those are beautiful things that can come from the organizational structure of religion. You can do all that without being like, well, we also want to dictate. Political policy and go after your kids, right? That's where I have massive problems with religion. I don't think that religion should. Place within society and that it should have special protections outside of. You should be able to discriminate against people for their religious beliefs because people do prosecute each other for that. But I don't think they should have tax exemptions. I don't think they should have special exemptions. I don't think they should have. You know, any kind of things like that? Absolutely not. I mean, these are at the end of the day, it's one of those things where like. I don't know where I could draw a line cuz where do you stop the definition of? What could be considered? Religion are Mormons considered religion considering? It's newer than the the you know the big three monotheistic religions because Scientology be considered a religion. Could the the the Flying Spaghetti Monster eventually actually get certifications of religion right? Just if you wanna believe.

Speaker 3: Believe it.

Sneako: Really accepts that there's one creator, and culturally it fixes all.

Lance: Well, Judaism is both an ethnicity and a religion.

Sneako: All of the damage that feminism has done, feminists are desperately anxious to prove that women are as strong and as capable as men. Speaker That's no good.

Sneako: Clearly it's not it.

Lance: It's not that they want to lift as. Many weights as possible. Alright ladies do it. Can you eat and *****? Eat all the raw meat like a man, and then lift all the weights. Can you walk in there, get a whole bunch of weights? Just like drop them on the floor, eat raw meat you can. Eat raw meat like you did. If you can do it, *****. Feminism's real, if not brah, then I'm sorry feminism fail. Speaker Eat that.

Lance: ***** raw meat.

Sneako: They are nagged by fear that women may not be as strong in his Cape.

Lance: See, here's the thing, this is all again so deeply transparent about how insecure deeds are, because we equate so much of our ***** worth with our physical strength. That is nonsense. You're never going to be the strongest man. There's only one. There's only one strongest man on the planet. Alright, I say this as a dude who's like I'm 62. Alright? Like I I should be by definition. Like well, this is like, you know, this is the archetype. He's a giant guy, blah, blah, that kind of stuff. Right. Yeah. No, it's.

Speaker 4: So weird to think that your words should be based. On your physical strength, guess what? There are women who could beat the ever loving **** out of me. Of course there are. There's very strong women now.

Lance: I'm not saying that there aren't differences between, you know, women and men, especially when it comes to a whole bunch of differences in physical development and and and in relation to being able to. Participate in fights, but this idea that like overall. Men are strong, women weak. Speaker Clean up your room.

Speaker 3: Like that's just, that's just so.

Lance: Weird, I was like. No, there's weak women. There's strong women, there's weak men. There's strong women, men, there's men who are super fit. There's men who are *****, morbidly obese and completely out of shape. And and in no in no way are ready for ***** a a fight. All all that kind of ****. But why? Why are we?

Sneako: Why is our worth?

Lance: As men, I am men, I am strong. I have muscle, yes.

Sneako: The Bulls men. That sneaky was a tiny little.

Lance: Twinkle with the bugs is he talking about? You should be careful what you say. He'll challenge you to a fight he's already. Done. It's most critical.

Sneako: Would an XQC have such a hard time arguing that women could drive cars as good? You ***** so. I know. I got. I got.

Lance: Not as good. They drive better. We have so much data on this. There's entire industries. Billions of dollars are on the line for insurance companies that want

to insure cars and motor vehicle accidents. They study so thoroughly that detectives of that **** can understand so much about a crash based on the. The tire tracks the skid marks, the speed of which you were traveling. All this ****. The forensics for that kind of stuff. They know the deets and the stats, and they got them, and the numbers are in. Boys, I'm sorry to say we are worse drivers. We take more risks, we speed more, we crash more, we get more accidents, we die more, we kill more. That's been we are worse drivers. It's OK, it's alright. Sorry, boys. It's OK. We got some other things. We can pee standing up. You know, it's like, well, women can do that too. Alright, it's fine. It's fine. It's fun. You know, you have 2023 new age, I guess, right? Don't wanna don't wanna get cancelled here.

Speaker 4: Don't get cancelled here, you.

Lance: Know talking about that whole ideology or whatever you want. To bring up here, but either way.

Speaker 3: You know dude. Well, we'll be all right.

Lance: We're going to be OK, you know, still. We're still dominating in a lot of industries. I mean, you can say that it's illegal to pay men and women different salaries based on being in the exact same position. But I mean, we still do dominate a lot of industries, which is really hard for women to even breakthrough into those positions alone. You know, look at entertainment, media engineering and **** audio. A lot of that stuff. Yep, you know where women are. Catching up and actually beating. Ohh boys. Ohh yeah. Be ladies. Be crushing stem. Well, you were like my wife. She needs shopping. It's like, no, she's **** she's really good at computer science and she's sucking. Getting really, really, really high. Paid salary when she's out of school. A lot of ladies are.

Sneako: Because deep down, everyone knows men are stronger, mentally and physically, but we.

Speaker 3: We're so hey.

Lance: Even if I was to give you the physically thing right, and I don't want to right now, but even I want to give you that mentally, men are not in a good way. You know, we just don't we we're not well equipped for. A lot of the a lot of the modern day problems that come along because it's like. Hey, by the way, did you know women talk to each other and open up about a lot of their emotions and the things are going through and then they kind of seek comfort in each others company through that process. Oh, that sounds nice. Yeah, it does. Yeah, it does. It sounds really nice. Oh, we've passed the boundaries of awkwardness between two men having a conversation. Two straight men who are not intentionally going to be having any kind of sexual interaction. So at this point, we should probably let's just say ease tensions a. Bit you like **** awh bro. Bits hell yeah. Loves ****. Yeah, bro. Yeah, yeah. **** are **** not awesome.

Sneako: Nor basic reality for feminist feelings when an Aiden Ross says there are two genders. It's a culturally bold statement only when.

Lance: No, it's a scientific and nonsense, and he's just saying it to be edgy and it's not even *****. Can't even do edgy right anymore.

Sneako: Everybody else is playing pretend. Speaker What the ****?

Sneako: Not for the cause of social justice. But for feelings of inferiority, it. Speaker It's clear.

Lance: But see, that's The thing is that all of? This is coming from feelings of inferiority. I lose nothing by the existence of trans men existing. The fact that right now there's a trans male boxer who's three and who could start just ***** cleaning up in that ***** he could dominate that, that that weight loss for a while. Now the problem is that he's having a lot of trouble finding opponents because of transphobia, blah blah and sexism. Also like, you know, the transphobic, sexist you're. You're transmission right there, where you're basically experiencing. People who are like, oh, I don't wanna fight that person because I think that they're a biological female and I don't wanna lose to a biological female cause. If I lose to a girl, then I'm not a man. Men cannot lose to women. Now women are inferior, mentally and physically. I mean like, it really feels like there's a lot of feelings of inferiority going across the board here. You know, again, I I don't lose anything by the existence of transmen. If anything, it makes the ***** male experience infinitely more exciting and interesting and ***** complex and like *** ****, why do we got to live in this? ***** medieval times.

Sneako: Society's faults are not the leftist real motive for hating America and the West. He hates America and the West because they are strong and successful.

Lance: *** **** the military industrial complex, the imperialism of the US. I gotta admit. Kinda jealous. Kinda jealous. Kinda kinda really want to exploit the global S myself, you know. Kinda kinda wish I got ahead of that, kinda wish I stayed some twos and set up a whole bunch of mining contracts for corporations that are able to extract all those precious resources for generations. All these post colonial ***** countries that have had to endure years and years of enslavement and other **** now just selling out their resources to the highest bidder. Hi, France. How you doing? You enjoying doing that still? No, that's not jealous. I wish that America uses vast wealth to help Americans. That's because I think of Americans had access to healthcare if they had access to better living conditions, housing and stuff like that, they won't be as ***** scary to me because right now, Americans are very scary to a lot of the world. By the way, a lot of the world watches what's happening in America is like. Yeah, so it's. About four mass shootings over the weekend and a lot of people have guns and because of the mass shootings, they got more scared. So they bought a lot more guns. But don't worry, they're making more guns, so there's more guns coming even they're buying. These guns and people are very, very upset and angry and old people right now. They're so confused. They're just like shooting people through their windows, especially if they happen to be black. They see a black person. They just opened fire 1st and. Then ask questions. And you're like, yeah, none of this seems healthy. I would rather that you you all have access to as much resources as possible.

I don't. I don't want that concentrated into the hands of the very few as the hands of the. Be armed. Become more armed.

Sneako: Today, every man that embodies strength and success faces scrutiny culturally, politically and legally that we've never.

Lance: No, it's the opposite. Oh, **** ***, no. People like especially men. Men in society. If you weren't successful, suddenly like, especially if you're successful in capitalism, people just have a newfound respect for you. It's an aura about you. Oh, that's a real man there. Oh, no. He's a Titan in his industry. Apparently is gonna be making ***** partner pretty soon. It's a catch. That's catch, ladies. Sorry he's taken. No, he got himself a trophy wife. Of course, because that's what he was supposed to do, right? He was supposed to be a man. He's supposed to be an inner provider and he wanted the game of capitalism, but also because women and their worth comes from their self beauty. He found someone who's basically ***** ohh we're talking influencer hot. Oh, yeah. No, she is. She's a smoke show, and that's basically the extent of what she is. She is a smoke show and that's all he wants. He doesn't want conversation or anything outside of, you know, the occasional sexual encounter. And then if she could just stand in the sun all day, mostly nude, that would be ideal. That would be ideal. No going to the bathroom now and yeah, that's basically gonna be their lives. They're they're. Living the rest life.

Sneako: Before seen. In the east, masculinity is celebrated and encouraged, but in the West, even when just the streamer like Kai, Senator Eye show speed become accomplished. Immediately the woke virus brings them back down. Tyson now starts dancing and they say he's defending A *****. Speed isn't high.

Speaker 3: Wait, what?

Lance: That's that's not what happened.

Sneako: High school and they call him a ***** , right in time for them to level up his feelings of inferiority are so ingrained that he cannot.

Speaker 3: What does that have to?

Speaker 4: Do with wokeness. How is?

Lance: Wokeness canceled them and last I checked, kismat is still ***** like the number one streamer. Now, after XQC left on Twitch, isn't he?

Sneako: Conceive himself as individually strong in value. Noble, hence the collectivism of the leftist, he can feel strong only as a member of a large organization or a mass movement with which he identifies himself. The reality is, people will always need to attach their identity to something bigger than them.

Speaker 4: You know, so wild about all. Speaker This it's not.

Lance: Like on paper? Like that's. That's like I would naturally gravitate towards a lot of the stuff that those people preach, such as like, you know, you have to be self-sufficient, you have to be able to, like, work on your own time. Like I think it has. A lot to do with my ADHD, but I've always had a lot of trouble working for bosses. Right. And in every industry that I've been, I've been in, I've been able to meet that lens. I work really hard, all that kind of stuff. But I would way rather prefer to be

able to just like. Creatively, you worked for ***** like, you know, 18 hours a day, just doing whatever I wanted kind of *****, right? But I also appreciate the value in society just existing and working cooperatively together, and how there are examples where societies. Work a lot. Better and have better outcomes than there are societies where things are kind of ruthless, like in the United States, and they have the largest incarceration rate in the entire world. That's not free. One to me, I don't look at the United States and think wow, ***** 1% of the population is in jail, freedom disproportionately black and brown people. Freedom. You know, the disproportionately poor people's freedom. Like I I'm not like, oh, *****. That's amazing. I'm like, no, something seems fundamentally broken. And by the way, it's benefiting the ruling class and you're upholding. That *****, like this entire. That's why I hate the Mittal red pillars so much, cuz they sell all this stuff under the guise of like, yo, what we're doing here is that we're trying to make sure that you, you men, can fulfill and become your best selves, live your best lives. All right. You're gonna conquer. You're gonna dominate. You're going to be ***** stallions that mount the world. That's what you're all gonna become if you buy my core sake. MLM's. You start advertising for me. Get that ***** you know affiliate code. Make sure you put the affiliate code in. Then you get a kind of every single person who signs up for the course as well. Make sure that they get indoctrinated. You start up a triage. We can say like as a triangle of people who work underneath you and they can all start filtering money up inside your upside. Tunnel, which will work out really good for everybody. Don't think of it as a triangle and and then basically that's. That's the whole way. In order to defeat feminism. Because if we don't, the. West will fall.

Sneako: The new religion is climate change and being gay.

Speaker 3: It's true, it's true.

Lance: He he did get us. That is what the left wants. We wanna end climate change and be good.

Sneako: That's why I believe Genius IQ individuals like the Unabomber never find God.

Lance: So I don't even get you didn't really explain the point outside of being like he figured it out as an in cell. That's his like thesis for this video. The Unabomber figured out the way the world works as an in cell. And the way truly is. So that's why he's a ***** genius IQ and might change my opinions. On him, he's a mass murderer. He's a mass murderer who had delusions of *****. Robots taking over the planet and ***** like that. The guy is not a ***** inspirational figure by any means.

Sneako: See religion as a coping mechanism for normies, who can. Find morality themselves. Streamers like Destiny will look down at religion for being collectivists, but end up battling their own minds by worshipping the self instead of God. Speaker There's nothing, I mean, like, it doesn't mean it makes sense. Like you're Islamic, like you believe in conspiracy.

Sneako: Notice the masochistic tendency of leftist tactics leftist pro.

Lance: If he's not, he's not. A leftist. And I'm not saying that to insult him. He would be the. First person to be insulted if you. Called him leftist. He's very proud liberal.

Sneako: Tests by lying down in front of vehicles, they intentionally provoke police or racists. To abuse them, it's.

Lance: OK. So they're asking for it. I guess you know those antifa, they want to be victims so bad, they'll just, you know, provoke police to to abuse them physically and sexually. It's what Antifa are always doing as part of their tactics. Don't fall for cops, alright? Maintain the line.

Sneako: These tactics may often be effective, but many leftists use them not as a means to an end, but because they prefer masochistic tactics. Self hatred is a leftist trait.

Lance: By the way this. Is not just Sneako. This is a worldview I guess held by a lot of the. Tim Poole was saying similar ****. He's like, well, the problem. Is that like I think Lance would pretty much probably be a really nice guy in general, but he's part of this, like this cult, and he's got this group think ideology because he's predisposed to being able to believe all these ideas. And so they, they actually secretly hate themselves. And I was like. I'll be honest with. I actually both love myself and. A lot of the things around me, like I absolutely. Adore was not even there. Ohh *** ****. I love Chico. Even if he's not in the room with me right now. But yeah. No, I'm. I'm actually, I I love myself. I I love the people in my life. I love my partner. I love my dog. I I I'm. I'm actually quite content to that. You know what actually gives me anxiety, depression and makes me like upset about the world. Sometimes there's watching all of these ***** for a living and then just seeing how their lies and *****. It's not even clever. Sometimes it. Could be so. ***** frustrating that. It's just like all you need to do is turn on the webcam and say whatever comes to your mind, and then all of a sudden it's like you don't have any ***** don't have to be fact checked. Don't have anyone who questions you don't have, like, not even your own audience wants to keep you in check. They just want wins. That's all that matters. Is this ***** liberal tears left us tears. We gotta get those tears. It doesn't matter if Emma Vigeland doesn't actually believe in giving ***** to 10 year olds. We'll tell everyone that she does, and we'll put that clip out out of context and then everyone will see it, and then it'll look like Emma Biglan. Actually wants to give **** to 10 year olds and then that's. That's, that's all. That's all I wanted. That's all we need. That's all we need. And then we just move on and it's like ***** hell. Like to some of you. Yeah, your true believers. So this is just part of your movement and the others. You're just ***** you're so Internet, brain. You're so ***** irony, brain. You're so 4. Chan brained like Tim Poole for example. That like he just thinks the whole thing is a lull for the checks. You know, the whole thing is ***** hilarious. The checks at the end of the ***** day. His **** is gonna have real world consequences if he keeps saying, like, well, they were holding a groomer event. Yeah, my. Lens rumors. I told you. I told you this was gonna happen even if he doesn't believe it, it'll have the same

effect. It'll have a whole bunch of ***** thousands and thousands of extremists who are sucking at the very tail end of the ***** radicalization pipeline being like, oh, ****, well, we have to do something and I have to activate. I have to tell the boys, the Knights of didn't have to know.

Sneako: Remember this was published 30 years before Black Lives Matter blew up police stations and climate change dorks ruin artistic masterpieces.

Lance: Did you not learn that they didn't actually ruin it because it was protective, like they didn't? The soup never actually got on the painting that was.

Sneako: the whole thing back when Greta Thunberg's ideology. Was still being written by New World Order agents on Epstein's Island was a serial killer really able to debunk an entire ideology? If our society had no social problems at all, the leftists would have to invent problems in order to provide themselves with an excuse for making a. Us if a deranged in cell could predict the future of technology this easily. What else is in store? Formal regulations will tend increasingly to be replaced by psychological tools that make us want to do what? The system requires. Of US propaganda and educational techniques, mental health programs.

Lance: My God, my God. You know what's really scary? Speaker What this though is?

Lance: That, like the sneakers and the Aden roses. They're still big enough. They have big enough platforms, they're massive ask streamers, they will have a large percentage of ***** teenage boys that are now just like. They're going down this rabbit hole, just like, giddy up giddy up. They're gonna go down this ***** we think that homosexuals are degenerates perverted, disgusting creatures. We think that the genocide of indigenous people is acceptable and is already taking place and they lost. They're defeated. We think that women are weak and are the weaker sex, and because they're weak, they try to manipulate and control us and we like. You're furthering a whole bunch of all this toxic **** like no one on the left is saying that we don't want men to exist anymore, that we want to eliminate the very idea of masculinity or being masculine, it's. We want to eliminate the shift parts. We just want to evolve in ***** it, not just for masculinity, for everything, for ***** economics evolve beyond capitalism. We've seen the effects we've been doing capitalism for a very long time. All the alternatives to it are the better systems to it evolve beyond the way our government is restructured and how it actually deals and utilizes resources. Is there a very high taxation for corporations and the very wealthy? Is that high taxation for the corporations, the very wealthy then put into social programs that directly reduce the amount of crime and suffering that happened on the street? Including the cost of your health care system, which would also be a public health care system, there is countries that do that OK, do they do it well? They do, but a lot of it happens to be on the backs and shoulders of imperialism. OK, well, then let's fix that part. Is there ways? To do it without having the remnants of imperialism that a lot of Scandinavia depends on, as well as a lot of dependence on the oil and energy sector that a lot of Scandinavia depends on. But still have a robust social structure that isn't xenophobic, but that can

also pay for a whole bunch of social safety programs and have jails that don't actually result in really high recidivism rates but actually result in people. Getting say the training and or help medical help they need in order to. Become productive members of. Society, which is what we ultimately should all want. Should we not right at the end of the day, I you don't even have to be an abolitionist to be like, what are your outcome goals? What do you want? What do you want there to have happen with the criminals in society, broadly speaking. And if it's I? Would like there to be less of them. Great. So what works? What? Works. Let's let's go with. That one, you know. And also Cinco was caught trying to pick up a 14 year old while live streaming with John Zerka of all people. Yeah, almost forgot about that John Zerka while John Zerka up here and was also hitting on. The 14 year old.

Do you enjoy the service but prefer not to have to use your eyeballs? Many are saying this. Well, we've got the solution for you. It's the surf Times in podcast form. Available on most major podcasting networks now, if you enjoy it, please consider leaving a good review and feedback because it really helps the show out, apparently, and. Free, just like the podcast.

Thank you kindly to our Lord and Saviors Peyton Ljust and Zander Corvus. Without you, we are nothing. And now a shout out to our Knights of the square table. Amazing flesh. Anna loves Riley. Adrian McCarthy, DM Rivera, Doug, Katy, everything important hagbard, Celine, Izzy. Modernity, LA Media Panza, Matthew Scarborough. Multi, Mondie nettle Omni peanut butter blonde political poppy quite 185, Rachel Kane, Riley and Anna. Roller Dragon Tubby, Sir. Tickets, spinach monster, stellar vision, Sebastian Devil Thomas Trevant EXE lucidly words, Greenwood, Shell Alvarez, Tony Perkins, Thomas Obexer, Travis McClinton, and Victoria Bell. Thank you so. Much and a huge shout out to all the other people who make this entire show possible. Without you, it would not exist. If you can support us, please go to patreon.com/the_serfs and even \$1.00 can help unlock all of the little goodies and help make this show entirely possible.

Styxhexenhammer

Ted Kaczynski, Expert on Leftists and Technology, Dead at 81

Source

33K views

Styxhexenhammer666

503K subscribers

All right, everyone, we have breaking news. Ted Kaczynski has died. He was 81 years old. He was found unresponsive in his cell. So he is gone. He was an expert on leftists, seemed to have understood their psychological depravity. This is, by the way, the comedic foil of orange man. Big Part 2 coming soon. He also was a mathematician. You know, a very, very skilled one. It's interesting, actually, looking at his life, how many skills he really had to become jaded so much by the system really is quite something. He had basically a limitless future when you really think. About, it could have partaken in society and become massively wealthy and influential instead decided to go out and do a cabin and build explosives. Anyway, I have a feeling that it was the rise of AI that finally killed him and sort of a fulfilling his his tragic prophecy with regards to the machinations of technology over time. Again, the reason he fled from society. That's about all peace out.

Keith Woods vs. JF Gariepy

The Life of Ted Kaczynski by JF

Source

February 8, 2022

3,030 views

JFG Tonight

6,245 followers

A review of the life and thoughts of Ted Kaczynski, as we learn that he is about to die from cancer.

Transcript

Hello everyone and welcome to JFG. Tonight we have two things to do tonight. I'll be reviewing the news first and then I would like to talk about Ted Kaczynski. A lot of you guys have been messaging me about him and I've always been dismissive and I realized that I was wrongly dismissive. I realized that this guy has been saying some very intelligent stuff, although he was a terrorist. You know, but that's no reason to dismiss his belief. And I think partly the reason I've been insistent at going through the whole thing. Well, there's two reasons. First, it was YouTube censorship. I was like, every time I was starting to read this manifesto, I was like, OK, well, I can't. Talk about this anyways because I'm on YouTube and so. Uh, so it's an example where censorship actually keeps you from thinking? Because I was. I was unable to engage in subjects that I wouldn't be able to cover. So I was like, it's less of my time. And secondly the manifesto did start. With a lot of psychologizing of leftist, and I think it's the wrong approach. I think he's a little wrong on this, but he was so insightful and so right in his analysis, despite I think his fundamentals in understanding truly a genetic genetic basis for the understanding of human behavior. That was me. This thing it was really psychologizing the human race and seeing all of our defects as being caused by lacks of want and unsatisfied desires. In that sense, it was very Freudian, but the fact that he got to the truth with this Freudian approach. Leads me to believe that he was extremely intelligent and that he has reached the right conclusions in his. It's amazing that in his manifesto, what published around 1994 or 1995, I don't remember before, before Google existed before Google existed, this guy saw the rise of technology and how it ultimately takes over the mind and the lives of people. And

he wanted to start a revolutionary movement against it in that sense. You did see the revolutionary phenotype coming, and now that I've read the whole thing, now that I was open minded enough to get through the 1st 20 points of his manifesto, I realized that he was extremely intelligent, suburban, says Ted's unofficial IQ is like 167 is what I've heard. Yeah, they say he passed the test when he was a student and that it was. That's why you skipped his 6th grade. He was, uh, extremely intelligent and so I'll be reviewing his life, the circumstances of his bombs and. And I'll be reviewing the manifesto and what was right about it. I think that what he's been appealing to is a very needed. Movement against the overtake of human realities by technology, I fully agree with him, although I'm not as much of an anti-technologist as he. Is I think that there are good things in this technology. I think that it was wonderful how YouTube first allowed free engagement and free debate of the kind that couldn't exist before. And it has put together people around the world that wouldn't have been put together. So I don't think that everything. Must be rejected in technology, but he thinks that and in the way and in the way I have to, I have to respect. I have to respect this kind of no, no compromise approach in a way. Maybe if you compromise with the goods of technology, you're already committing the sins that will eventually lead to your destruction. So I have to grant him that I will read a letter that comes from him from jail. Because he's in jail forever, he has six life sentences and he says from the Medical Center Butner in North Carolina. Thank you for your kind letter postmarked December 23rd, 2021, which I have received on January 27th, 2022. You conclude your letter with get well soon. There is yet work to be done. There is work to be done. A lot of work. In fact, the work has barely been. Haven't started, but I won't be able to do much of it. I'm not going to get well soon or ever because I have terminal cancer. I can't expect to live more than two years at the outside. And I may well be dead in less than a year, so the work will have to be done by younger people. What about you? What are you doing? I'm told that you've ordered a paperback, French and English Dictionary for me, for which I thank you. But seen in relation to the problems we face, the matter of the dictionary is trivial. Have you been following the recommendations in sections 28? And 29 of chapter four of anti tech revolution. Have you made any efforts at organization in accordance to rule one of Chapter 3? If you want to organize but don't know where to begin, let me know and I'll give you some suggestions, but my suggestions will not be easy to carry out. We don't want to delete and things who are ready to do only what is easy. We need people who are capable of total commitment and are prepared to take any tasks, no matter how difficult or unpleasant or time. Consuming it may be yours for wild nature, Ted Kaczynski. So those are the words of Ted, Ted Cousins ski who's about to die. And so we'll be reviewing the news first because I think the news is less important. And then I will finish on my review of the Ted Kaczynski life and manifesto. So first we we see, we saw that parlor was into. I didn't know much about it. Because I don't engage much with parlor, but it seems that the video by Mark Dice, which was highlighting the use of the N word by The Young Turks and calling for their cancellation, has been hidden and parlor has this bizarre way of censoring, they say,

trolling content detected. Show content anyway. This is a new one to me. A trolling count. Well, it's not trolling content, it's a compilation of uh of the use of the N word by The Young Turks. It's journalistic content. It's summarized content. It's not trolling content. So how this is a new one to me that you would designate something as trolling, and if it's trolling uh, why is it still there? Well, who who is being trolled here? Thomas Howard says as Jeff already covered the news of the DM Ed Revelation on military. Health in 2021. I may have said a word or two about it. I don't remember, but I've seen this news item come again and again. The thing is. I've covered the claim the claim was made in the among other places in the Senate airing by. By some senator who decided to hold these hearings on his own, the claim is that the military database shows a massive increase of all sorts of diseases, and it is claimed that these increases could all be due to the vaccine. UM, I've not covered it by giving it credence because. I'm not sure this is a right way to acquire. To to see a scientifically uh convincing difference like how is this database being gathered? Who are the people gathering? Are they making the same effort to gather this information in 2020 versus 2021? And I was proved right by the response from the government because the response for the government now is, well, it's because of a bug. So the increase in 2022 or 2021 is totally artificial. It's due to a bug that has not properly compiled the past events before 20/21. I will note that on the outset the data doesn't seem super compelling in the sense that it would be an increase of all diseases. Basically, things things that we we wouldn't expect were caused by the vaccine and if if a method leads you to conclude that a single vaccine. And uses a rise of all diseases in the range of like 10X. You have to ask yourself questions, so that's why I didn't cover this by giving it credence. I did mention that they said this in the Senate hearing, but I would be waiting for more serious look into. Is this an over representation due to biases and sampling? Let's not forget that a hidden data from the military. Uh personal is not a scientific study. It has not had a stamp of approval that says I'm a scientist. I think that I have a credible way to look into the question and there is an increase. So let's be careful, Nicolas Petrus says 10X. Yes, the 10X is back. As people have been requesting, someone has already sent a super chat on entropy. Join me on entropy, it is my favorite platform for Super chat. Very important to support the show through your super chats on entropy. Or you can use the support button. On others say there is now a credit card option enabled, you just have to create an account on audit one moment. My voice is weak today. Do you agree that Ted's manifesto was deeply correct? Or I haven't read it. That is the question tonight on are they say the link to the link to entropy. Entropy is below the video. Some random bloke sends a super chat, it says Ted K Red pill me on leftist when I read his manifesto, he was ahead of the curve and brilliant on his analysis of the evils of leftism. Absolutely, and nothing that I say tonight should be interpreted as an appeal to violence or even. Somehow that I that I would respect what he has done in terms of violent attack. I think violence is should be opposed. So, you know, don't don't ban this video. It is not a an energy of everything that Ted Care has done. Has been committing acts that are crimes, and I think he should be punished for those.

But leaving that aside, that doesn't mean that he was wrong in his manifesto, which is unrelated really to his. So that's what we will review today. And I think you're totally right. It was extremely insightful, extremely in advance of his time. UMA YouTuber has been arrested. For Coke prank, he called he had someone call the police and say there are people who are weird in an orange car and then they were in the orange car and they were clearly saying to the policeman we have. Book in the in the car and the joke was that the policeman would open the back of the car and find that it was coke cans. It was like. Coca-Cola, not actual cocaine. Uh, this is pranks gone too far. OK, so this guy would end up in jail, probably with a felony because it's a felony to make a false call to the police. This uh, this is not funny. I mean, he could have ended up dying from it. Uh, he's lucky to be alive. Don't do that kind of stuff. It's ridiculous to do this for YouTube video. Boomer jokes says Nicholas Petras. Yes, it's pretty boomer ish. The trucker border blockhead in cats is continuing the border between the US and Canada is still being blocked by the trackers. This rebel the this is a liar for the truckers who's been hired, I believe, by rebel News too.

Issues associated with enforcement on this type of a protest, especially with some peculiar and large pieces of heavy equipment out on the highway and the sheer volume of them, creates an an insurmountable issue for law enforcement to.

So he was saying that the law enforcement yesterday has been threatening the truckers to get them out. But he says that the amount of trucks is insurmountable, that even if they wanted, it would take days. And they don't seem to be able to have even the Technical Support necessary to move these heavy rags. Gibson go as taken over the Freedom convoy. Pending, however, the page has disappeared. Today it had reached \$5.2 million. And now it's a 404 error. At Gibson go. I hope this is not censorship happening at Gibson go or is it hacking? Or is it a FBI? Or perhaps it's just an error, perhaps gives and go has just never had a \$5.2 million campaign work on their website. So perhaps it's just growing pains. Is OK with the money of the truckers? Go away, says Gibson. Go exit scam. I mean the their website otherwise works and so I suspect there is something like a database error that they have to figure out. Maybe you know if their database is set so that at like 5000 donation everything the PHP scripts. Bugs this can this could explain what's happening yesterday in Ottawa, the truckers have been targeted by police, although it was a very minor operation. The police came in, seized some fuel tank. It was like 2 wheelbarrows of fuel tanks and they arrested a couple of people saying if you bring fuel to the truckers, we will arrest you. But yet plenty of fuel has been still passing, even after those arrests, so it looks like they just went in. They just made a little photo up to show. We're applying what we're going to go after the people supporting the truckers, and then they ran out. So we add actually on camera people continuing to bring fuel. So it doesn't seem like the provisioning of fuel to the trackers and volunteer has been significantly intercepted, but they did a photo up to make it look like it was. It's pretty fascinating to me. I don't know what will happen with the. Arrest in any case, the tracker protest seems to continue. We see it on live streams today. Trucks are across the city of Ottawa

and the city is not functional yet. Well, I don't know what to think. It's kind of a failure. It's kind of a display of a success, but it means nothing. Trucks have been provisioned with further fuel since then. Jeffrey Epstein sends 100 LBC. Thank you so much for the support. In fact, I think Crypto is going well. I think that LBC is starting to have a little rise and BTC is going well tonight. It's now at 44 K for BTC. Very happy about this slow recovery of Bitcoin. Of course we're not back to 60. Ki would like to be back to 60 K as soon as possible, but it's very encouraging. Jeffrey Epstein says a theoretical question. Would it be possible in the Metaverse to use the four feet distancing rule to cage? Oh my God, I think you just found the floor. Uh, you know the four feet distancing rule is a rule that makes it so that you cannot be close to four feet or else the program will push you back. But you're right, we could cage someone in principle. If you surround them by four people. Someone could be worse than, uh, arrested by a single person. They could be arrested by a coordinated group of four or even 5 persons to get the three-dimensional effect. I hadn't thought of this. Wow. You know, you have to ask questions. About your mental sanity, when your brain goes there, I think you're not ready for the metaverse. Warner Bros UH sued over abysmal matrix resurrections. Released Warner Bros is being sued by Co financiers village roadshow over the hybrid release of the sci-fi sequel The Matrix Resurrections. As with all of Warner's 2021 titles, the 4th. Patrick's film was released on the big screen and the company streaming service HBO Max as a response to the pandemic. Yeah, it's not the first time that we see this. You have a lot of artists who are contractually engaged with these companies that says it's going to be a theater release. So the artists are happy. It's going to sell tickets, they're going to make it part of the profit. But then the companies cut the grass on their feet and they're like, oh. COVID-19, we have to we have to release this. On the streaming platforms and then on streaming platforms, they don't make as much money and it's not as grandiose and they end up losing a lot of money. I'm impressed that the streaming companies do that. It seems that they should be respecting their contractual obligations. The NYC mayor is being questioned by a. OK. By a journalist, it's the new NYC mayor. So the journalist was asking him because it's being questioned whether he's a true vegan, because he goes around claiming that he is a true vegan. But the journalist was pointing out that. You may be eating fish and meat and it looks like he may not be fully vegan and his answer is totally a cope. He's totally trying to avoid. Responding directly to the question.

You brought up your eating habits. I just want to clarify something.

Do you eat fish and?

Do you eat any other animal proteins?

I eat a plant based centered life.

A plant centered life, so it's like you see how your plate is made of a of a meat piece and then of plants on the side. It does the opposite. He puts the plant at the center of his plate, and then there's meat on the side. IE is just eating like you.

You want to call me vegan? Vegans eat Oreos and they drink Coca-Cola. I.

Vegans eat Oreos and they drink Coca-Cola.

Don't I eat a plant based centered life?

A plant based certain life. You lead a plant based certain centered life. You don't eat a plant based centered life.

And those who are the full police. For me, they can fool police all the time. Either plant based centered life.

Like this doctor is like, yeah. Yeah, we get what you're saying. Yeah, that's the way. So basically, the vegan, the vegan business, including vegan youtubing, by the way, is a big scam. They have to eat secret meat somewhere to survive, and then they make it look like they don't eat it and they are misleading people toward extremely dangerous lifestyles. The Bias News reports on Gab, the Virginia Supreme Court dismisses the challenge brought against Governor Jenkins executive order that seeks to end mandatory masking. So the order is reinstalled. So that's the Virginia Supreme Court saying to the lower courts. No, your challenge is not working. The ban on forced masking is in effect, and we're going to apply it. Meanwhile, in in our high school, students told to put on masks or leave, and they decide to leave. After an Illinois judge struck down mask mandates in Illinois, High school students in a Chicago suburb were still told to mask up or leave. It's amazing the amount of cases like this we see across the nation where. A judge has already found that the mask mandates are illegal, and yet the schools say ohh well. Despite despite this legal finding, we're still very convinced about our our rules, so we're going to keep applying them like, what the **** are you doing? You're you're violating the rights of people. Knowingly, billionaire people tell to leave Facebook board to help advance the Trump agenda. Billionaire venture capitalist and PayPal founder Peter Thiel has decided to leave the board of Meta platforms he says he wants to concentrate on the Trump agenda, pushing the Trump agenda. It's quite interesting. What does that mean? Will it be more on truth social? Will they be trying to have Republicans elected that are pro very much pro Trump so that Trump can make a comeback in 2024? I don't know, but we don't know what his plans are. But anyways, he's out of Facebook and meanwhile Facebook is continuing to lower in value. That was about. Three days ago, a big drop, and it's been dropping since then. Dropping, dropping, dropping down to 224 now and at its peak it was at 322. I think it's time to abandon Facebook if you are still on. Please be somewhere else while the Facebook is in the process of becoming absolutely cringe, you don't want to be there when it attains Max, cringe rumbles pack explodes higher after SEAL offers Joe Rogan \$100 million to make the world a better place. So this is just an offer made out of nowhere. It's like it doesn't even include a potential response from Joe Rogan, but it's just a letter that the Rumble CEO made to Joe Rogan saying hey, we can pay you \$100 million for over 4 years. If you move to Rambo, so the question then is, if Joe Rogan attains a point where Spotify, the contract with Spotify is ended, or perhaps Spotify with themselves want to get rid of Joe Rogan, there could be a tree light lateral deal transferring. Rogan to rumble that would be the only way for Joe Rogan to pursue the. Lifestyle that he he was on. But I don't. I don't even know if Joe Rogan is interested in doing this because Joe Rogan has decided to kneel already. I don't know.

I don't know if he can do this mentally, like, does Joe Rogan need free speech or is he? Was he just thinking that free speech was cool, but that if he's denied it, he won't fight for it? That's a big question that hasn't been answered by no by anyone. Go away, says Jeff Addison should offer Joe Rogan 100 million LBC to join the platform. Yes, and I I'm willing to add, I'm willing to add to the Odyssey offer to Joe Rogan that this is an official offering. If Joe Rogan moves to Audyssey, I will. Emit and deposit directly in his bank account in in his wallet 100 million JF coin. So you the ball is in your camp. Joe Rogan, the ball is in your camp. The modern served them model and the Bitcoin escape hatch everything about society sets up to become subservient to the pursuit of the mortgage. But Bitcoin changes that. I absolutely agree. Yes, Bitcoin liberates us from much. Much dependence onto the system. I love it, and that's why I love that Bitcoin is doing good today. And finally, before we start our review of Ted Kaczynski's Life, Ukraine and NATO, a great threat of Russian invasion is low, but us continue apocalyptic rhetoric. Ukraine is again trying to give Washington a dose of reality and clamping down on overly alarmist hype surrounding the potential for a Russian invasion. Of Ukraine, as we detailed earlier, Biden's national security adviser, in Sunday's interviews, said the invasion could come any day now, or possibly even tomorrow. But now there are other people in NATO, including European countries, that are saying to the US, calm down, OK? Calm down and it doesn't look like we are in an imminent situation of war, so just calm down. Alright, so let's get started on the life of Ted Kaczynski, and again, for those who were not present at the beginning of the show, I essentially want to say I apologize. Many of you have been bringing my attention toward his his manifesto across the years, and I've always been dismissive. Because I was always reading the 10 or 20 first points and I was like, OK, that's. That's a psychologizing discourse onto leftist and its interpretations of the kind. Ohh, they like this, and so they they satisfy themselves by doing this or that. It's all extremely psychologized, and in that sense I think it's not a proper model of the mind. But is so not far from reality that if you if you jump over these 1st 20 points and you get into his predictions, I think his predictions are absolutely right on target. Ted Kaczynski was right on pretty much everything, and even if he has used a detoured way to get there, he has attained a full understanding of the problem with modern society, and he was extremely intelligent in doing so very early. As soon as the Seventies, 80s and 90s. Where he has done most of his thoughts and writing. So who is Ted Kaczynski? Ted Kaczynski is an academic. He is a mathematician in the 70s. He has published even mathematical papers. This is a paper by Ted Kaczynski. Boundary functions for functions defined in a disk. It was a geometer. It was very much a Euclidean geometry. Look at this. He makes lemmas and explains all of the mathematical consequences in this particular case. He was he was interested in the arcs or that are inscribed into a circle. Uh, this is writing by Ted Kaczynski. In the 70s, so he was really a mathematician in his childhood. When I look at his Wikipedia biography, his childhood was spent in Chicago. He was the son of Polish Americans. I don't know if they were Polish Jews, but in any case he they he was raised as Catholics, as Catholic and eventually

his parents became atheist. So one of the things that happened in his childhood is that first he skipped the 6th grade because he was deemed too intelligent. Having a IQ test scoring at 167. So he was transferred to another school where unfortunately it wasn't a good solution for him and he was bullied. He had a case of skin rash, severe skin rash called hive. And during a part of his childhood, he had to be isolated. I don't know exactly why. Maybe it was believed that it was a response to the environment and that he needed to be in an isolated situation, but his brother was telling the story of him being isolated in an hospital for many months. And coming back from this experience being never the same again, having developed a kind of isolationism. So he was he was apparently shocked by this period. But, but I don't think it can explain his later behavior. I think there was evidence of him being intelligent independent of this, and I think that any intelligent person eventually. Starts enjoying time isolated from the social world. The social world is very painful for anyone above 120 I. Thomas Howard says Ted will solve the slash has solved the Goldbach conjecture, forcing Jeff to take back his kind words out of spite. No, I don't think that he has solved the Goldbach conjecture. I would be very happy if he did. Alright then he was exposed to very bizarre psychological experiments, apparently during his first year as at Harvard University. He participated to. To psychological studies that were run by psychologists there, and there's all sorts of rumors around these psychological studies being part of Project MK Ultra or that kind of stuff. But I don't know. I don't know. It doesn't matter, really. They were psychology experiments. Where he was asked to explain his beliefs on a piece of paper and write an essay. Like his deep philosophical beliefs. And then they would have an actor come in, and while his brain activity was recorded, they would have the actor take the most fundamental beliefs of the guy and mock him like you believe that there you believe this and that. Ah, you're an idiot. Just to test this reaction now. These encounters were filmed so the subject and what Murray himself called vehement, sweeping and personally abusive attacks using the content of the essays as ammunition electrodes, monitor the subjects physiological physiological reactions. These encounters were filmed and subjects, expressions of anger and rage were later played back to them repeatedly. The experiment lasted 3 years, with someone verbally abusing and humiliating Kaczynski each week. Kaczynski spent 200 hours as part of the study. This guy was abused Syria. On his beliefs as part of an experiment on Ohh how does the brain mechanism of belief work? How do people react when they are challenged on deeply held beliefs? I find it amazing that that this is happening. I don't know if I don't think that this caused is later behavior. I don't think that this caused the bombings. This is not how I would express it. But it's certainly weird that it happens in a man that ends up sending bombs to essentially academics across the nation with the goal of reducing technological progress. So he goes on in life in a mathematics career. Ones when's a couple of minor awards and rights, apparently stellar text in mathematics, getting the best compliments from the people who were supervising him. His doctoral advisor called him the best I have ever directed. So apparently an extremely intelligent guy, this is a picture of him. What he

was doing is mathematics studies, so an extremely high level guy, but who eventually gets tired of teaching, apparently. Although he did like the truth and mathematics, he was not getting super well reviewed by the students when he started teaching. And so it seems that the social part of academia. Was annoying to him and it reminds me of myself because same thing here. I wanted to be a researcher, but the whole pairing with necessarily being a teacher, although I don't think I'm a bad teacher. I'm certainly not fascinated at the idea of being a teacher. It's not a format of communication like bridging to the low intelligence person. It's not something I like doing. I wouldn't be terrible at it, but I wouldn't be stellar at it. So, uh, he goes back to uh live with his parents and eventually isolates himself into a cabin in the wood. And somewhere along this line. This is where the bombing started. The bombings have been spread between 1978 to 1995, so a total of 17 years of bombing not being cut by the FBI. Let's see a couple of the descriptions of the initial bombings. So Kaczynski is first mail bomb was directed at but Buckley Christ, a professor of materials engineering at Northwestern University. On May 25, 1978, a package bearing Christ return address was found in a parking lot at the University of Illinois at Chicago. The package was returned to Chris, who was suspicious because he had not sent it, so he contacted campus police. Officer Terry Marker opened the package, which exploded and caused minor injuries. Kaczynski had returned to Chicago for the May 1978 bombing and stayed there for a time to work with his father. And brother at a foam rubber factory in August 1978, his brother fired him for writing insulting lime. About a female supervisor, Ted, headquartered briefly the supervisor, later recalled Kazinski as intelligent and quiet, but remembered little of their acquaintanceship and firmly denied they had any romantic relationship. Kazinski's second bomb was sent nearly one year after the first one. Again, to Northwestern University, the bomb concealed in inside a cigar box and left on the table, caused minor injuries to graduate student John Harris when he opened it. So he was targeting professors in the field of engineer. Thing and yes, just just that as just share the link and there is a movie coming out. It's coming out at the end of February. The trailer is out now. It's the movie is called Ted. OK, I will certainly be watching the movie with interest, but it's not available now. It's just been shown in festival. But to now it should be public at the end of February. Another thing that I didn't mention about the early life of Ted Kaczynski is that he wants ended up for a moment, apparently at least thinking that he was a trans. So when he was young, when he was a young adult, apparently he ended up in the process of discussing with the psychiatrist sex change surgery. And he has. Uh. He has ended up in the office, waited for the psychiatrist to arrive and. Chose against gender transition and escaped the office. Essentially, they described it as follows for a period of several weeks. In 1966, Kaczynski experienced intense sexual fantasies of being a female and decided to undergo gender transition. He arranged to meet with a psychiatrist, but. Changed his mind in the waiting room and did not disclose his reason for making the appointment. Enraged, he considered killing the psychiatrist and other people whom he ate. Kaczynski described this episode as a major turning point in his life. I felt disgusted about

what my uncontrolled sexual cravings had almost led me to do, and I felt humiliated, and I violently hated the psychiatrist. Just then there came a major turning point in my life. Like a Phoenix, I burst from the ashes of my despair to a glorious new. So 1966, that's 12 years before the bombings start. Ted Kaczynski having the fantasy of being a female, but then deciding against going on the path of gender transition. Touchbar says my my trans friend idolizes Ted. OK. OK. And as a reminder, because I did the warning at the in the early show, but I will do it again for those joining the review of Ted Kaye's life is not a way to. To advocate for violence or say that I agree in any way of with the violence that he's committed, I think it is wrong, but I think the the. The kind of character of this guy is extremely interesting and I wanted to document it as we learned that Ted K is about to die from cancer. Wouldn't it be nice if there was a way through technology maybe, although he may not like it, wouldn't there be a way to plug Ted Kay on odyssey? From his jail cell or from his house. At all, wouldn't there be a way for him to watch this show? That would be interesting to me because I'd like him before he dies if he can to read the revolutionary phenotype. In any case, so those are the list of the bombings that have happened from 1978 to 1995, seventeen years of bombing, 2 cases of bombs that haven't exploded. But the vast majority of the bombs have exploded, have exploded, some of them causing minor disease. Mine are cuts and burn. But eventually causing severe burns, loss of fingers, loss of vision in the victims and eventually three of them causing death. Jeff, what's up?

Yeah, I think in the US, you can send your book by the mail.

Yes, you maybe someone in the crowd would would be able to find the address of that care and maybe send them a an exemplar of the revolutionary phenotype.

Or was it with? Is it on your show? I saw this that you have. To go on the. You I think you have to order it from Amazon and then it goes directly to the.

Ah, send it as a gift.

Yeah, like that.

Ohh, that makes sense. Maybe there is a way if someone if someone knows about this. If you wanna do it, that would be wonderful. If you want to me to do it, I can. I could do it. If you can give me the trick and explain you know, yes, scatty points out we should continue to batter Brett. Thing. Look, guys, at some point you have to do intelligent investment. Brett Weinstein. The chances that he reads the revolutionary phenotype in the next year is maybe 50%. Ted Kaczynski is going to die in the next year. So Ted Kaczynski is should be our target. Because he's much more likely to to read the revolutionary phenotype and to be honest, based on his writings, I have to say. That I must conclude, is certainly much more intelligent perhaps, than me, and certainly than Brett Weinstein. So let's get through the manifesto. So what happened is that? In, I believe it was it in 19. Well, that's a text published in 1996, so in 1996. Ted Kaczynski, having performed the 17 years of bombing behind him and having led to the death of three people and severe damage, and many other Ted Kaczynski decides from his log cabin in the woods. And I think there was a picture. This is a picture of his arrest eventually, so eventually this is where you were. We found out

that the Unabomber was living. It's a log cabin. OK, people are sending me. People are sending me his address. OK, I'll see if I can. The thing is, I believe he's been moved to a Medical Center, so I don't know if sending to the US penitentiary is the solution. I would like to know. Does someone have the address of the recent Medical Center? Right it was. Where he was relocated for dying from cancer. So that is him. He was living in a log cabin. The sheriff came in and because the reason he was found is that after publishing his manifesto in the New York Times and the Washington Post. His brother recognized the style of writing and his brother had been annoyed by his wife for many years, saying look into your brother a a lot of the talk around the by then, then it was called the Unabomber manifesto. She was studying him, his brother. She was saying you should report your brother to the FBI. It does look like him, but eventually the text gets published and it it makes the brother conclude. This is probably my brother because the style of writing. Is recognizable from past text that Ted Kaczynski had been writing and had been sharing with his brother. So uh, he was living a life, withdrawn from technological society in the wilderness, and they found in his log cabin they found a lot of evidence that he was the bombard. They found parts to assemble into bombs they found. Documents documenting is bomb attempts and what was working, what was not working and various plans and instructions to to put together the bombs. So he ended up getting arrested due to this manifesto. The way he sent this manifesto is he sent it to several outlets, including the New York Times, the Washington Post and other smaller outlets. And he demanded that the manifesto be published. And he said that. If it was not published by the two bigger names, the New York Times and the Washington Post that he was reserving the right to kill another person, he was reserving the right to attack randomly some person through a mail. Found and that someone would die if he didn't get the Max exposure from the top newspaper and eventually the FBI and the Attorney general recommended to the to the newspaper to publish it because they concluded that it was probably a good way to catch. Ted Kaczynski, that it was probably a good way for anyone to recognize his style of writing. And as it turns out, they were extremely right. It turns out that this is exactly how Ted Kaczynski got caught. His brother recognized his style of writing in the New York time. Carnival is on entropy, he says. The social world is extremely painful for those over 120 IQ, one of your most true statements to date. Well, yeah, because the social world doesn't even operate on the. Assumptions of the search for truth and the search for non contradiction and coherence, and on top of it, most people are stupid. So most people are not only stupid, but they are also not interested in the pursuit of the truth. So it's a double combo that. That makes it extremely painful for anyone very intelligent to engage with large groups of individuals. Tillman says, Jeff, I think his brother is the one that turned him in. Well, that that's exactly what I've been saying for 10 minutes now. Uh, it's exactly what I've been saying. Like, are you even watching the show right now? OK. Industrial society and its future, that is the title of the manifesto. And I will go over each each section and tell you my comments. I believe that it was an extremely good writing, extremely interesting, and it was more

radical than I would be in terms of rejecting technology. I think that I think that there would be no harm done if certainly the amounts of technology were. Used by us and even by people who object to other technologies. I, with the revolutionary phenotype I object with the genetic engineering of the human race, because I think it undermines our it undermines our own existence and the evolutionary pressures that keep us a Darwinian life form. That is a big problem and it will be an undoing of everything that we are including intelligence, creativity and everything. Uh, but I don't think that we have to reject all technologies for a proper combat of the revolutionary phenotype to be 1. But I have to credit Ted Kaczynski here, because perhaps he is right. Perhaps if you let a little bit of technology in your life, you're already letting too much, so that eventually. Step by step you will concede and concede until you let technology control your. So in his introduction, he makes the case. We therefore advocate for a revolution against the industrial system. For him there is a continuity in Ted Kaczynski with the Industrial Revolution. So even technologies like machines like. Industries manufacturers that kind of stuff that to him, this is not fundamentally different than Google, Twitter, even if Google and Twitter didn't exist when he wrote this to him. This is all a continuum of the progression of technology taking over society and taking over. The means of production in human society and eventually also constraining the psychology of individuals to submit to the system. And he starts with the psychology of modern leftism. And this is where I was kind of annoyed. This is the reason why I was most of the time not continuing my reading of this manifesto. The psychology of modern leftism seeks to frame everything in terms of wants and desires, and failures to meet them. And I don't like it, I don't like. Theories of human psychology that are based in motivators of that kind. I prefer basing in genetic knowledge. The reason why is ultimately all motivators are genetically caused, and all motivators must boil down to some evolutionary force. If we like sweet stuff, it's because sweet stuff was better to survive than non sweet stuff. Period and so. I don't like these people who construct the desires of the leftist to control, or the desire of the leftist to have his unsatisfied want for freedom be satisfied. I don't like this because they they rely on axioms about humans. Being in a certain way and ultimately the question is, why are humans in that way and it has to be evolution. So that being said, leaving aside, I think he starts making extremely good point around over socialization. He says the two psychological tendencies that underlie modern leftism, we call feelings of inferiority and over socialization. Feelings of inferiority are characteristic of modern leftism as a whole, while over socialization is characteristic only of a certain segment. Of modern leftism, but this segment is highly influential. It was right on target in pointing to the over socialization and its relationship with leftism. Ultimately, there is something extremely wrong in the way modern society attributes a lack of socialization kind of diagnoses, a lack of socialization in young people at times. And sometimes in older people to try to shape them to the requirements of the system. And over socialization, I believe that we are totally in it right now. Consider how children are thrown into classes of 30 other children. This is already more social interactions than our ancestors

would ever get in their entire life, and on top of it they have the female. Teacher and on top of it they go through this up to 18 years old. Ted Kazinsky takes an issue with the format of the kind of forced socialization that is imposed by our societies. And I think he's totally right. I think it's not so much that children are maladjusted and need to be fixed with drugs because they can't interact with this over socialization. It's the over socialization itself that is wrong and that's why you end up having moral displays in leftism. That's why you end up having. Leftists who are willing to do anything, including self contradiction, to adhere to A cause, A cause that is agreed upon by the collective, and this is a correct evaluation of the psychology of leftist when he says that leftist see it as a success. Not to find the truth or to be carry around or to fight for a principle of theirs. They find success when they fight collectively for a for a principle that has been perceived as being desirable by the collective. That's how leftist win. It's through a kind of social conquest. Uh, by only adhering to these principles, not that they deeply agree with internally, but that they can see. Is adhered to by the collective skating, says Jeff. I would like to recommend you get a pair of £35 dumbbells and curl them until you can do other movements without too much joint exertion. A few simple set of curves a day will give you much needed total body fitness. And a simple flat bench which can easily be constructed will assist you greatly bro get get out of here. I don't want to hear about this. What the **** are you talking about? I don't have time to consider Gym Bro's concerns. OK, tonight we're talking about the life of Ted Kaczynski.

Try to focus Kandy.

Wasn't Katie a mod of this channel? Why is it not a mod? Feelings of inferiority. Ted Kaczynski goes into a trend of the left that we've seen only expand since he wrote this. It goes into. This kind of. Adoration of victimhood that is part of the mind of leftist and the fact that he could write this in the early 90s is quite amazing because he talks about how the leftists you know, they're looking for an oppressed. He says many leftists have an intense identification with the problem of groups that have an image of being weak. Woman defeated American Indians or homosexuals or otherwise perceived as inferior. The leftists themselves feel that these groups are inferior. They would never admit to themselves that they have. Such feelings, but it is precisely because they do see these groups as inferior that they identify with their problems. And, he adds, we do not mean to suggest that woman, Indians, etcetera, are inferior. We are only making a point about leftist psychology. And this guy is right on target. Ultimately left his knee the victim for their mindset to work. And so you only have to see the groups they are fighting for. And you'll you'll realize you'll realize that they are. They are considering these groups and fair. It is precisely by this quality of being inferior that they have the attraction of the of qualifying as oppressed. He then goes on on over socialization and he hits the nail on the head. On each point. He says we do not claim that leftists, even the over socialized type, never rebel against the fundamental values of society. Clearly they sometimes do some over socialized leftists have gone so far as to rebel against one of modern societies, most important principles. By engaging in

physical violence by their own account, violence is for them a form of liberation. In other words, by committing violence, they break through the psychological restraints that have been trained into them because they are over socialized. These restraints have been more confining for them than for others. Hence their need to break free of them. But they usually justify their rebellion in terms of mainstream values. If they engage in violence, they claim to be fighting against racism or the like. So very well seen here are leftist, although they can be revolutionary in their behavior. They will ultimately justify their the reasons for their revolutionary attitude. By adhering to values that are deeply values subscribed to by the system and favoring the system he has this conception of a power process and the power process is basically the idea of having a go. I don't think that power process is the right label here. But it's basically the idea of having a goal. And having the means to attend that goal freely and having some struggle in the pursuit of that goal. And having some autonomy in the pursuit of that goal, such that you're not totally being micromanaged to attain that goal. And I think there is. There's something interesting in this definition. There's there's a concept there that definitely. Is very healthy. You know, if you can have these four conditions in what you pursue and. You're going to be most likely very happy, very satisfied with life and dependent of how strong the struggle was on your way up there. So if you can have a goal that is worth attaining, that goal is difficult to reach. There's some competition or struggle in getting there, and on top of it you know you solve the problems by your own intelligence or your own talent of some kind. That's the recipe for a good life. So I agree that the power process is an import. Aspect of human psychology and probably animals too. You know, it then defines surrogate activities, he says. There are a lot of things in modern society that are fake instantiations of the power process. For example, scientists and how they pursue. Arbitrary or abstract goals like. The mathematician wanting to attain some kind of truth about the given problem or the specialist in chemistry you really care about this molecule. And to him, those are server gate activities in the sense that they come to emulate what the power process would give you as a satisfaction. But they don't fully capture the full struggle of the power process. And the reason a modern surrogate activity. May not be properly giving the experience of the full power. Process can be multiple. I think he invokes for example the fact that these goals may not really matter to you, that there may not be an actual struggle in attaining them. Like the monarchs who were hunting you know in their private enclaves were essentially. Animals had been brought there so that they were easy to hunt. Or you can be in in the modern times, if you are part of a corporation that is highly controlling, you can be attaining goals, but you're so micromanaged in the attainment of these goals that you ultimately they don't qualify as an autonomous pursuit. Expands on autonomy and another section, and he explains that you know, in the modern world you get to a job. You can essentially survive in our world if you just know what to do. When being told to do. If you can just follow orders, basically 95% of the people. That's all they need to do. If you can just follow order. If you can just bring this food from here to here, you're going to get paid and you're going to have a

life and survive. Has this kind of surrogate activity or the kind of breach of the power process in so many ways by modern society causes social problems and this is very long. You know you get into. Into the whole disruption of it, but I can skip over that and simply summarize that. Basically, social problems, drug addiction, blah blah blah, anything the lack of satisfaction with modern life, all of it could be caused by how the industrial and technological society came in. And impose these things on the behavior of humans that are incompatible, ultimately with the power process, with the need of humans to strive and struggle for something meaningful. He then explains in the part how some people adjust. He explains that there are various. Ways in which individuals will deal with the demands of modern society and how they are incompatible. Some like him, apparently have chosen to isolate. Many will simply choose to do what they need to do in the system. Some will have a surrogate activity in the sense of pursuing. Something in your hobby time that makes you not a threat to the system, but that allows you to enjoy your own life and give you the illusion of pursuing a a kind of struggle. He then describes the motive of scientists and it shows that you know, the this whole conception that modern scientists are driven by either curiosity or benefit to humanity is false. He says if they were really curious, why would they specialize that much? Like, if you're, if you're really a curious person, if you've been guided to specialized chemistry by your curiosity, why don't you show the same curiosity about nuclear physics or about astronomy? And he's right. And so ultimately, he presents the scientific endeavor of the modern world. As being a surrogate activity, something that looks like the power process, but that is not it. It has a a weird definition of freedom, something that I would not agree with because it's too narrow, but it's OK to defend the term narrowly when you make an argue. But it says we are going to argue that industrial technological society cannot be reformed in such a way as to prevent it from progressively narrowing the sphere of human freedom. By freedom, we mean the opportunity to go to, to go through the power process with real goals. Not the artificial goals of surrogate activities and without interference, manipulation or supervision from anyone, especially from any large organization. Passion. Freedom means being in control, either as an individual or as a member of a small group of the life and death issues of one's existence. Food, clothing, shelter, and defense against whatever threats there may be in one's environment. So although I don't think it it's a proper label here, we can skip over this because it doesn't matter, it's quite it's still good. It's that in the modern world. Technology and industries came in and pushed things either toward OK, we're gonna let you free to pursue it, but it's meaningless or it's meaningful. And therefore we're not going to let you free of pursuing it. Essentially things have been pushed from the middle where you could find some things that are both meaningful to pursue and you're free to pursue them and slowly things have been pushed in either. We won't let you pursue it. We won't let you pursue it because it's too important. So you're going to be micromanaged by the corporate world and the industrial technological process, or it's totally abstract and we're going to let you pursue it, but only in your hobby time. So for one example of

this is mathematics. Or academic pursuits or hobbies. It's like, OK, you can collect all of the baseball cards you want. So the system doesn't care so much about recruiting, micromanaging you in the process. But if you create meaningful stuff like food for people or clothes, the state comes in and the industrial complex as a whole and starts legislating, micromanaging ultimately, giving every order for every move. They're going to make in the process. Something can be said also about the raising of children. Since that's a thing that matters, it fell in the this other category where the state micromanages the transmission of knowledge to children than to doing it as a whole through public school. And the parents were slowly withdrawn from their liberty to do so. Some principles of history. He talks about revolutions. What I retain from his talk about history and revolution is he has a good understanding of history and that he sees that history will have a tendency that goes to a certain direction in an uncontrollable. Right. And any movement against the natural movement of austerity toward its convergence point will be hopeless, will serve nothing easier, totally, very black build for a revolutionary is extremely black pilled. And he's saying if history is headed toward a certain point. Any movement to the contrary will simply be have temporary effects, and so he doesn't believe that. Single humans have the power to fundamentally revert history or to drive, for example, a new society based on a paper ideology. So guys, I don't like banning people. But I'm annoyed because you guys have been talking for 20 minutes about fitness. I don't care about fitness. This is not a show about fitness. I don't give a **** about fitness. I think the next time I see the word fitness or gym or weights or dead lift or whatever, I think I'm going to ban. Everyone that I see using this word shut the **** **, OK? Industrial society Industrial technological society cannot be reformed where he goes on to say you cannot make a small change that will fix. Uh society and stop it from its course of reaching total technological control over the human body over the human experience. That's part of the black pilled aspect, but I think he has to be right. You know, you see how after is right things how Google took over, how the Internet became our entire lives. I think he has to be right there. There was nothing. There was not a little push you could have done in 1992 or 1994. Or 1998. That would stop the progress and he has an extremely fine understanding of why that is. He understands that technology technology doesn't just come and violate human desires and ruin our lives. That's not how technology works. Technology comes and is good, and that's a principle I've I've that I've explained in the revolutionary phenotype. Ultimately, the revolutionary phenotype wins because it's good, it helps you and people adhere to the genetic editing. Because at first it helps them and they get those who don't do this get outcompeted. And so you there's no way to fight against it because all that's required is that a small part of society benefits from the gains brought up by technology. And they will eventually be out competing. All the others who don't. That's almost evolutionary thinking, although it's very rare that Ted Kaczynski refers to it explicitly as a kind of selfish gene based theory. Sorry, you then talks about how restrictions to freedom is unavoidable in industrial society, and he describes how, ultimately, industrial society

as compelled humans to submit to the system because it needed them to do so. If so, much actions of humans were led to happen that are going against the interest of the system, the system would break down. So the way the system survives and the reason it has survived is precisely that it has. Be have your own control over people and he explains how, for example, in schools, this behavioral control can take the form of pharmaceutical interventions. How psychiatry ultimately is already a form of behavioral controlled by the system where we. And we justify this behavioral control, he says, by humanitarian concerns, we say ohh. It would be terrible to to to leave a depressed person without support and not give them antidepressants. So the system ultimately fixes. The and the incompatibility between individual behavior and the interest of the technological industrial system by fixing it in the brains of people. And it says it's going to get worse. It's going to get to genetic engineering. It says that ultimately technology has a more attractive effect on people than the aspiration for freedom, and that's why it will. It has a good chance of winning. Now, in the view of Ted Kaczynski. the way we can win as resisting the advance of a certain technology of our of our technologies and it's. Yeah, is by exploiting weaknesses of the system, he says. There doesn't need to be an action necessarily taken. Now it says you have to let the system converge toward its own weakness, and then you have to take action at the moment where the system becomes that weak. So this could take the form in a future society where let's say in 50 years or 100 years. This content has accumulated in the population they're like you see, this content of the kind we've seen in the anti VAX protest or the anti mandate protest and only at these points of. Of conflict between the system and the individual. Could a revolutionary person, someone who wants to stop the development of technology in our society, could take action to kind of serve on this discontent and serve on the already existing conflict? So his view of history is not so much that you come in and you create a whole society. It's just that you contribute in little ways to undermining the system when it's at its weakest. So that's and then we are headed toward the conclusion of the manifesto. He talks about strategy about. What to do given is black Pilling and he talks about making movements that are based on small communities recovering the power process, isolating from certain of the bad effects of modern societies, but most importantly waiting, waiting for these moments at which. Action can be taken that would undermine the system stability because the work of the system going forward and growing in terms of its control on children and on adults is a work that comes with certain defects that comes with certain conflicts, and there will be exploitable. Moments in that imperfect walk forward. It concludes on a final note saying throughout this article we've made imprecise statements and statements that ought to have had all sorts of qualifications and reservations attached to them and some of our statements may be flatly false. Lack of sufficient information and the need for brevity made it impossible for us to formulate our assertions more precisely. Or Add all the necessary qualifications. And of course, in a discussion of this kind, one must rely heavily on intuitive judgment, and that can sometimes be wrong. So we don't claim that this article expresses more than a crude approximation to the

truth. All the same, we are reasonably confident that the general outlines of the picture we have painted here are roughly. Correct, just one possible weak point needs to be mentioned. We have portrayed leftism in its modern form as a phenomenon peculiar to our time, and as a symptom of the disruption of the power process. But we might possibly be wrong about this. Of our socialized types who try to satisfy their drive for power by imposing their morality on everyone. I've certainly been around for a long time, but we think that the decisive role played by feelings of inferiority, low, self esteem, powerlessness. Victims by people who are not themselves victims is a peculiarity of modern leftism. Identification with victims by people, not themselves victims, can be seen to some extent in 19th century leftism and early Christianity, but as far as we can make out, symptoms of low self esteem. Were not nearly so evident in these movements or in any other movements, as they are in modern leftism. But we are not in a position to assert confidently that no such movements have existed prior to modern leftism. This is a significant question to which historians ought to give their attention. So I find it amazing how this guy is super reasonable in his ideological assessment and at times he's in this manifesto. It's not grandiose. It's like he he's saying. Ohh yeah, I may be wrong there, but I think this gives you a general idea. It's amazing that a guy who has done. More than 15 bombings or something like that. Ends up being so reasonable in his estimation of his own ideology and his own understanding of things. So that concludes my review of the life of Ted Kaczynski. I will conclude that what we see here is a. Totally ahead of its time, set of thoughts in terms of resisting technology, instead of tolerating it or accepting that. Technology is inevitable. It is a different choice of life, and in many ways I lead my life that way. I tend to, I find out reading through this manifesto that I've been making a lot of aspects of my life to avoid. Over socialization to avoid the dangers of the modern world and the dangerous effects of technology. But I have never thought of rejecting technology as a whole. And I don't think it would be in any way efficient, you know. Where do we even start? If we, if we stop engaging with technology, are we talking about not having the Internet? Are we talking about getting rid of the idea of walls and floors? Because the cabin of Ted Kaczynski? Had walls and floors. And that is a technological progress. So I think that Ted Kaczynski, in his absolute rejection of technology, misses a part of the important point here. Much of what he takes his shoe with is really control and not technology in and of itself. I think that if free humans were to engage with technology that they have the ability to choose for themselves that it wouldn't be that dramatic, just like the fact that Ted Kaczynski chose to live between walls and. Below a roof. Didn't hurt Ted cousin. That it's ultimately the way the modern world imposes these things through control through. Dishonest manipulation of the youth through ideological programming and eventually pharmaceutical interventions and genetic modification control is the problem, Ted. That's what I would say before you die. If someone can find a way to send this. How to save video to Ted or maybe send my book? That would be appreciated. Because my books makes the case that. What the problem in the genetic control of humanity comes in the control world world, not so much in the genetic world. In other words,

when you give up control, the other entity that controls you starts making a life of its own. Out of controlling you out of determining what you will become, and this is largely what has been happening with industrial society as the control aspect of it was taken over by entities that are the corporate entities that we know. Love, as long as people are in control. To determine whether they interact with the controlling entity or not, and as long as they are given a significant contribution, you know, as long as they're not being deceptively manipulated and accepting that control. I think it's fine. Just like I think it was fine that Ted Kaczynski decided to give a little bit of control to the lumber company that they decided to live and walk on floors that were built by the lumber company that provided him his lumber. The problem comes when the control entity as I make the case in the revolutionary phenotype, when the controlling entity can control so much of you that it controls even your choice. And at that point, the controlling entity as full. Determining outputs determines you as an output, and then you don't exist anymore. So I believe there is a way the fight against the technological revolution and the industrial revolution can be LED in a much more narrow and much more. Effectively because you could be. You could be losing a lot of energy if you fight against the whole of technology. But you can be concentrating your fight. Against the most. Negative and deceptive aspect of all this control that is birthing into the world, which will be. The day a machine decides what your children's jeans are, and as such it will decide what your children's choices are. I believe that this more limited fight is worth pursuing. That being said, I have to take my hats off to the case of Ted Kaczynski, which is a much more radical case than mine, where he thinks that rejecting it all is the solution. That is it for tonight, boys. Do you agree that Ted's manifesto was deeply correct? Four people have said yes. Two people have said haven't read it, but interestingly, no one says that it's. No one answered no, so you seem to agree with Ted Kazinsky, in his estimation of the situation of modern totalitarian tendencies on the left, Thomas Howard says. I remember reading Mark Zuckerberg wanted to spend a year. Eating only food they had grown slash rest slash butchered himself. I wonder if this is a nod to the idea of fulfilling the power process. Reading through the manifesto, I realized that so much of our world is living inside this manifesto. So much was predicted by this manifesto. So much so much of our, you know, even there are videos of even Sargon, a backup, that I think back. And I'm like, oh wow, was this maybe. Reference to Ted Kaczynski. Or was it conscious or not conscious? So much of my life, my own choices in life, are in line with this kind of fit as a fear of rejection of a part. Of society and its negative effects on the individual. So I'm very impressed. I should have read this before. Like you guys told me in multiple super chats in my life, but I've always been avoiding doing it because I was. Half put by the beginnings of the text. It turns out that it's a totally high intelligence and still relevant. If anything more relevant today than when it was written. John Drake says. I think we talked about this on the show years ago. I mean, yeah, years ago, people were sending me messages saying Jeff Reed, that Ted Kaczynski. It's like the revolutionary phenotype and I was like, you know, reading the 1st 20 points, I'm not super interested, but

that's because Ted Kaczynski. Uh, by having this psychological construct to explain how the world works. He he is playing within. The kind of blue, pilled, psychologized view of the human race. That's what was off putting to me is that I think with this framework you cannot go anywhere. But clearly Ted Kaczynski knew more than this framework. The problem is, people who construct friggin like psychological statements about people are generally not insightful. But clearly, Ted Kaczynski is insightful, and I think that his insight comes from totally different domains, including mathematics and evolutionary thinking. Whether he knows it or not. Thomas Howard says. I knew Jeff would come to deep agreement with Ted. Glad he managed to get through it before Ted passed on, or better yet, before Jeff passes on. Absolutely all right, that is it for tonight, boys. Uh, I will see you tomorrow. Uh, some people have sent me guest suggestion. I've been sending emails and we'll see, you know, sometimes guests don't want to come. Sometimes they will want to come in any case, so we will keep covering the news alone if needed. And as a reminder, Wednesday, we are starting at 9:00 PM Eastern Time. The show will be permanently or semi permanently moving. To 9:00 PM Eastern Time I have family stuff that I want to put first and so it's all good news. It's all great, but I have to move the show and it will be for an undetermined amount of time, undetermined amount of time and eventually. We might go back to 7:00 PM Eastern Time, but for the time being, starting on Wednesday, I'll see you at 9:00 PM Eastern Time. Just that says when Ryan Dawson as a guest here, Jeff, I'll, I'll contact Ryan Dawson. I'll see if we can have him on the show.

Links used in the show

- Status / Gab Social
- WATCH: YouTuber arrested for 'coke' prank meant to provoke officers - Breaking911
- Discussing the truckers' border blockade in Coutts, Alberta - Rebel News
- GiveSendGo - GiveSendGo - Error: The #1 Free Christian Fundraising Site.
- LIVE: Arrests in Ottawa - Rebel News
- ðŸ”Ž LIVE Ottawa - RAW Footage: Freedom Convoy 2022 Day 11 - State of emergency - Monday February 7 pt2 - YouTube
- Warner Bros sued over â€˜abysmalâ€™ Matrix Resurrections release
- New compact terahertz laser with 120 frequencies
- Status / Gab Social
- Status / Gab Social

- Illinois High School Students Told to Put on Masks or Leave – So They Walked Out (VIDEO)
- Billionaire Peter Thiel To Leave Facebook Board To Help "Advance The Trump Agenda" - ZeroHedge
- Meta Platforms, Inc. (FB) Stock Price, News, Quote & History - Yahoo Finance
- Rumble SPAC Explodes Higher After CEO Offers Joe Rogan \$100 Million "To Make The World A Better Place" - ZeroHedge
- The Modern Serfdom Model And The Bitcoin Escape Hatch - ZeroHedge
- Chinese 'Fight Club' No Longer Ends In Arrests Following Backlash - ZeroHedge
- Ukraine & NATO Agree Threat of Russian Invasion 'Low' - But US Continues "Apocalyptic" Rhetoric - ZeroHedge
- Status / Gab Social
- Boundary Functions for Function Defined in a Disk
- Tk arrest - Ted Kaczynski - Wikipedia
- FULL AUDIOBOOK - Ted Kaczynski - Industrial Society and Its Future (Unabomber Manifesto) - YouTube
- Text of Unabomber Manifesto
- (3) Cointelegraph on Twitter: "The SEC gave the crypto industry 30 days to comment on a 600-page proposal that could affect DeFi platforms. Is that enough? <https://t.co/meAv2za1Do>" / Twitter
- Stealth rulemaking: Is proposed SEC rule with no mention of crypto a threat to DeFi?

The Myth Of Right Populism by Keith

Source

Keith Woods

50.9K subscribers

34,861 views Mar 7, 2021

One of the interesting things recently was looking back at predictions table from last year. There was a guy on Twitter, small Twitter account, who started keep a track of predictions and he put them on a WordPress site. And you know, if you made

a big prediction and you got it right, you'd get a lot of points, small prediction. A small amount of points and get a prediction wrong. You lose points and he told up everyone's predictions from, Ann Coulter to Dave Rubin to Bernie Sanders, to more dissent and top type voices like myself. And it was quite interesting. I mean, one of the. Reasons I was uh. Became so interested in it is, uh. I was flying for top place and. You know, unfortunately he discontinued it around the time of the election because I think if he tied up the election predictions, I would have ended up in first place. But what was interesting looking back was that. You realize that things seem so much more important. Uh, at the time that they're happening, which is maybe kind of an obvious observation. But you know, one of the I think the only prediction I had wrong was that there'd be a minute of silence for George Floyd at the first presidential debate. Which seemed very realistic at the time, but even a month after that seemed very unlikely and. I'm not the worst offender. I mean, there was so many predictions about civil war, about an uprising. During the riots in the summer. And then you think back and then you look at the year and you think well. You know, at the start of the year 2020, with the Iran strike and. People were talking about World War Three and then. When the next crisis came along, everyone started, talking about the China virus and people were saying that. that the death toll was being hidden and there was actually like 10s of millions of dead bodies in China and all this kind of thing. And it was going to be the worst pandemic since the Spanish flu and uh, it was a bio weapon that was going to kill 10s of millions of people. People were saying all this kind of thing. And then you come along to the BLM riots and people are saying this is civil war. This is an uprising and this is the end of America. This is collapse. Uh, this can't go on. The only way this can end in this conflict. There's no way that they can just get these people to stop right now. If they send the police after them, it's going to escalate. People are going to form militias. They're gonna fight back. All of this kind of thing. And you get to October. And those riots are kind of forgotten about. And then you have. The election and you know, I remember doing a poll on my Twitter account where I asked people who would be president in January, and this was like 2 weeks after the election result came in. And even then, even then, you had the majority of people. Thought that Trump would be inaugurated president on January, even knowing that the whole. that none of the establishment is on his side, that somehow, somehow, through, through the power of lots of angry Trump supporters that he would, uh become president. But you realize this and you realise that, especially the talk of collapse of civil war of a popular revolution is very common in in the right. It's very common among right wing populists. Sometimes they'll do with saying, well, I don't want it. Obviously, I'm not advocating it. But how else can this end your? And this is like a very sort of popular way of discussing right wing politics, especially on YouTube. The case in point is Tim Poole. Yes, something like 28 videos on his YouTube channel about civil war, and he had a video up recently on the book the 4th turning, which is all about historical cycles. how there are certain, uh, generational types that repeat throughout history, sort of archetypal. Visions and how the interplay of these generations create patterns

of events. that there's sort of a winter and summer of civilization and that you can kind of trace when there's going to be. A major. Uhm. Conflict that will usher in a new cycle. All this kind of thing. So you know, he has a guy explaining this book, and it's always kind of the same thing with these videos. He gets some guy on to summarize an article of a book, and he's like, oh, this is what I've been saying. This is proof that we're heading for civil war. You know, he has all these videos where it's like he's going to quote one article where it quotes a professor and a professor says that. America is headed for cold civil War, and Tim Poole is like, well, this is exactly what I've been saying. And his argument is always to say. And people are really angry. You know, America is the disunited States of America, the divided States of America and Civil war must be inevitable, says Tim Poole. Because people are really mad at each other and polarization is getting worse and the Democrats hate the Republicans and the Republicans had to Democrats. And this is the very sort of basic. Right wing populist take on. Political conflict on civil war on where things are headed, and it's always basically this formula of people get really mad at each other. There's a lot of polarization. People get very cynical about politics and then somehow some way, people take up arms and they take to the streets. And I guess they pick sides. And suddenly you're in a civil war. the most powerful empire in the world has ever seen, really, in in scope and power, it just descends into civil war because people get really mad about parts and politics. This is kind of how Tim Poole explains. But I mean this. It's not just limited to this kind of thing either. I mean, I did a poll on on Twitter, actually after the election and this I think this was like. Two weeks after the election results and it was like who will be president who'd be inaugurated President in January and the majority of people said Donald Trump. Now you can think what you want both the election, but I think by the time we got around to December, the likelihood that Trump was going to overturn this stuff was was pretty low. But again, you saw this logic with the Capitol Hill, right? You saw this logic with the whole way the election narrative was approached, which was again, it was this thing of. Our path to victory is we're going to make conservatives really black pill'd we're going to. Show them that democracy is a fraud and then. Again, the polarization is gonna get so bad, people are gonna lose so much faith in the institutions that again, it's just going to descend into this kind of conflict, or there'll be a coup of some kind. And there'll be you know, deinstalling of some new regime, but it always sends to follow this pattern. No, I didn't buy that narrative anyway, because. I mean, I think polarization is such that regardless of who wins an election in the US Now, it's gonna be deemed illegitimate by the other side anyway. And it said that for months leading up to the election, whoever wins your side isn't going to accept it. you can talk about election integrity and all this stuff, but at the end of the day, if Trump won, the Democrats would have considered illegitimate because he's a NEO fascist because he used racism to get elected. Because even if he won. At the popular vote, it's never acceptable to kind of oppress minority groups, even if the majority group votes for all this kind of thing. The same kind of things we heard in 2016 that said Russia was involved, murdered, say he didn't win the

popular vote, so therefore he should be president. If Biden won, you can look at the collusion of mainstream media? You can look at the collusion of big tech and silence and Trump supporters all these kinds of things. So I mean, I think the meme that people are going to realize. Something about the integrity of the electoral system, and that's going to be what pushes America over the edge. I think that's very misguided too. But again, all of these things, it's this idea that there's kind of a certain level of cynicism. There's a certain level of anger. There's a certain level of polarization that keeps getting worse and worse, and past that point. Conflict is inevitable, but none of this stuff really is, is. Borne out by what if you just looking at look at what is happening structurally, I mean yes, you can look at the news events and you're constantly seeing racial strife and partisan politics getting more and more vicious and cancel culture and all this stuff. But if you just look, structurally if you look at how the elites are doing, I mean. America is doing quite well for the people it's meant to serve and. It's this very sort of liberal view of conflict, that civil war, that these big political conflicts has this kind of spontaneous self organizing thing, where individuals come together and they each have grievances from what they've been seen in the news and they sort of spontaneously form these groups take. Capable of taking down the state and what all this is missing is, I mean, there is no. There is no elite that is interested in a civil conflict. In the US there is no elite on the side of the populace, right? There is a there is a certain appetite, maybe among some uh billionaires, for a kind of populist right. But I mean the kind of populist, right they're interested in. angry boomers going out with assault rifles. It's much more milk close than that. But, I mean, if you look at, you can look at conflicts through history and. You can think of. What's the what's the case study that you look for something like this, and in almost every case of civil war, in almost every case of a major social upheaval like that, you have. Uh, different elite factions that become sort of fundamentally incompatible it becomes. Worth the bargain of an outright violent conflict for one of these factions to make that move. And often what this is preceded by. It's some kind of big economic upheaval or some kind of big uh, sort of geopolitical pressure. You can look at something like the Russian Revolution and again this is where the left will look at. The growth of right wing populism, and they'll do this very kind of uh juvenalian analysis, they'll say right wing populism is a phenomenon of. Billionaires see that the working class are becoming resentful against their rule, and they want economic reforms. And So what the billionaires do in that case is they fund right wing demagogues that will tell the people your problem isn't the class structure your problem isn't. Plus, the wealthy elite. Your problem isn't that you're being exploited. The problem is, the immigrants are. The problem is, whatever minority group, and that this is a way for the elites to use populism to maintain and expand their control. Of course, to never put this lens back on the left, but you look at what is the classic leftist revolution, the Bolshevik revolution, and you look at that as a case study. And I mean, you have a few things here, first of all. You know, obviously Russia is in a war at the time the Great War, so obviously there's immense. You know, geopolitical pressure, the existence of the state

is at risk. So straight away you have. When you're under that kind of pressure you have. The people on the home front, you have a leak that is becoming more aware of the potential of a complete loss of their wealth and power, complete capitulation, but you have serious elite interest here. you have people like Lenin and Trotsky were funded from the beginning by Wall Street bankers, and this is kind of well documented now, bankers. Like the warburgs on on Wall Street that funded the Bolsheviks even after the revolution, you have huge American industrialists that make huge money, do huge business with Russia under Lenin and Stalin. More so than they ever did with desire, because of course the communists industrialized Russia and Henry Ford builds tractor factories in Russia. What you also have, which gets less discussed is, Lenin was sent to Russia on a train of full of communist agitators. Paid for by German intelligence when Lenin got to Russia and he got to what's now said Petersburg. German. Military intelligence officers and to communicate to the Kaiser, telling them that everything was going and planned. Everything was going as planned in Russia with Lenin and Bolsheviks. So I mean right the way through this, you have elite support you have. Incentives for elites to overthrow desire, and it's really no different. Anywhere you look. I mean, all of these supposed spontaneous civil conflicts. There's always this sort of structural change. That incentivizes the new elite to grab power, or there's some kind of outside geopolitical influence. War funding by outside interests, and none of this is applicable to America. When you look back at it, I mean, I think probably the most if you to try and think of the most populist revolution, the best example of a grassroots popular uh popular revolution. I mean, I think Cuba is a good example, but even Cuba, they had funding from people that had fled Batista's regime. But probably the best examples would be that the Chinese revolution, the communist revolution. But again, there's just been a war with Japan and wars and conflicts tend to really shake up the structure of delete. It tends to really shake things up and it allows. Kind of rapid change in in leadership, but maybe the best example I think is the Iranian revolution. And it's an interesting case actually, because. And I talked to Chris Bond recently. He mentioned this Marxist theorist Peter Scott Paul, who has this kind of structural analysis of revolutions. And analyses revolutions not from this sort of individualist or. Psychological understanding but takes this very structural look. And says that this is due to structural changes in the state and so on. It's this very state driven thing, a very sort of hard headed materialist analysis. But Scott will actually acknowledge that the Iranian revolution kind of falsified her own theory, and that it is as close to you get to kind of a genuine. But what you find with something like Cuba, what you find with something like? Iran and what you find with China is that each of them is less the case of some big, powerful elite bankrolling all this stuff and all this stuff, pulling the strings. And they're more populist. What you find with all of them is this common factor where. You don't find revolutions in very traditional societies. Where you find them is where there's a lot of modernization going on, and basically the political system isn't able to keep up with the economic modernization and social modernization. The scenario that seems to perfectly lead to this kind of uh revolution is when you have a

despot that's in charge of this stuff and is very slow to change and really isn't able to manage these kinds of transitions. Uh, at the proper pace, BATISTE is an example of that and. In the case of Batista and Shad, they're both transparently puppets to the people. At some stage it's obvious to everyone that, uh, the wealth of the country is being sent abroad, that the despot is doing a very bad job of managing the country, that a lot of groups are being left out in terms of. How prosperous they could be under a more competent regime. And what the common factor is, is that these despots fail to find a way to integrate new elites and aspirational elites. One of the interesting things about the Islamic revolution is that how you support from the middle class, the only group that really supported the Shia. Interestingly enough, was the industrial working class, which is seems a bit surprising at first sight. But the Islamic revolution had support from university graduates and had support from the middle class that support from merchants, traders, Craftsman. Again, this was due to modernisation. the share managed to badly. He was uh. Putting like these hundreds 1000 year olds, uh Guild systems that operated in Iran with these tradesmen, he was putting them under pressure, bringing in new forms of economic modernization. In the case of. Cuba again, it's a very sort of singular mode of production. It's often remarked that these revolutions happen more in like banana republics as they call them, where there's like 1 main commodity export that the economy is reliant on. And So what you find is that. When there's a. Wave of modernization and you have a despot that is very rigid in how they govern and unwilling to, uh, integrate new elites into the system. Uh, that then there's an incentive for everybody to get rid of this guy. No one's benefiting from this. Uh, there's lots of potentially wealthy and powerful. People that see what is in their way, and so you do get a popular revolution in the case of uh, the Islamic revolution. Now of course also you had the institutions of UM. The Islamic religion that really perpetuate the stuff you have, the institutions of the Guild systems and the Bizarres and the uh, interconnectedness of the traders and the merchants and so on. So these are really old sort of subsidiary power systems that we're able to thrive. And again, this is where kind of the Shah failed to crack down enough on these power systems that were existing within this country. So the common factor in these cases, and these are the most popular cases you can find really, really. Most times civil war civil conflict in the case of, look at the American Civil War. Look at the American Revolution, what you have in those cases is just two completely different leagues. It's two very fundamentally different ways of life. Ways of uh. You have two elites that are reliant on very different kinds of economic production. You've want to leave that. If they lose that kind of economic production. If they lose that kind of. Governance that they lose their wealth and power, and so they're going to fight tooth and nail to segregate from that to separate from that. And when it's that irreconcilable, you're going to have conflict on the lower level and you're going to. Have civil war. So I mean, that's the blueprint for civil war. But the blueprint for a popular uprising. If you're to be more optimistic and say, well, OK, there's no elite like there was in the time of the Civil War, there isn't this sort of fundamentally different rural or industrial lake that's

going to repose the neoliberal merchant caste that governs the US? But maybe there will be a popular revolution. Maybe it would be something like the Islamic revolution or the Cuban Revolution or the Chinese revolution. But again, the common factor in all of this is a big wave of modernization that the state isn't able to keep up with. And this isn't what you have in the US, because actually what you find with the US. If you were to look at it. Sort of coldly and just look at this kind of structurally. If you judge it by that metric of how well is it able to integrate new elites? The US is actually quite good at this and really economic liberalism and capitalism is. Really, the best system for this and the way it's in America, I mean. Yes, the US is an oligarchy. Yes, to the West in general is an oligarch. But it's, it's not an oligarchy of 1 elite, that's kind of excluding other elite groups. the Silicon Valley tech entrepreneurs aren't excluded by the Wall Street executives, the Wall Street executives aren't excluded by the old money. These old money families like the Rockefellers or. The Fords and the melons and so on. So there is a certain level of fluidity where it's able to. I mean it's not like the American dream where everyone can get rich, but there's a certain there's a certain openness where it is able to integrate powerful people into the elite structure. Of course, the. The problem is, there isn't really fundamentally any difference of values with these people and. You know, this is how the system functions. There's maybe a few 1000 people that control most of the banking industry. Most of the insurance industry, the hedge funds, uh, the big lobby organizations that are the Senators and the representatives. That controlled the big media companies. And that's the that's the rule in late. And there's a remarkable uniformity of opinion. And there isn't like this cluster of an elite that are those people. And then there's some other big elite class that controls some hugely important industry of whatever kind that's completely kept out and separate. So the oligarchical structure is quite. It's quite able to integrate these new elites. And there isn't any big wave of modernization that's going to kind of sweep those elites away. what you got with the French Revolution? And the revolutions of the 18th centuries, you have the merchant class. You have the mercantile elite that. Got more and. More powerful since the end of feudalism, with the start of capitalism. And UM, they they become sort of international. They can leave Amsterdam for London and set up the Bank of England. At the same time, you have to existing alongside sort of feudal institutions, uh, feudal modes of production and as the merchant class gathers power at a certain point, it's like. You know, this stuff really isn't necessary anymore. Do we really need these kings and nobles hanging around? Do we really need all these restrictions? They're kind of leftovers from a bygone age, and the French Revolution was very much like that. It was the new elite class, kind of just sweeping away the stuff that was no longer needed. This isn't what you have in the US. The state is very much in keeping with elite interests, and when you see Black Lives Matter, when you see riots and protests, I mean, this isn't any this isn't a sign of any fissure in the elite class. I mean, the entirety of. Of Black Lives matter. You can look at where they're getting their funding from and you know, Coca-Cola is funding Black Lives Matter and. All of these institutions, the Open Society Foundation and the Ford Foundation and all

of these big companies. And there's uniform support for them among politicians and Trump, when he was president was. Tweeting about the tragic death of George Floyd and all of this kind of stuff. So I mean, the elite is in is in complete agreement on this, I mean the. The fissure, if you like, is largely imaginary. I mean, they're fighting something that's kind of elusive. They're fighting white supremacy. But again, there's no elite group that represents white supremacy. There's no one to be removed from power, really, because we know that that's. Basically, leftist mythology that white supremacy is somehow in power beneath the surface. And all this stuff was really harming them, it seemed like. People are logging on to Twitter and there's riots every night and it's like, wow, this is, this is chaotic. We're watching the decline of an empire, but I mean, really, what did it matter? You know, the stock market was still going up. You get some broken windows, you get some burned down cars, but you have kenian economics and you have MMT. You know, who cares? Just build more stuff. Just fix up these buildings. It doesn't really mean anything at the same time. you have. Police kind of send them back, letting this stuff happen. It wasn't like this was some big conflict where there was militias on the streets and the military police couldn't deal with them. No, it wasn't like that at all. You had the mayors and these uh cities were basically telling the police to stand down. You police chiefs were basically telling them to stand down and. It was kind of a win, win situation for everyone. You know, the police. Allowed this stuff to happen, and then the conservative politicians say the police need more funding. So you know, the police get more funding. And I guess the police chiefs are happy. Or, you have the left saying that we have to abolish the police, which was quite an absurd demand. But what do you get? You have abolition of sort of local community structures for police, and you have the introduction of more federal police. And so even that is this kind of high low versus middle centralizing force. Where they use the. Animus of Black Lives Matter and they use the stalking of this racial tension to allow greater centralization into more federal centralized police force. And you're gonna see more and more of this in in the next few years. So I mean, the myth of right wing populism, the myth that people are going to get so black pill, they're going to get so angry, they're going to turn on the news and they're going to see these riots every night, and they're going to form God knows what, and the country's going to split in two. This is real. Fancy thinking it's not born up or anything? I mean, you're just at that point, you're just so caught up in these spectacle, you're so caught up in hyper politics that you're missing the wood from the trees, and Tim Poole is guilty of it. Timpul as, as I said, 30 videos on that and lots of people are guilty of it. But the right wing populace especially fall into this. It leads to, I think, very mistaken action. Very mistaken thinking, but very mistaken action. And I think January 6 is a good example that because again, it's this. Ignoring of OK what are the? what is the structure here? What is what direction is this stuff going in? And it's just looking at the ground level. You know, people are mad. We've got all these people. They're mad as hell. They're not going to take it anymore. And surely this has to lead to some kind of change. Surely this has to lead some kind of revolution. And then what happens,

inevitably. The end of this kind of. Online right wing populism is. You get a lot of people together. You get a lot of angry people and someone says, OK, well, let's go go to this place On this date and let's make loads of noise and from the ground up, we'll create this huge change and do right wing populism. And then you go there, and you have, again, you have no factions on your side. All you've got is is Donald Trump, and he's kind of shown himself that he doesn't take the sides of his supporters, that he doesn't really have the. Uh, the will. Or maybe the intelligence or Conan? Who knows to implement the kinds of changes that these people think he wants to implement? you go there and you have the whole apparatus of the intelligence services of the deep set of the media. Uh, ready for you to arrive, weeks to prepare for this. Once you do that, your pawns on a chess board where the players, none of the players are on your side. And regardless of how big a crowd you get, or regardless of how fired up they are or how good they look, how well presented there. When you do that, you're no longer in control. Anyone can show up, infiltrators can be sent in. We've seen footage of the police at Capitol Hill opening the doors to these protesters. And even if they didn't, even if they didn't, even if that's a conspiracy theory, even if that didn't happen, even if that footage was misleading, theoretically they could have. And that's something. Something that you could forecast before that event, you could say, hey, we've got. The whole system against us, the whole system wants to see us fail. The whole system wants to see people like us made illegal and thrown in jail and completely. How would you use that event if you were an elite you know? Would you maybe let them in and let them smash some windows and steal some stuff and have? For politicians covered and in fear, and then used that as a pretext for another Patriot Act used that to be presented as a another 911 or another Pearl Harbor. And again use that to centralise power. It's just another way for the state to kind of overreach and to use all these buggy men, all these cameras, the specter of white supremacy to further their own interests. if the whole system. If all of the elites have that goal in mind. Then really, there isn't really a way to beat that. There's no way around that. Anything you do is going to further that because fundamentally when you have all the media, when you have complete narrative control, you can spend anything to your advantage as long as you have people out there as long as you have people out there, uh, you can do this. You know, if no one showed up as no one showed up to the Biden inauguration, you can't really spin. That into anything. So it's a situation where it's like, you're in quicksand. And the more you struggle, the more you sink into the quicksand. And you know, no action is good action in a certain sense, except for, you start keep with this analogy. you start building something and you hook it on to something. Uh, outside the quicksand and you kind of, you take the long approach and you build something that will. Give you some sort of independence from the system, but as long as you're in that and as long as you're struggling within the confines they're set for, you're going to be advancing your enemies interests and you know, then you have people that are. Weeks later and I'm seeing all of these commentators. All of these people that were promoting and saying, well, obviously it was a setup. Obviously it was a

failed operation. Obviously this was this was planned by the feds weeks, months in advance. You know, it's like, well, why didn't any of you see that coming? Why didn't anyone predict that? If you think that deep state is so evil, if you think that the whole system is compromised, that all these people are against conservatives trying to destroy conservatives, well, why didn't you expect something like that to happen? Why would you put yourself at risk of that? And again, the problem is. Because they have this assumption of right wing populism that, well, we have enough people, we're going to organize just going to be some kind of spontaneous thing and somehow we're going to. Get our way. And the right has this tendency to just fall into this trap again and again, no matter what it is. You know, anytime there's any kind of momentum for anything, it has to turn into, it doesn't turn into the kind of positive action of of. Community building of trying to build things. Uh power structures and hierarchies that are not controlled by the enemy that have a certain independence and anti fragility from the system, but it always has to turn into. The hubris of lets punched the system in the nose and see if it punches back, and maybe this time it won't punch back with 100 times more ferocity and try and wipe us out like it did every other time. And inevitably it always does because again, they're looking at historical examples. They're looking at case studies. And they're looking fundamentally at just this mythology that. Uh, this is what happens that people take to the streets and the whole thing comes down and the good guys win in the end. Now another example would be. Accelerationist and people that get black pillled on this stuff and they say, well, OK, I don't believe in any of this stuff and there's no. So we're going to wait for a collapse. Maybe we're going to accelerate collapse. Then we will take power. Then you know, one day you'll open your curtains and there'll be militias on the streets and you know, very soon we'll take back everything from the elites. But again, you look at popular revolt. Cushions and they happen at times of. Great modernization, great upheaval where you have a central state, uh, power. That's very uh. Very rigid, very reluctant to move with these changes to integrate new leads. That's not at all what you have with collapse, which you have with collapse is something like, you could look at the Soviet Union and really argue the Soviet Union was really a managed. But again, what you have you have outside institutions, you have, things like the Open Society Foundation. You have these foundations that are direct and capital into creating these protest movements, creating these color revolutions. But what you also have, and this is the problem is. A lot of the accelerations seem to think that once things collapse that you're going to get this. Flatten it out that well. OK. Right now we don't have much resources. We don't have any power, really. But the big we head have all of the power they have all of the resources. So what will happen if there's uh, if there's accelerationism into some kind of violent civil war? It will be a flattening effect and then they'll have, they'll lose all their money in power and you know, we don't have much to begin with, but it'll be just kind of flattening effect where the people at the bottom will be raised up and the people at the top will be. Brought down and wiped out. But what happens when collapse? It's the opposite of a popular revolution. You know, popular revolution

comes in times of modernization. What happens with collapse? You look at the Soviet Union and you have oligarchs that just completely gobbled up the wealth of the Soviet Union. They used collapsed to use the weakening of the state they used. The chaos of the time. You know, the hyperinflation. The political incompetence, the privatization campaigns done by corrupt politicians, often paid for by the same oligarchs, and they used this chaos to consolidate power to. Seize the resources of the Soviet Union to take the oil to take the minerals, to take the banking sector. And you get to the mid 90s and you have seven people that control 70% of the Russian economy you get. You get these people like, UM, Roman Abramovich, that come from nothing that are, uh from a middle class or poor background and within a few years they're multi billionaires and some of the most powerful people in Russia because they've just. Collected this stuff that was stayed owned, that was collectively owned and they've become billionaires out of it. So I mean, Russia was carved up, it was divided up by these oligarchs and. There's no reason why that wouldn't be the case. I mean, if you look at. What's going to happen and collapse. Well, it's not going to be this thing we're overnight. Uh everyone's bank accounts are wiped out, everyone's properties flattened, and we all kind of conglomerate in the center and it's back to tribalism. No, it's going to be. it's going to be a bit more gradual. The elites are going to see this happen and they'll probably see it happening before anyone. And because they have the wealth, because they have the power, because they have the institutions, because they have the connections, they're going to have ways to manipulate it, whether it's in the Soviet Union, where they can just pay a corrupt finance minister to. Privatized the resources of the. Newly non communist Russia and just hand over hand over the resource system or where it's going to be what you saw last year with the crisis where you have small and medium businesses being wiped out and you have a consolidation of wealth by UM billionaire international oligarchs and with this. Move to Neo feudalism, it just highlights this. You can have this kind of catabolic capitalism where. You have things collapse and you have environmental destruction. You have people getting poorer, you have much worse. Uh, conditions for the working class, you people. Owning less stuff, you've less homeowners, you've all this kind of stuff. And the international elites the oligarchs have such power that they can really manage this decline and they can use this kind of managerial capitalism to turn it into something other than the free market. Churches earn capitalism and they could gradually transition to NEO feudalism, where their reign is much more managerial. It's much less fluid, much less dynamic, and this is something that you could easily see happening, with the power they have now, you could easily see this happening at the time of a collapse. And don't forget that these elites are so internationalist now, they have their money. Hidden in in offshore bank accounts, they can easily jump between countries within a matter of hours on flights. And that's another reason why, 1 country collapses and it's very easy for them to hide out and. The Cayman Islands or Bermuda or New Zealand or something else? And it's very easy for them to kind of manage that collapse from a fair. So again, you get this kind of populist thinking with collapse. You get this kind of popular think when

accelerationism that again you make people so black pilled people will get so cynical racial conflict will get so bad that. Eventually there'll be some event that will trigger a collapse and all of this stuff will just boil up. And you'll have the people from the ground up sort of season control of things. Institute in a kind of year zero. But again, there's no reason to think this. And when you move to collapse, you just have a lease that already existed in the previous system. Becoming the elite of a new system and you know, there may be again there may be conflict between those elites that could sort of come to the fore in the time of a collapse. But again, what you find with the US. Is it's less of a problem for the US than? Most previous empires because you have a you have a capitalist elite that's. Tremendously united on on social values and on the direction of things. That's it's uniformly internationalist. And because America is. Not a nation that has this kind of embedded, uh. It doesn't have embedded elites, industrial elites. But what it is is the seed of financial empire. It's not so much a an empire itself, as it's the seed of an international financial empire. And that is what kind of gives it its. And that it has no barriers to assimilating new elites, because in virtue of their money power status, they become assimilated and the US becomes kind of their plaything, rather than vice versa. And so there's never that conflict cropping up between the elite capitalist interests and the state interests. And this is what separates this system from. Other countries like pre Revolution China, where you had the potential for major social upheaval and for a mass popular movement you don't have this, uh, sweeping wave of modernization that's going to destroy an older way of life. Uh, what you have is a system that's very much in keeping with the modernization that's pushing modernization. And it has an elite that's constantly in flux with the direction of techno capitalism and with modernization. So this is the, this is the kind of the myth of, of right wing populism. And I think it's very damaging because it crops up again and again and you think people will learn lessons from things you think people would learn lessons from things that happened in 2017, but then they do them in 2021 and you see this just time and time again. Whether it's about the lockdowns? Or whatever else the lockdowns is. Another example the tendency is always we. We'll do our best to kind of insert ourselves into the discourse and black pill as many conservatives as possible, and then when we have enough conservatives, we will, uh, take to the streets and we'll all show up in one place and we'll make a lot of noise. And, maybe some people will, uh, attack the police officers or. Maybe some people will do very. They'll do things that make us look very bad, or maybe they'll be some infiltrators. Maybe the security services will set us up. But uh, maybe we can spend the narrative after that and tell everyone has a set up and. Try and try and get to the public before the mainstream media and tell them our side of the story. And it never works because it can't work because you're not going to outsmart the entire apparatus of the deep state and the entire apparatus that has been assembled by the oligarchs to keep the system moving. And at a certain point, you have to accept that it's so anti fragile that any action like that. Isn't going to really leave a dent in things. And you know, people complain about black Pilling, but I think this kind of black pill is necessary at some point. Because

this is the kind of thinking that keeps people in the spectacle and Tim Poole's job is to keep you in the spectacle. Tim Poole's job is to get views on his videos. I mean, that's all he cares about. He doesn't really have any beliefs. His thing is that, oh, I was a liberal and the Democrats went too far. So now I criticized the Democrats. That's the same schtick as Dave Rubin. Uh, that is the. that is the way to get views and not get banned off anything and be kind of acceptable to everyone and not really have any strong beliefs and not be radical, not be an ideologue, but just be a guy that's there for clicks and fame and popularity. And that's the formula that these guys follow and that's why they're always pushing. People back onto the merry ground of this. Narrative of right wing populism. what really shows the effects. Is just take a step back and look at how stable things are. You know, things seem particularly polarized, cancelled doctors. They're canceling Doctor Seuss books. Everyone hates each other, but you just had an election in the US where you had, uh, one guy that ran on a like Jeb Bush 2016. Political platform a typical Republican platform. And then you had the guy that was Vice president in 2000. So I mean, this was an election in the US that could have taken place in any other year. It could have been the 2000 election in terms of their fundamental policies in terms of where they're coming from. So as much as you have all these radicals, you have the voices popping up and you have everyone is identifying as an anarcho communist. Anarchosyndicalist and you have fascists popping up and you have all of this radicalism that's developed in the last few years. You have this polarization paradox where everyone is going way, way out, left and right, and the center is more stable than ever. You can't even get Bernie Sanders as the Democrat candidate, or you can't get a you can't get a. You can't get Trump to maintain a kind of nationalist platform. And I think what does this is people are going out so far to the extremes. But this polarization, it doesn't create fundamental change because what it does is. It brings people back into the spectacle and it's the fear of the other that drives this stuff forward, which is like, well, I may be an anarcho communist, and I may think Biden is a capitalist shill and a warmonger. But Trump is a racist, and Trump said really nasty, mean things. And he seems like a fascist. And I've seen, him, say lots of horrible, nasty stuff on the news and so on. So although I'm an anarcho Communist, I'm going to hold my nose. I'm going to vote for this guy. You know, push these foreign wars and. Is a complete neoliberal in his economics. I'm gonna have to vote for him because the other guy is so terrible and you have right wingers and you have, like, nationalists in the US to say, well, Trump was a disaster. They criticized him for four years. You know, he betrayed us and everything. But at the same time, there's this kind of inevitable logic to it. There's this inevitable logic to polarization where, well, our side is bad. But the other side is absolutely terrible, so you know, I'm going to have to vote for Trump on this one. So the system can tolerate this extreme radicalism. It can tolerate extreme polarization and polarization. Even has a stabilized. So Tim Paul is wrong. the elites aren't expecting that this polarization is going to create a civil war. They're not scared of that, and probably rightly so. And you know, polarization and people being really angry at the Blue team

and really angry at the Red Team is not the stuff that fundamental political upheavals and a civil war of the scope and magnitude capable of destroying the UM, unipolar hegemon. More some powerful empire to ever exist. That's not gonna happen. That's really a fancy thinking. But again, this shows you what the point of the spectacle is. The point of hyper politics. It's making people impotent because while they're watching the spectacle while they're expecting the civil war to start any day. They're not getting their lives together. They're not building their own communities. They're not making real life contacts. They're not creating things that could survive some kind of collapse. and they're not doing things to further the interests of their group within the system because they're so focused. And the spectacle is so focused on the urgency. And I make this video now because. The trial of Derek Jovanna's this year. And I think you'll see all of this again in the summer because. Looking back at those predictions, you just see that this stuff is endless. People never learn. There are people that have been making these predictions and doing this stuff, doing the conservative carousel stuff, the right wing populism stuff for 30 years and I'll keep doing it and. It's going to happen again with this trial. There's going to be riots. There's going to be looting, there's going to be stores burned down. There's going to be police, cars burned out and, UM. If you pull right wingers on it, they'll all say that it's going to be civil war and that this is the end of America. And there will be a revolution in, by the end of the year. And it won't happen. It'll all be forgotten about by October, again or whenever the. Democrats, never the elites decide ended because. Frankly, you look at, you can look at a case like the, when George HW Bush was president and he ended race, what riots very quickly, it might seem like the state apparatus is very weak now because you're constantly seeing riots and upheaval and they're allowing this stuff to go on. Fundamentally, if they decided to end these riots, if they decided that in the summer, and if they used the military and the police force, uh, disorganized group of looters that don't really have any political idealism and are just there for destruction, they're not going to. Make any kind of dent or they're not going to be able to do anything up against UM. Uh, an organized, centralized military force. So there may actually be less right in this year if they decide to end it early, but. At the same time, even if it goes on, even if they decide to let it happen, if they don't want to cause any more grief by by causing any more casualties or whatever. People will get caught up in this stuff again. You'll have another couple of months of people predicting the worst, but it's not going to happen, and nothing fundamentally is ever going to change by. Thinking you can sort of reset system by black Pilling conservatives or by kind of cheering on polarization from. Your Twitter account, and that's not real politics. And I think real politics is uh, community build and real politics is things that translate into real life and. If the right wants to stop failing, it's going to have to. Start looking at how its actions translate into the real world and into real life. And start separate not from the spectacle stuff. So that's about all thanks for watching subscribe. Hit the bell. All that good stuff and thanks for your time.

A Review of Ted K by JF

Source

September 1, 2022

1,655 views

JFG Tonight

6,245 followers

Transcript

Hello everyone and welcome to JFD. Tonight we will be reviewing well. I'll give my thoughts on the 10K movie. I don't know, it was out, but it's been out since February and I wasn't aware of it February 2021 and somehow, I don't know. It's hard to actually search for the movie on the Internet, and because Ted OK and you get Google results for other things. But I wanted to know about the. And so I kind of missed it that it was out, and now I've watched it. It's an interesting movie. There are divided opinions on the chat. Thai Rogerson I see that you fixed your nickname. That's great, it works. It seems to work here, he says. Glad to see you're reviewing. That is, I found to be a decent film. I agree with this lappy, top says I was disappointed in the movie, found it boring. I was more engaged watching the documentary and TV series about him. I also agree with this. I think it's a decent movie. But I think it misses capturing the full. Capturing the full. Breadth of the quality of arguments of Ted Kaczynski, because when I read Ted Kaczynski, I see an analysis of society that explains the mechanism through which humans are threatening the earth. I didn't see this in the movie and as someone points out, it's kind of bizarre how the movie turns into an incel. Angle on him. So he's kind of an insult, terrorist. So you watch the movie, you get a fair representation of some of the views of Ted Kaczynski. but when you read him, you see him explaining how he attains these views and how he he thinks he can prove that society is headed toward a wrong direction, the self-destructive one. I didn't see that in the movie. In the movie, what you see is OK, this guy. Likes nature is very things that there are skidoos and you know motorbikes around these little cabin and he's attacking these people and he's shooting with a gun at helicopters and planes not touching. And then he starts bombing people and killing people. What we see. And then he gets arrested out of a sudden what we see in this movie is a psychopath in cell who just likes nature. And once his stuff published and succeeds at getting it published through threat. It's, uh, it's a little lower than what that Ted Kaczynski is, because when you read Ted Kaczynski, you realize he has a whole understanding of the theory of evolution, of transhumanism, of technology, and how it relates to humans and how societies that use technology. About competed others. This is all missing from the movie, and so you end up with a feel good movie about just a mood movie. It's it's about the mood of Ted Kaczynski, and that makes it. That makes it incomplete in my view. I think that they better owed to Ted Kaczynski was warranted. But of course,

in today's world, everyone wants the Incel terrorist and so. There you go. They serve to the, to the normies the insult terrorists that they wanted to see. Micro strategy sued by DC Attorney General for tax fraud. That is an important news before I start talking about my review, I will also be talking about the chapter two of the cousins. These anti tech revolution, why and how? A book by Theodore John Kaczynski. Uh, someone talked to me about it on this card and wanted my views. I will be commenting on it. MicroStrategy sued by Washington DC Attorney General for tax fraud and they are they are both suing the chairman, Michael Taylor and MicroStrategy. Uh, this is the left of the sea going after. The guy who has uh, who has resigned as CEO of MicroStrategy very recently. I didn't know exactly why he was resigning, but I was. I didn't take issue with this, but now I understand. Perhaps he was resigning because he knew that the these charges were coming. So what did Michael say or do? Well, he's been accumulating Bitcoin now. If he hasn't sold those bitcoins, and if he's. Still holding them? That shouldn't be a. Uh, But if he is, if he has sold them and use the money, which I don't think he did, but it, it seems to me that if you just accumulate Bitcoin, you are not subject to taxation. So it's very weird that there's a claim here that basically has made false claims. That he has been benefiting from income that he didn't report. And it seems to be at the DC level, the DC income taxes. So basically the whole case relies on arguing that Michael seller was acting as if he was not living in DC, but he's been living in DC. Very bad idea to be living in DC. If he does do. But that's the whole problem with having buildings and being present in physical places. It's really eventually the state will go after you. So we've had Michael Saylor. We've heard him many times in the last few years, say that the big advantage with Bitcoin is you can reappear. Anywhere in the world, and you can suddenly be in Thailand. Then you can suddenly be suddenly be in some other country and try to tax that, he said. So basically, Michael Saylor has been admitting publicly that he was. Is that that Bitcoin was a an efficient means to evade taxes? Let's see if he can walk the walk now. When when we see him. Uh, reappear in some other countries and continues and turn at presence more and more the the the American police has access along with the international police. Interpol has access to finding you in any country. So can Michael seller make it out or will he fight? This in court? Or will it disappear? I don't know. But micro strategy has been losing some. Stock value as a response to this case sliced bread, says JF. DNA is like a code, right? Uh, how has the environment know how to read it correctly? If DNA is in C++, how did the environment know that and didn't make a mistake and read it as Java? Uh, those are loose. Uh loose metaphors that you're working with. Where do I begin? I mean, ultimately the answer to your question is the revolutionary phenotype. If you do not understand the selfish gene and the revolutionary phenotype, you are walking blind in the dark forest and it doesn't even matter that it is dark because you're blind. The first step is to understand the selfish gene. The second step is to understand the theory of phenotypic revolution and then you'll realize that replicators naturally. Well, naturally, what do we know from the selfish gene, the replicators. They modify themselves to survive better. Now that's

that already gives you a cue about. What what could be the mechanism that leads to? Stable encoding because it doesn't have to be the case that throughout life. The DNA code has always been interpreted in the same way. Interpreting DNA in the way it does right in the way we do right now is an efficient means to produce proteins that will allow you to survive. But that doesn't mean that it was the same code 4 billion years ago. In fact, we know from. We know from tango DNA, RNA viruses that there are alternative codes, alternative readings that you can do of DNA and RNA codes. Those are alternative routes that viruses use, and that's partly why viruses can hurt you a lot. It's because they get in your system and they produce other proteins with other encoding schemes with other T RNA's that read the code differently. Now, so from the selfish gene, you get the idea that, well, a fitter life form will outcompete others. So as soon as there was one way to read DNA that had completed the other way that way one and so it can all start very simple where DNA. The segment could have been read in some unreliable ways with some errors. There might have been extremely, extremely high numbers of errors in the early transcriptions of DNA. But eventually a stable and more stable and more stable reading of DNA evolved through natural selection. On top of it, add the theory of phenotypic revolutions. Not only is it expected that a code would stabilize simply because it's better than having no code, you know the the more life form evolves, the more there is knowledge in its gene. And the more you pay a price, if you don't read them correctly, So what time you had a an increase, an increasing precision of the reading of a given replicator simply out of competing matters with the natural selection? On top of it, you add the. Theory of phenotypic revolution. The theory of phenotypic revolution shows that if your molecule is. Less reliable in your code. Your genetic code is less reliable than some other available molecule in the environment. A life form will converge toward exporting its own code into the superior code, and that's how DNA evolved through through phenotypic revolution. Also, there were better holders of the code, so it's not always been the case that DNA was the code and that it the current way in which it is interpreted was the center of life. Before then, it appeared there was a less efficient life form and before RNA appeared. There was a less efficient life form codes build themselves progressively in life through outcompeting the other life forms, either through phenotypic revolution or regular evolution. Now you have to understand something. There is nothing special about a code. The way the way the tires of your car react to the road. Encodes a binary sequence of. Oh, here's a little bag of asphalt, and ohh, here's a micro hole of 1 micrometer and the whole here's another bag of asphalt. And here's another micro hole of 1 micrometer. All of this creates signals of heat in your tires. That no one will ever give a **** about. And yet it's as binary as the freaking codes that runs in my CPU right now. All this to say that the physical universe is filled with codes that you don't give a **** about. And there's nothing special about it, and it doesn't imply God, in case that's what you're implying, because I I know where this argument is headed. You are like ohh my. God life is so complex a cold. There's a cold and literally every physical interaction that has ever happened since the beginning of the universe, up to

the end of time. There are freaking codes everywhere, and it's a matter of how fine when someone care at to what extent will someone care about. Taking the information, someone or something will care about taking the information from that code and doing something with it. Obviously human programmers do because they want to create a good program, but life also does. Life cares about how the message from the past generation. Will be interpreted because interpreting that message turns out to be the best way to survive. And that's a direct consequence of natural selection. So yeah, Ted, Kate, the movie. Let's go back to my critique. A acceptable movie, a mood movie, but that doesn't capture the philosophical greatness of Ted Kaczynski. So overall, a 7 out of 10 because they were honest, they were they they have taken the words of Ted. OK. And the historical report. That is this movie. Is fair it. It is all fact. Most of the the vast majority that I can verify at least. So there were. Harnessed to the true story. But somehow they they weren't intelligent enough to know how. How do I take the intelligence of Ted Kaczynski and make it sweat through the movie? And that makes it an incomplete movie in my view. OK, misses the mechanistic analysis level of Ted Kaczynski, and we are led to believe that he's just a guy in some shack begging money to his mother to commit terrorist actions. The response to my critique of the code. It says no, I wasn't going for God. So is it a bad analogy to call DNA code? Well, again, you know, it's. Are are you willing to call everything that is information in the universe a code? Because that's what you would have to do now for someone like me. It's not a problem because I know what information theory I know the view of physics based around entropy and quantum mechanics and the the general theory of fields. So I know what information and codes are. But if you don't know, and that's why I rarely use the word, it's because I know there's a lot of people out there who don't understand what a code is. A code implies a message. A code implies, therefore, that there is a Thunder of information and that there is a receiver of information and that they have pre agreed to interpret the the message in that signal in a certain way, such that it means something for the sender and it means something for the receiver. Therefore you are imbuing the physical universe when you when you said that is a code, you're imbuing it with a with conceptions from intentional human communication. Now when you are doing this, you are wrong. Uh, the DNA code exists as a. As a sequence of information within the universe, but not one that was intended by a sender and not one that was understood by receiver. It only deploys itself in the universe in a way that makes. You feel or look like. That it might be a message, but it's not a message in the human sense of it. Uh, it says a code implies decoding, no? A code could be sent by a sender and never be received by a receiver. But this is all the baggage that comes with the word code, which is why. I'm not using the word generally, except if I talk about the genetic code because it's simply how it's called in biology. You have to understand that when you use the word code, you are importing A baggage that comes from multiple different definitions of the word, and if you are speaking with someone like me refined a an iridite biologist doesn't matter because you won't fool me. But the problem is when you speak to a general public lay audience. Who gets these senses of cold? They

feel it, but they don't fully understand it. Uh, that's dangerous because you're going to mislead them, and this is exactly what the creationists are doing. They are they are equivocating on the various definitions of code. And so suddenly, first the code is just physical information. With some processing, so decoding and then suddenly hold it then. Then there's God, there's a sender. Someone has to send the code. A programmer must have been there to program the code well, no, no. If you want to call the inner code. Uh, it's a code without a thinking sender. And it's a code without the thinking receiver. However, it is silly cold that is sent. It's sent by previous generations to the next generation, and it's the most packaged. The set of things to be deployed in the universe to survive better than most people than most others. And it's a highly. Areas, Suarez says, code in the most general sense just means information or data. Both terms can be interchangeable, absolutely. Every also always says a programmer doesn't even have to be a conscious being. Yeah, that's true. You can have self generated code you can have. You can have arbitrary code. You can have arbitrary logic tables drawn at random among. Various possibilities so. But generally interesting code will have been imbued with a human intention, and that's the equivocation fallacy that the creationists are relying upon when they use that argument to justify God. So chapter two of anti tech revolution, someone came to the discord and said. Jeff, can you please review chapter two of Kaczynski's book? What I am curious about in particular is your opinion on making that kind of direct comparison between biological organisms and human organizations on assumption that evolutionary pressures in some form apply on both? So this chapter 2, I read it today. It's an excellent chapter and again you see Theodora Kazinski's superior ability to understand at many levels, systems ecology, selection, biology, mathematics at Kaczynski is a superior. And in this chapter he uses his own words. I would use different words than what he used, but he comes at a very similar idea. And then in fact the IT does mention natural selection, but it comes. To explain natural selection with different terms as it applies to his analysis of society. So instead of talking about organisms and groups of organisms, he talks mostly about systems, self propagating systems that he calls them. Which include life, but could include other things. And he talks about subsystems. So for example a self propagating system will be would be say the WE F. The World Economic Forum and all of it, all of the globalist ideas, let's say. Now this system has subsystems. It has little guys working for it. It has nations that are subordinated to it. It has politicians sympathetic to it. And then it has whole population. Missions potentially playing the game of globalism, or rejecting it so those are the subsystems of a higher self propagating system. And you can think of, uh, larger systems like in symbol of nations, alliances, etcetera, all of these forms self propagating systems. And he thinks very much that, uh, he thinks in line with biology that ultimately the systems that win is the system that can self propagate better than the other. Uh, there is, however, a deep problem with the chapter and it leads him down a bad path in my view. There is a double definition that it uses for self propagating system and that it has two components. He sells self propagating systems as he defines them. He wants them to include life. So of course things that replicate will

be part of it. So self propagating system, he says. Are things that either replicate? Now, it may seem like a little is it. Is it really that grave? Yes, it is that grave. Because if you if you have this R in your definition, then you're really talking about two different things. There are the systems that replicate, and there are the systems that expand. And what Ted Kaczynski fails to capture is the the importance of this difference. A system of thought like the WE for globalism as a whole. Is one of those systems that expands maybe. But doesn't quite replicate. And this is so important because it's at the heart of my big contribution to science with the revolutionary phenotype. To understand that memes are just memes, bro. That they fail at reproducing, and therefore they are not in the in the Darwinian struggle with us. So this leads him, you know, is is analysis leads him when he changes from biological Organism to societal ideas and alliances and political groupings. It ends up leading Ted Kaczynski to far see a global domination of, let's call it industrial technological globalism. OK, because it's it's really large, but basically expects a because there is transportation across the planet he expects. A force of kind of what we would call today, globalism. To overtake the entirety of the planet. The problem with thinking of ideas as. Placing them in the same category as living things is that it it fails to realize that. The NATO alliance of today is not the NATO alliance of 50 years ago. And if globalism as an ID was to overtake society and expand an empire over all of Asia, Russia, America, Europe and Africa. It wouldn't be the same globalism as today. It would be localized in all sorts of complex ways. Such that I don't know would say globalism takes over the world in 2050. Will the average African then that adheres to globalism have the same ideas as Klaus Schwab? I don't think so. Because these systems that expand and they only expand, but they don't reproduce, they fail at the Darwinian struggle because of something that I've said in the revolutionary phenotype, they end up getting reprinted out of existence. In other words, flash webs ID, whether they lead to a global. The Empire or not? People will slowly reject different aspects of these ideas as they find them not useful to their own existence. And eventually your own existence becomes and turned around, competing with the local forces that are attempting at. They they are, they are attempting to slow down your reproduction, basically. And so in in the reproducing may mean, you know, find water and. Find a a familial relationship to allow your children to have a good sexual male. In Canada, it may mean combat the the winter, the cold of the winter. And because all of the needs are different across the planet, a global ideology that simply expands and gets more coverage and more coverage would be eventually dismissed by local populations as their struggle against each other comes to be at the at the forefront of their Darwinian concerns. So because people are free to adhere to an empire, join a political alliance, or not join it for real, or say that they joined it and then forget about it. Because people can profess principles without even living by them. The expansion of IDs has really 0 biological meaning other than as tools for reproduction, and what determines the direction of the world ultimately therefore. Reproduction and its local competitive needs. Now this can get big and it's a complex thing. It's a complex game, but really no one is playing the game of global dominance

biologically. You only have a bunch of deluded fools who think they they can impose a meme on the entire world which has not been done yet for you know, there there's. There's still not an idea that I know of that penetrates the entirety of society. Across all countries and all cultures like I'm talking here about political ideas of some kind or models of life or principles of economics. So what does that mean, then? Is that Kaczynski wrong about everything? No, it's analysis of. Of systems that keep taking more and more resources is true for life. It's just not true for human politics, I think, and I think that's what he gets wrong. Human politics can have ups and downs, but ultimately it will always evolve to serve the genes. And therefore it will always evolve to serve the highest breeding populations. Which may or may not be white people at any given moment in history. But that's what it is. So he ends with a comment that is absolutely destructive on the kind of leftist naive environmentalism totally destroys solar power, in my view, and I had forgotten about this. But you know, I had forgotten to think about this, but he says one of the fundamental problem with solar power is that it competes with plants for. And he's absolutely right. You know, every single. Solar power that you. Put up is depriving the world of some grass and some trees and everything that could have grown there. And when you think about it. Keeping trees from existing when in fact trees are taking the CO2 from the atmosphere and getting it into solid form may not be the cleverest thing to do he so he he's a guy with environmental concerns, but also with such a contrarian nature that is completely able to see through. The left ***** on the. Decay shadows as we can put solar panels on barren land or desert. Yeah, we can. But to A to a certain extent. But then you have to pay the cost of transporting electricity. And who knows? You know, he he's also talking about so many other problems with solar panels, such as the mining that they require. But you know it it really limits what solar the solar power dream could be for the future. Sliced bread says it's also more reliable. You see it just as well in direct sunlight as you do in dim light. Try seeing something in direct Sun on an LCD. It also doesn't distract the circadian rhythm by shining light into your eyes. Ink only bounces what is naturally in the surrounding it doesn't shine. OK, he's making the the apology of UH Inc uh E ink, the kind of Amazon Kindle type of screens. I've been trying these screens, I've not been super. Charmed by them. They kind of suck. I'm OK with getting a little bit of light from my screens and. You know, compared to the irradiation machines that were my grandparents, TV's on which we were all sitting in front and there was this big analog tube that was just projecting electrons in our face or whatever it was doing. I I think that LCD is pretty fine. Let's not forget that LCD, while illuminated, you know there's still a bunch of liquid crystals that melt precisely, and I I want the extra light at this point. I'm happy with LCD, extra light. Mama Jeff is coming. What is up, Mama Jeff?

I just want to say something because in the I watch a lot of video about the the, the regenerative system and the because the problem about the carbon is not so much that we use too much carbon, but because we should. Put it back in the earth and when you do, regenerate the system with the cover crops again. This puts so much

carbon in the soil and actually the plants need a lot of carbon. Because they they take carbon and they make nitrogen, no.

They make nitrogen, maybe, but they certainly make O₂. They make oxygen.

Oh, really? OK. Ohh yes, and you know what? Even the people that I listen to, they are fighting now to get the government to give them money. Because they put back carbon into the soil.

You know, put your carbon into the sun if that's your hobby. But I won't pay you for.

It I know it's kind of weird. I kind of feel a bit weird about this. Everything about government is weird.

Yeah, it ends up being a system of exploitation and basically they want to. Be paid for? For a dropping accidental about a face on some land and claiming them that the CO₂ will be reabsorbed by.

They say if you plant a good plant with the government, like if you do cover crop with the mustard and everything and the government gives you money. In France, that they do. OK.

And the problem is that if the government starts accounting. What? Who puts what back into the earth? They're of course going to miss the calculation. They're not going to include Papa Jeff's carrots. And yet Papa Jeff's carrot are made of carbon. And they, as far as I can tell, they have bred those those carbon atoms from the air.

Yes, but yes, that's just what I wanted to say. It's just it's not so much the problem that we use carbon, but the problem is that now we do the CK peeler and we put a chemical fertilizer. But actually what we should do is put. Carbon back into the soil. That's what is missing and that's why we have environmental problem.

Absolutely, I agree. And you know trees as far as I know, just having trees in life. Is the most efficient way to transform CO₂ in carbon. I mean, you can see it just take a log of three and burn it and look at it. You know, when it's a black car, piece of charcoal. When it's a piece of coal, that's the amount of carbon that a tree has been breathing into from the air into a solid form.

Eight 8000. Yeah, I said. Send him my little video that I'm watching, I'm sure. He would like it.

At Kazansky maybe dying very soon. So if you want to do it, do it quick.

Maybe he can do a little garden. In the tail.

A little garden in the jail?

Maybe I can send him some wood chip at the jail.

Oh my God, we are keeping these criminals alive and they are consuming O₂ and breathing out CO₂. Mama Jeff finding a way again to. To make them more ecological, how are you doing? People of the regular chat. If you would like to support the show, use the dollar button under the other, say chat. Make sure you enable your payment method if you want this button to be available. Alternatively, you can also use entropy. The linked to entropy is in the description below. Someone sent a message on entropy.

Authority staff says Johnny. I tried to recommend your book to some people and. They brought up your court case. Your haters applied quicker views on female individual dignity, and I smacked them down. How is it going? Ohh well yeah. Someone who rejects a scientific idea on the basis of. Any considerations of Adam and them, including false ones from hit pieces don't do not deserve knowledge. So but thank you for owning them and. And destroying them and reminding them that female adult females in the US have a constitutional right to suck scientific ****. Another fake Americans are racist story. Oh my God, this one. I actually guessed the news on this one. If you've watched the show, I believe it was yesterday or two days ago. I think it was yesterday. Someone came to me yesterday and said Jeff, have you looked at the Duke volleyball story? Someone got called a racial slur. And it's making scandal in the media and I. Was like I. Have not read that story at all. But there is a hoax hate crime on a yearly basis at Duke University. And so my guess is that this one would be this year's whole site crime. Again and again, there are hoaxes coming out of the university system, and if you look at it from the whole of America perspective, it is dozens a year. So here we learn that. The whole Duke volleyball story. That led the ESPN to to be in support of this black volleyball player who got called a racial slur. Turns out this didn't happen when ESPN issue a retraction. Now that you've brought their network into. So the police has been investigating this whole thing. It's a volleyball player who claims that a person in the audience from a certain section of the audience, the student section, they call it. Would have called her a racial slur. And meanwhile, a lot of people observed that during this match some guy was taken by the police and. Gotten out of? The volleyball mats in the crowd. And the administrators of the university eventually said we found the racist. We have banned them from future event. We're sorry that this happened. But then the police investigates and realize what what? The guy never said a racist slur. The guy was a mentally ill person. Ohh was on the hinge and was trying to somehow in his mental health problems he was trying to take contact with these volleyball players, maybe because he loved them or I don't know, but he he was like kind of obsessive about touching or talking to the volleyball player. But they have reviewed the cell phones that were filming the match. They were they have reviewed the videos. They have also noted that this guy never was present in the student section. Because the because the the, the alleged racial slur would have come from the student section, but now the university is confirming this guy that got out is not a student of ours. He was not in the student section out of the video cameras catching the action that night showed that he was in a totally different part of the stadium. And the police and and now many students are coming out because they were in the student section and are saying we never heard a racial slur. Of the whole night, we just saw a guy get get brought out of some other part of the stadium and brought out by the police, but we never heard any racial slur coming from that section. So it looks like we are faced here with a false claim. Someone trying to elevate themselves in the victim status. Another justice mallet and I called it in advance. I refused to accept this news until. We knew more. But now the police says the guy has not committed a hate crime,

has not, has not used the racial slur. The students around are saying we didn't hear a racial slur. It looks like there was no racial slur. So again an invented racist. Uh, the big tech purge of the truth continues. Google just removed WorldNetDaily, the first online conservative news site, from its search engine. Look what happens when you click on WND from Google search engine. Warning visiting this website may harm your computer. And then yet they they report that no unself content was found. So basically they have put W&D on their blacklist and D will no more be featured on Google. Fairly conservative. Very, very bland. Right wing Center, right outlet that was just covering stories that matter to the right wing. Purge of the truth media stand by Google's vicious action against WND. This file is so dangerous, Chrome as blacked it big tech, the political establishment, the United Nations, and the World Economic Forum are cohesively endeavouring to implement the great reset agenda and usher in a new world order. This agenda can only be achieved by making the conservative Christian. And pro American paradigms, obsolete and decimating public awareness by barring access to the. Roof radars, who search for WND on Google, are now directed to a page that issues an advisory when they click on the news site from the tech giant's search engine. It's time we get this cartel under mind. It's time that we get an intervention from. Government on the basis of the development of a monopoly, Nicholas Petrus is hearing audio *****. I tried lowering a little bit the gain. Output maybe play with the ratio? I don't know. Lap it up, says the audio is fine for me. I I know that I was maxing out the level, so maybe when I was speaking a little louder, you may have heard. Uh, some ***** , hopefully. Now it's gone. With the new settings, Western allies, led by UK's Boris Johnson sabotage tentative Ukraine, Russia peace deal in April. Well, that's not surprising. I've said it. Clearly when I see the behavior of America and of all of the. Western Western nations. They don't want to peace. They, so they're they're pushing for this war. To continue forever. So I'm not surprised that there were active tentative. To do so, Thomas says, yeah, you're not clipping here. And I have Pro audio Pro level audio here. Aerial service says it may have subsided by now. Yeah, I just lowered a little bit. And normally, when you lower, you know, if you were reaching the peak, maybe sometimes now I shouldn't be reaching Trudeau government to give \$100 million to LGBT groups across Canada. Oh my God, it will suck to be in Canada. You're gonna have all these LGBT people in all of the little villages of Canada. Hey, we're here to say everyone is welcome. They're gonna be at freaking, local barbecues and everywhere. \$100 million is a lot of money. It is enough money to get. Uh LGBT cheerleaders and the whole of the country for the next 50 years in every single village and every single little barbecue in every single public activity. This is worth \$100 million can and it's what it would. They will impose this on everyone. Can't we have a little local activity where we don't get past these pamphlets? I mean I. I don't want to give too much details, but me and Mama Jeff, we were chilling at a place. Just local activity. Corn, hot dog, everything. And it's like and someone is like, hey, what do you guys like to take a picture with me? And now Jeff was like sure, what? Why shouldn't we take a picture with you? And I see the guy had a little. I don't know how

you would call this, but he had a little strip like like these pageant queen winners. He had a little strip like this and it was the LGBT rainbow that was. Mama Jeff, I don't think we want to be in this picture. Because as it turns out, it was one of these fun dead activities from the government so that this guy can take the picture and say see all these people except to be backing the openness of the LGBT community. Mama Jeff is here.

Ohh yes, I remember he even wanted to come to our house. What did he? What would he have done if he would have come to our house, he would have done some propaganda.

Yeah, basically, he wanted to come to our house to welcome us, and I was like, no, we don't need this.

You think so?

But basically what he would have done. I see what I've said. So are you guys open about different sexual practices because there are different people? Not everyone is hater or, you know. These guys are just paid for it, \$100 million. Of course it's going to lead to your local LGBT flag bearer.

Oh my God, are you kidding me? Everybody who come here. Oh my God. It also you know another thing they pay for. When I was in Montreal, I talked to the transgender people and they say they all. Yes, they I don't know why I I was talking about them. I I I said I would like to get laser to get. Ohh my hair removed from my legs and everything.

Because you don't identify as a hair person, OK?

Because it's so annoying, you always have to remove it. No, I don't know why it says not live but anyway. And they said Ohh US, I can have this paid by the government, all Lazer everything. I was like what? But why they don't pay this for me? I want to look like a woman too.

OK, I see. So if they pay sex gender surgery, you would want them to pay your epilation laser too. That makes sense. That makes sense. I mean, if we're gonna pay it, let's pay everything. Uh, thank you, Mama Jeff. Yes, sliced bread, says Jeff. Why are you ever consenting to random people taking pics with you and Mama? I'm surprised based on your ultra private way of life. No, I mean that's the point. The thing is. Already when I saw him take his photo, his photograph machine out, I was like, no, no, Mama Jeff. No, no, no. And as I was about to stop Mama Jeff. Because Mama Jeff needs to be guided by the male patriarch of the family. So I was about to play my role as a male patriarch in front of this obvious. Introduction in my family by. Another agent with a penis. And I see I see the whole rainbow thing. It was relatively subtle because it was this guys as some other things like it was not like the whole LGBT flag on his chest. It was more like, oh, here's a bandlet. And ohh, there's a little rainbow on the bandlet. And then there was something like something. Like we are. Welcoming or something like this written on it. Uh, and and then just before I I was even about to stop Mama Jeff, just because. No, we don't take pictures precisely. Uh, I realize, holy ****, this is not a regular picture, which I would already object to.

This is a picture to be included in the Count of Pro LGBT people by some local pro LGBT organization. The the the problem is these guys go to sit their their buses in the state apparatus of grant funding, of welcoming and stuff, and then they can say ohh look, I photographed 30 people. We served hot dogs too. 30 Pro LGBT people at the local park today. And then they get funded for this. The problem is you. You just took a local activity. Where people were naively going, but then you're turning it into your thing, into your political fight. Absolutely take issue with this. Grapes called *****. Then you find that he wants to be it. He wants you to be his patriarch, Jeff. No, you wouldn't have wanted. You would have probably been against the patriarchy this guy, but it was so subtle because it came. It came dressed as something else than pro LGBT stuff. It came as. Ohh yeah we're welcoming. Ohh your hair. Your hair eating hot dogs. Well, have you been welcomed because we're welcoming? Don't you want me to go to your house? And welcome you. I was like, holy ****. The **** is? This guy is bugged or something I've never. You want to. I'm born in this country, *****. Donald J Trump, congratulations to the many FBI. And DOJ whistleblower? 1st we have flooded the offices of our Senators and congressmen slash woman with really bad things to say about what is going on. This is the time after many years of flat breaking and unfairness to clean things up. All things for a reason. Drain the swamp. So now the conman special agent of the FBI has announced right after getting cut rigging the election and many other things getting blasted by his bosses. That it would be. A wonderful time for him to retire. What damage he has done to our nation. Look at us. We have become strictly third world. So Trump is, of course, continuing his. Is free of complaining. Complaining against the FBI raid, I've not been following the details, but it's been getting some coverage. This is a contrasting image. This addendum machine was posting a glimpse of a future without white people. That's an article that we've reviewed here on the show. The last white man. Blah blah blah. And then you get the Guardian article if white people were still here, this wouldn't happen. The majority black town flooded with two webs. Is is your wife? Is is your whiteness free? Future feeling like it? Like you thought it would. Are you enjoying it yet? Because yeah, you do need a bunch of white people to operate a sewage. Or if if there's no white people around you to operate the sewage system, you need to operate it yourself. This is what's so funny about this state of white. Is that I. I just wish that we left people who hate white people to themselves to their own devices. You go ahead and build your own cities. You go ahead and develop property and develop the rule of law and develop politics and develop even just a functional. Society that can bring food to you. Charles Garrett says the picture would be Photoshop with JF. Uh, OK, so fanatical socialist super chat. Thank you so much. Can you explain the origin of heterosexual evolution strategy, prehuman heaven and its advantages. Oh my God. I mean, I I've said it many times, if you want to. I I make the best case for it in the. In explaining to. How wrong he is when he tries to compare the the fixation rate of bacteria to sexual species. The great advantage of sexual selection. You know what I have? I have written a text about it. On Kora, because someone was asking. Someone was asking

on Kora. What is the advantage of? May use it. So let me read because I I I could I could try to. To summarize, but I think it would never be done better than this text, which I've taken greater for that writing. So let me I will also share the link in the description below. At the end of the show, you will have access to this link if you want to read it. Mayor, this is 1. This basically is the fact that we are a species with sperm and egg. And a species with sperm and egg doesn't have to be human, and in fact, heterosexual sex has pre existed humans by maybe a billion years, maybe more. Meiosis is one of the most fascinating things that ever happened to our ancestors. Of all the very fascinating things that happened to them, meiosis is the process that makes us sexual species, species that bear 2 copies of their genome and pass only one to their offspring. The other copy coming from a sexual partner. Not only do you pass just half of your genes, the particular half that you pass to each offspring is shuffled through various mechanisms, including the genesis of the gamete and something called crossover in molecular operation, in which genes from one of your chromosomes jump to associate with your partner's chromosome. And vice versa. So shuffling has been important for our genetic evolution. The evolutionary significance of meiosis is major and multifaceted. Without meiosis, you get bacteria, but we don't know that you'd get mushrooms, plants and animals. I personally believe you wouldn't. I believe that of all the planets hosting life out there, only those where sexual selection develops come to see life. Forms as complex as ours. The reason I believe this is. The the reason I believe this is. The the reason I believe that is that most of the things we care about as complex in life are known or believed to be due largely to sexual selection. From flowers that cured bees to carry their seed to Peacock tails, to your ability to pull a joke at the right moment in order to charm a sexual partner. Meiosis is often thought of as a radical accelerator of evolution. Compare two life forms evolving. One is bacteria like and doesn't have meiosis. One is human like and has meiosis. Suppose that a change in the environment renders a necessary nutrient for these two life forms. Suddenly very rare. How do our do? Our two life forms evolve in response to this change. Our bacteria on the one hand has no choice. It must do whatever it needs to find whatever amounts of this nutrient it can find, even if not optimal in its search, it will attempt to produce some copies of itself, even if that means carrying imperfect genes that are not quite as good to handle this new environment as other competing. Bacteria would be it would take thousands of generations before the evolutionary disadvantage shows in full, leading the unfit bacteria to slowly disappear. The important thing is that the bacteria doesn't have a way of getting rid of its bad genes while reproducing for the bacteria. It's all or nothing other. She survives and is stuck with her good and bad genes, or she dies, in which case evolution still goes on for the surviving bacteria, but not those that died. I think evolution is painful, long and wasteful. It waits for the right mutation to happen to the right bacteria. Compare this to the same nutrients scarcity problem applied to our sexual species. The female goes to a place where males are available. 99% of the males look poor, malnourished and feeble nutrients. Scarcity has been hitting hard. She chooses a male among the one person to look more healthy

and immediately reproduces. By doing so, she has found the male most capable of gathering our rare nutrients, and she may not even know it in a single generation. She has solved the problem that the bacteria might take thousands of generations to solve. She has evolved without even having to wait for natural selection to finish her children. This is allowed because of sexual selection and the gene reassortment that occurs in it. May you think evolution is quicker. It allows genes to find the right partners to combine with without going through the very slow process of natural selection as it applies to bacterial. Why wait for the right mutation when you can just pick the sexual partner that happens to already carry it? Mayor take evolution as its own wasteful aspects from Peacock tails to Ferraris. The level of investment males will make to quarter female can become quite ridiculous. But fundamentally, mayor this allows the genes not to be bound by left life or death contract within a single organisms. But rather get an opportunity to team up with other better genes on every generation. Think of the difference between a fixed rate mortgage and one that can be renegotiated every five years. So that's what it is. Meiosis sex intersexuality. Renegotiate able mortgages for life. That is, it is a deal in which the genes. Can renegotiate who they partner with when, in fact bacteria cannot do this. I know that the cast shadow has more plasmid. Even my plasmids. I mean, it's not enough, and it's not fair. And it's really the genes that end up evolving as plasmid that get out of the bacteria to get into another one, end up being viral. Because by nature they are. They are escapists. They they run away. They, they they don't care about killing the Organism that they run from. Uh, whereas maletic evolution is a stable way to make genetic reassortment constant, obligatory, and fair for all the genes. And that puts you in a situation where suddenly. The genes that can be innovative. Don't have to evacuate the genome as a plasmid and flee to another Organism. They can develop innovation and their their measure of the the the importance of that innovation in evolution will be by how much they can serve the Organism by instead of, instead of being viral, they end up being. Constructive contributors to the Organism. So that's why I may use. This is good. It's because you don't even have to wait to develop a genetic technique to gather the. To to face a new environment, you can just pick whoever has survived that environment and you already have a a man of genetic quality in choosing a good partner. You can see mayor this in so many ways. One of the ways you can and it's not a contradictory ways with with what I've just said, it's an alternative length that you can also put on it. Imagine that you were a life form, neither a male nor a female. Imagine that the environment was, so changing and so complex that your life form could benefit. From splitting in two. For a moment to test the environment here and test the environment here. To ensure that when you get back together, when you when the sperm comes back to fertilize the egg. That this sperm has survived through a lot of ****, and this egg has survived through a lot of ****. That evolution would be much faster than an evolution in which. You have to try everything you need to survive, but with your bad jeans and with your good jeans. And then eventually, what that would inevitably lead to is that the sum of the accumulated genetic knowledge gets lost. Because bacteria have

little ways or no ways to communicate genetic knowledge to other Organism, plasmids being an exception. So that's my answer to your. Super chat. Fanatical socialist.

White, white. White.

Percent 21 bucks. This has great show tonight. Thank you so much to white, white, white for supporting the show. And let me tell you, we've been spending a great month, me and Jeff getting a lot of red tape result. And with the government and companies and stuff and white, white, white has made this month a very, very profitable month. So thank you so much because we're we're rolling in finances, we are super healthy. We are there. There is no sign that this show will ever stop in the coming years. We are rolling on gold. Thanks a lot to the generosity of the people watching this show, including white, white, white, who's been a very. Some random blokes and the Super chatty says, hey, Jeff, did you see that Canada recently passed Holocaust denial laws similar to Europe and you can get two years jail for? Yeah, I've seen this. Someone sent a link to it and I've just quickly commented on it, but basically what Canada has done is they made a little amendment. To the hate speech laws and they they just specify. Ohh yeah by the way, denying the Holocaust is this crime. So the the crime of hate speech already existed, but they've just specified. Denying the other cost. That is saying that the Holocaust does not happen. Is this crime which has already existed, which already existed, but now we're just specifying that this is an instance of it? What do I have to say about this? I can't say anything. Dear Jay, likely to wait past midterms to reveal any Trump charges. This this is so hilarious. This news item, because the DOJ has announced. That it would wait after the midterm elections to reveal whether they're going to bring any charges against former President Donald Trump. On the basis that. You know, we have a long standing policy that bars disclosures that would impact elections. But the FBI, the DOJ has never been respecting this rule. They've always been revealing. After the election, when it's, uh, a Republican, or when it's something that could that when it something that could damage the the the Democrat. And they've been. Revealing before, if it's something that can damage the right. The fact that they would say this and invoke this rule, which they violated again and again in the last few decades. Tells me that probably they don't want to charge Trump. Because if they were charging Trump, they would announce it now and they would say, well, it's a matter of public interest, by the way, Trump is not. In the midterm election, so technically they could announce something and say, well, we're, we're we're suing Trump, we're not suing. Conservative Republicans and but what this tells me is they want they have created a cloud over the head of Trump and they just want to extend that cloud as long as possible. And then what we're going to have probably after the midterms is them saying. Where there we can't sue, there are no facts that suggest that that it was intentional hiding those documents. So we will cancel all charges. DOJ bans officials from all partisan political events amid allegations of bias. That's the deal they're trying to hide their bias. Too little, too late. And anyways, I'm not worried about FBI agents cheering Hillary Clinton and being at the Democrat Convention and. Yeah, I love you, Hilary. That that is my last concern. The problem is the inherent bias

that they put in their work. The the problem is that. By banning them to participate to political events, you're making the bias an even more hidden thing. You are now asking the Democrat agents within the DOJ and FBI. To be acting in the dark, which is what they love to do anyways. So this won't resolve anything the the the inherent bias of these of this intelligence and legal community will pursue will be pursued, but it will be pursued away from public eyes. And with our boss, as liberalism is a mental disorder, California is poised to phase out sales of new gas powered cars August 25. On August 31st, California Power Grid declares Flex alert urges residents not to charge electric vehicles. Bravo, California. You have demonstrated. The unsustainability of getting everyone on electric cars when we can't even afford to charge. When one person of people on electric cars, Can you imagine if everyone had an electric car, were already shutting down electrical networks across? And we're saying to people you can't charge your electric car. Imagine when everyone has an electric car. Biden administration has drained the US strategic petroleum reserves with lowest levels since 1984. Holy ****, I'm born in 1984. 1984. The Petroleum Reserve of the US grows, grows here and then Biden comes in and says everything. That's why gasoline has a couple of Suns less on my. On my bill. But what will happen when the this petroleum reserve runs out? We're gonna be back to big prices. In 2024, Los Angeles will vote on forcing. Hotels to house the homeless. So they will make a system. Where anyone operating in hotel? By something like by 2:00 PM. By 2:00 PM. Must send a notice to the government. Saying how many rooms are available at the hotel that night. And then the government will designate a bunch of homeless people to go fill this hotel room. And the hotel will be bound by that to accept on the civil penalty of \$500.00 for each day that each individual or family was unlawfully denied lodging. And the government will develop a measure that they call fair market rate. The hotel will have to accept the amount determined by the government to be the fair payment for this night of hosting a homeless. This would go wrong in so many ways as far as the fact that. Homeless, homeless people. Some of them are are out there because they have chosen so some of them are out there because they have mental disorder. Some of them are out there and are unable to live in society. They will come to room. Some of them will come to ruin the hotels. The experience for the other guests. Some of them may destroy and and cause criminality problems within the hotel. And on top of it? Who knows what the government will determine is the fair market right? And this is different for every hotel. There's a bunch of hotels who maybe would be happy to get \$85 a night, but there are some hotels who just cannot sustain themselves at \$85 a night. Especially not if you get the 85 and you get all of the problems associated with homelessness to deal with. And so hopefully I mean, hopefully I don't care what happens to. California and LA. Hopefully California gets what they deserve and what they vote for. Mama Jeff says there's going to be. The prediction of Mama Jeff has been censored. Oh my God it's not. Going well for Alec Baldwin. Not only is the on the hook for potentially killing someone with a gun that. Police say he may have fired. He may have pulled the trigger, but now he gets sued because of a social media post he did about a fallen

marine from the Afghanistan withdrawal. And somehow, Alec Baldwin baked into the history of this fallen marine and found out that his sister. Was an insurrectionist who had participated to some protest on January 6. It's not going well for Alec. This guy will have \$0.00. Uh coming soon? Avoid charging electric vehicles. California grid operator warns of blackouts or just energy conservation. So now you have not only were you highly pressured in buying these electric vehicles. But on top of it, you cannot use them because you can't charge because we ask you to care about. We ask you to care about the environment you care about the environment because you've bought an electric vehicle. We're going to ask you to care a little more and not charge your electric vehicle. Is that an electric vehicle at this point? Can it be fairly called a vehicle? If you can't use it to do transportation. EU declares energy crisis emergency. the US will not be immune, European Commission President Ursula von Derlein declares an emergency energy emergency. The crisis will not be contained to Europe. Skyrocketing prices, blah blah blah. Yeah, we know it's a problem, but it's a problem that. You guys have caught. Bring back Trump, bring back. Bring back fairness and bring back openness to development and you're not going to have these problems. There's going to be companies wanting to pump you. And also you know, stop the oppression of Russia. If you resolve all that I've just said in the last 30 seconds, if you do all this, the fuel price will be back to its normal. Someone shared this on the discard Gorbachev, the last leader of. Of the Soviet empire. Uh was featured in a Pizza Hut commercial. I didn't know this. It's very weird. I don't understand what's the context of this. What's the context of this? TV spot for Pizza Hut involving Gorbachev. So that's Gorbachev. Is going to a Pizza Hut. And then people in the restaurant are starting to argue politically.

If there's anyone, that's what you just claimed is stabilized.

So they are going around. We have freedom because of them. We have instability because of him. It's basically a discussion between a young capitalist revolutionary in Russia and a whole the more conservative. And then eventually the whole conflict is resolved by. The woman who says. Because of him, we have pizza. So they're saying. We have pizza because he he led to the fall of the Soviet empire. Therefore capitalism was able to enter Russia. Therefore, we now have pizza because of Gorbachev that that's what I can understand. But I I mean, I can't imagine this happening today with corporations being so careful. I I think they wouldn't take the risk of having a figure. That has led. An empire in one of their commercials. Big tech firms. Farm runs pro migrant tie up in Poland. Google subsidiary Jigsaw will blanket the nation with psychological ads meant to inoculate them against patriotism. Well, hopefully this kind of **** will not penetrate. Hopefully when the more you go east and Europe, the more you will have a cultural resistance. I don't know that it is the case, but I hope. That you'll get some kind of cultural resistance that will reject the wokeness, but they may succeed. Who knows if they really invest much money and. It seems to be the next target. You know, all these countries in Eastern Europe, it seems to be the next target of the globalist to make them. To put the their migration policy in

their throat against their will. Hopefully they don't repeat the errors of America and of Western Europe. That was it for tonight, boys. Uh, I was happy. To speak with all of your authorities, Star Wars on entropy was saying you're still in Canada. Or did you leave? I'm still in Canada, but I have left for a very distant region and. We live, me and Mama JF a secluded lifestyle. A family lifestyle away from civilization, away from big cities, which is why like. Like yesterday and today, we had to go to offices and fill out forms and papers. And for this we have to drive many hours because we live. Distantly, from any. Big corporations and any big governmental agencies, and we really love life here. So yes, we live in the northern Canada in an undisclosed location. And we are facing the strong winters, but they are so much more pleasant to deal with than. Governmental agencies and the civilization and the people and the neighbors and. It's such so preferable to know what you're fighting against, because when you're fighting against leftism and hateful neighbors and people who want to know everything and control everything about your life and your land, you don't know what you're fighting against. They will change. They will use all the most vicious tactic. But when you fight against the cold of the winter and the forces of nature. Then you know what you're fighting against, and it's much easier to live than much love. See you all tomorrow.

Links used in the show

- MicroStrategy Sued by DC Attorney General for Tax Fraud
- Ted K (2021) - IMDb
- TKZ_WH.pdf
- Guild on Gab: 'Another fake 'Americans are racist' story.
- Police Report, Student Interviews Confirm Rachel Richardson Lied About Being Called Racial Slurs During BYU-Duke Volleyball Game, Innocent Man Banned By Administrators - TB Daily News
- BIG TECH RAMPS UP PURGE OF THE TRUTH: Google Just Removed World Net Daily, The First Online Conservative News Site, From Its Search Engine - LOOK What Happens When You Click On WND From Google's Search Engine
- Purge of the truth: Media stunned by Google's vicious action against WND
- Western Allies Led By UK's Johnson Sabotaged Tentative Ukraine-Russia Peace Deal... In April - ZeroHedge
- Trudeau gov't to give \$100 million to LGBT groups across Canada - LifeSite
- @realDonaldTrump - Truth Social

- Blompf2020 on Gab: 'â€'
- (16) What is the evolutionary significance of meiosis? - Quora
- DOJ 'Likely' To Wait Past Midterms To Reveal Any Trump Charges - ZeroHedge
- DoJ Bans Officials From All "Partisan Political Events" Amid Allegations Of Bias - ZeroHedge
- Takeaways from the historic Justice Department court filing on the Mar-a-Lago search - CNNPolitics
- Andrew Torba âœ\x9Di, \x8F on Gab: 'Liberalism is a mental disorderâ€'
- Disclose.tv on Gab: 'NEW - Biden administration has drained the U.S. Stâ€'
- In 2024, Los Angeles Will Vote On Forcing Hotels To House The Homeless - ZeroHedge
- Family of fallen Marine sues Alec Baldwin for social post accusing his sister of being an 'insurrectionist' - Fox News
- "Avoid Charging EVs": California Grid Operator Warns Of Blackouts, Urges Energy Conservation - ZeroHedge
- EU Declares Energy Crisis 'Emergency', The US Will Not Be Immune - ZeroHedge
- (1) Pizza Hut Gorbachev TV Spot Commercial :60 International version - YouTube
- ADL-Led Big Tech Firm Runs Pro-Migrant PsyOp in Poland - National File

Why was Ted Kaczynski one of the most insightful thinkers by JF

Source

Now we need to talk about a big event of the news. Ted Kaczynski has died, and Oh my God, at the same time, a beautiful picture of Evila Vlaardingen Gerbron. She says it's time for another unvaccinated chemical sunscreen free. See the all disrespecting sun dress wearing white girl summer. Holy **** is ever beautiful. I mean, it is unbelievable. And what's so unbelievable? Is that a woman of this beauty? Is basically the ideological child of Ted Kaczynski. Holy ****. Ever. Is really the most beautiful woman right now in the world because she combines the resistance against technology, technocracy, medical authoritarianism, and on top of it, she's the top true Stacy

10 out of 10 guaranteed. But Ted Kaczynski is dead, and so she now is the leader, effectively the leader of the resistance against technology. On the public space, Ted Kaczynski was a genius, someone who wrote something that was extremely visionary, and it's so unfortunate that every time. Instead of engaging really with its proper predictions about leftists and what the world would become. People always feel the need to start with. But he was a horrible man because he sent those bombs. But here he is being extremely correct in predicting something like Twitter's trust and safety, and how, ultimately, the leftists have no stable positions across history. They will just be against something as long as it's not controlled by them. They will be. For it, once they obtain control of it. Harry was writing some leftists may seem to oppose technology. But they will oppose it only so long as they are outsiders and the technological system is controlled by non leftists. If leftism ever becomes dominant in society, so that the technological system becomes a tool in the hands of leftists, they will enthusiastically use it and promote its growth. And doing this they will be repeating a pattern that leftism has shown again and again in the. When the Bolsheviks and Russia were outsiders, they vigorously opposed censorship and the secret police. They advocated self-determination for ethnic minorities and so forth. But as soon as they came into power themselves, they imposed A tighter censorship and created a more ruthless. Than any that had existed under the Tsars and they oppressed ethnic minorities at least as much as the Tsar had done in the United States a couple of decades ago, when leftists were a minority in our universities, leftist professors were vigorous proponents of academic freedom. But today, in those of our universities where leftists have become dominant, they have shown themselves ready to take away from everyone else's academic freedom. This is political correctness. The same will happen with leftist and technology. They will use it to oppress everyone else if they ever get it under their own control. Stunning. Accurate prediction. And is is manifesto is filled with proper insight into. The increased dependence, the relationship of dependence that happens between societies and technology, and how technology is constantly making advances and also a proper understanding of the leftist hypersocial mind. This kind of leftist to seeks approval. You know, social cancellation is the greatest. Possible harm that can come to someone that is exactly the hell in which we live. The hell in which we live was properly predicted by a man who was living in a much less advanced society. Like much of these things are not developed to the extent that we know today. But you could see it from just the tip of the iceberg. That's what makes him in my view. A really great thinker. The Unabomber manifesto, Ted Kaczynski's IQ 167, Harvard admission at 15 years old, youngest ever met Professor at 25, money spent by the FBI to find him \$50 million or more. The manifesto attacks modern civilization like nothing else. Before or since 14 best insights from a philosopher theorist. Kaczynski lists the four big problems with modern civilization, excessive density of population isolation of men from nature, excessive rapidity of social change, the breakdown of natural small scale communities such as the extended family, the village, the tribe. The big difference between the primitive civilization and our contemporary world is that before individuals had a lot

of autonomy while the state was largely powerless to penetrate into the everyday life of people. Kaczynski argues that modern tech suddenly flips this balance. The balance of power between individuals and the larger system flipped when machines made much of human labor obsolete, while simultaneously allowing Big Corp and big government to observe, track, exclude social media bands, stripping away bank accounts. Anyone being naughty? The Industrial Revolution has radically altered men's environment. It is to be expected that as technology is increasingly applied to the human body and mind, man himself will be altered as radically as his environment and way of life have been. With robots doing most work, will people find work in service industries? Kaczynski says no. People will reject the pointless, busy work of driving each other around, making handicraft waiting on tap. And embrace dangerous outlets, drugs, crime cults, hate groups. Kaczynski against Leftism is states. Leftism is, in the long run and consistent with wild nature, with human freedom and with the elimination of modern technology. Leftism is collectivist. It seeks to bind together the entire world. Both nature and the human race into a unified whole. Kaczynski devotes a large chunk of his manifesto attacking leftism, but in a powerful paragraph he argues that the Conservatives are fools, too. They whine about the decay of traditional values, yet they enthusiastically support technological progress and economic growth. Apparently, it never occurs to them that you can't make rapid, drastic changes in the technology and the economy of a society without causing rapid changes in all other aspects of the society as well. And that such rapid changes inevitably break down traditional values. The system knowingly destroys intimate bonds between people because it wants to soak up all the loyalty and energy of individuals of it for itself, Kaczynski writes. The Technological society has too weakened family ties and local communities if it is to function. A democracy with advanced tech is less free than a dictatorship with primitive technology. A low tech society has no rapid long distance communications, no surveillance cameras, no dossier of information about the lives of average citizens. It is easier to. Throne can we go back to small scale communities? Kaczynski says no, because we are enmeshed with and dependent on large scale systems like Public Utilities, computer networks, highway systems, the mass communications media, and the modern healthcare system. Those were just some of the great insights of Ted Kaczynski. Ted Kaczynski also succumbing the problem of genetic modifications, the problem that we were headed toward a world where people leftist in particular, would want to change the. Human body change. Human evolution. And that we would become dependent on these technologies in the same way we became dependent on anything else that helped us. So a great thinker. Who knew that the way in which these technologies set up in society is by by rewarding by rewarding those who use it by excluding those who don't use it, and eventually you end up having an influence on human evolution, a selection system that. Favors only the growth and the expansion of the use of technology. So, having realized how this dependency is set up for a life in a cabin where he didn't want to be. Help didn't want to be in contact with much people and wanted to work on his own things and eventually started sending bombs to people who are

involved in some kind of technological progress. As a kind of way to stop the to seed chaos, to stop the walk forward of society toward the inevitable technological end of it. Just to show you the insight of this guy as a last comment on this. This guy was potentially the victim of this kind of tendency of psychiatry that we see today that's trying to convince people into sex change surgeries and self sterilization. And not only did he see the ***** coming. But he was clever enough to test the system to see if he could mislead the psychiatrist and to. Trying to change this sex and he made an experimentation. Starting from an initial problem that he suffered from, which is that he was a self exciting around the idea of being a woman, but in the way not so much. A gender dysphoria leads you to do, but more on the side. Of self stimulation and, erratically fantasizing about the body of a woman. how Jordan Peterson recently said that there are different types of trends? Some of them really feel that they are a woman, some of them are just excited at the idea of touching the body of a woman and therefore, if they were a woman, they could touch themselves. Amazingly, Ted Kaczynski. Was an autogenic philic fetishist for some instance for some moment in his life. It says in the summer after, well, it's written that after in the summer after his fourth year, he describes experiencing a period of several weeks where he was sexually excited nearly all the time and was fantasizing himself as a woman and being unable to obtain. People to be forever and to those who reject minds like Ted Kaczynski. I say you may be the cause of future violence.

The Philosophy of Ted Kaczynski by Keith

Keith Woods

21K views

Streamed 4 days ago

50.9K subscribers

A look at the life and thought of Ted Kaczynski.

Source

And as promised, today we're going to be talking about Ted Kaczynski. So I'm sure she followed the news at all. You thought this was the week, Ted? Finally kicked the bucket. And I've actually been planning to do something like this for a while. Also, it was interesting. I mean I got a little. Bit of a phase of all that kind of stuff, like some people in. The chat were like, oh, I hope he's actually read the manifesto and all this kind of thing. It's like manifest. So I've read the chat hag book on Ted. OK, alright, I've got the deep lore actually interviewed Chad hag before. He's like the best. Talks writes about this stuff, but yeah, I used to be very interested in the anti texts of Jackal. all the related sort of intellectual schools around that peak oil, all

that kind of stuff. John Michael Greer. But as all when Ted died, there was this big reaction. This is going around a lot on on Twitter. It was actually Twitter responded to her. So I do this stream where. People were like ohh you know. the the the lip tires like this without Ted Kaczynski because he did violence. But no one can prove him wrong. And there's this. This seems to be like the take everyone settled on that Ted Kaczynski. You know, he might have gone too far in a few places, but he's basically correct and no one can ever prove this incredible critique yet. On and I have been thinking of doing a video like this for a while, like there's a whole and prim side of the distance, right? And you know, I like to formulate content kind of answering a question like. The basic questions are sometimes people don't interrogate that are actually very important to these kinds of things. Why not just stay in improvement of condition? Right? So yeah, I saw the reaction to this. And I'm like, these people, they have very contradictory ideas. Like there's people that were in my chat in the build up to saying that they're never going to watch my channel again, devastated. And someone said it was anti white to disagree with Ted Kaczynski, which? Is kind of. Funny, but owning. Any of these people are consistent because they're probably also like nationalists that support nationalist political movements, which is definitely something Kaczynski didn't support. you can't have Ted Kaczynski's ideas and hold a lot of the things that do this and write does, right? I know people like to kind of splice thinkers together, these kinds of meme thinkers you get in the this and right, a little bit of Julius have a little bit of. Tech Kaczynski does, really. Work like that. And I do think Kaczynski had some very good insights, which I'm going to go over, and this is going to be. Pretty in depth what I'm going to cover. The aspect of his manifesto, his critiques to the left, his take on technology. The whole like basis of his worldview going to interrogate how he justifies aspects of it. And then I'm going to look at, well, I think he got right. And well, I think he got wrong. If anything, I mean if the if the final take to come out of all of this is that well, the distant right just can't literally can't like argue against this Luddite that advocated. A violent political revolution and they have no justification for high civilization. I think that's kind of a problem, but like I said, I don't think the people that are Kaczynski, it's on on Twitter and online are very serious because it's not anything he advocated. He didn't advocate creating an online subculture around his ideas or something we already advocated. But that's, for that I'm going to get into this. You can of course send super chats, so read at the end I'm thinking about a new format, I think maybe. I like to do these videos, some of the slides, some of the presentations, a bit more research. I did a lot of research for this one. I'm thinking maybe like I'll combine the video production and the the live streams and that if I stream these presentations and then take super shots, maybe I can like re upload the presentation on its. Or maybe I'll just leave the whole stream up, but I'm thinking maybe something like that. You know, maybe I'll start streaming off YouTube and then I'll just upload the presentation after. But yeah, let me know what you think of this format and you know, maybe we'll do more of it going forward. So this is. Before we start, this is the these are the sources I'm

going to be using. Obviously, industrial society and its future, it's Kosinski's manifesto. So technological slavery is a book of his collected writings. It has his manifesto in it, but also. Letters that he wrote from prison, he had a lot of exchanges with David Sirina, who's another anti-tech philosopher. Chad Hagg, the philosophy of Ted Kaczynski mentioned him already. Chad Hagg is very into anti-tech ideas. He has a lot of videos on Ted Kaczynski on his YouTube channel. He has this book. He has other books about peak oil, about the effects of peak oil, industrial civilization on memes and on intellectual. Very interesting thinker. Kind of comes out from like kind of has a similar approach to me in terms of, using these platforms to, present ideas from thinkers of outside the mainstream. And I did. You did a live stream. You said you'd be watching this, so hopefully I don't. I don't do too bad a job. The math, physics of technology by David Scrubbing who I mentioned a lot of correspondence with Ted Kaczynski and Kaczynski's in prison. You may have seen them seen him around these kinds of circles of the Internet because he also has a book on. Like arguing for Jesus mythicism not even Methodism, but basically, an outright hoax arguing that Saint Paul's kind of effect Christianity. So he writes on some topics for you outside the mainstream as well. But he wrote this one, the metaphysics of technology. And trying to kind of create a deeper critique of technology from that kind of Kaczynski perspective. And he covers Kaczynski in a chapter 2 in that. And like I said, he has correspondences with Kaczynski as well, which illuminate. A lot of Kaczynski's ideas, and on that one in the top right is the Unabomber, and the origins of anti-tech radicalism, which is a paper written by a guy called Sean Fleming. And that's interesting because it gets into what inspired Kaczynski, which isn't often discussed. I'll get into why that is, but. We do see him as a very original thinker, right? People think his critique of the left and his idea of the power process and all this, that he's a super original thinker. It's actually it's. A little bit more complicated. You create a lot of ideas and kind of. Reward them, but we'll get into that. But that's an interesting paper for background and work as Kaczynski was coming from that you've missed otherwise. Who was Ted Kaczynski, right. While he was a certified genius? Measured IQ of 167. I think he was measured at that when he was a teenager, when he was in jail, they did another test on him that tested at 135, I think. But he entered Harvard at 15. He completed a PhD in mathematics, became a professor. The year wasn't really rated as a professor, wasn't popular with the students, he just tended to read from mathematics. Books, didn't really engage with the students. Seems like through his youth he was extremely introverted, suffered with depression and. Very avoidant personality. When they did the psychological examination of and that was one of the things the psychologist thought was that he had. That he was kind of borderline avoidant personality. But he retired in 1969, kind of spontaneously. No one was expecting this, just decided to retire and live in a cabin in the woods that I believe he built with his brother in Montana. And of course, he began his bombing campaign would become known as the Unabomber. 78 He posted the first one to university professor later businessman corporate executives. The first person he killed was a computer store owner. There was also an executive

of a timber company. I think, I believe another one as well. And in 1995, because Kaczynski centers manifesto. Industrial society and future to New York Times and the Washington Post for publication, he promised to stop his bombing campaign if this was published. And the FBI told them to publish it and then sent out a request for tips based on the writing. And his brother actually recognized the prose style, thought it was Ted and handed him into the FBI. And of course they got a warrant and found that he had already made bomb in his home and thousands of pages of writing where he outlined his beliefs. And he was arrested in 1996, but he continued to write about his ideas on anti tech from prison, obviously for. The kind of mainstream narrative on Kaczynski that's where the story ends is he has a killing spree and he gets. But he did continue to write extensively and develop his ideas, but the core idea has never changed. Of course, if you read industrial society and. Future you have a. Pretty solid idea of his whole worldview. Now of course, a lot of people have been talking about this since his death. Kaczynski and his relationship with MK Ultra in his first year. However, Kaczynski was recruited to a psychological experiment that would last for years, and it was headed by former OSS employee Henry Murray. The USS, of course, was the precursor to the CIA. Every week, someone would make Kaczynski to verbally abuse him. The experiment was part of the CIA's clandestine illegal program, MK Ultra, aimed at finding ways to brainwash and psychologically break people under interrogation. At least that was the stated purpose of MK. Ultra there's all sorts of speculation about the real purpose. Was it to? Trained assassins like the one that killed Robert F Kennedy that had no memory of any of the event has a lot of strange political assassinations in that time. But I know we know this was happening. We know there was very unethical experiments going on and Kaczynski was one of the victims. Now, according to the psychological evaluation. The young Kaczynski had persistent and intense sexual fantasies, but being a woman in 1967, he went to psychiatrist to discuss the sex change operation. But he changed his mind while he was in the waiting room. This is one of the things that came out of his psychological evaluation when he was arrested. Obviously there's a question of if he. Was sane to stand trial and this female psychologist who whose name I'm forgetting right now, did this very in depth report on him. She interviewed him for 22 hours, got him to do one of these MPI tests. Her conclusion was that he was a paranoid schizophrenic and that he had paranoid personality disorder, but he was not insane. Which might sound like a contradiction, but essentially that he had these paranoid delusions, but he knew the difference between right and wrong. His actions were wrong, so therefore he could be competent. Central other people have analyzed that report and analyzed Kaczynski. There's another kind of feminist forensic psychologist that concluded he. Wasn't a paranoid schizophrenic, but that he had schizoid personality disorder. Either way, in his 20s he was extremely introverted, suffered a lot with depression and anxiety. Also, according to the psychologist, had signs of avoidant personality disorder, which is, a tendency to be extremely sensitive to criticism and to. Interactions with people and that's a pattern that seems to be there in his in his 20s and 30s, based on the her basis

for the paranoid delusions was that he came to believe that his family members were plotting against him at a young age. And that he was being controlled by technology. Now, Kaczynski wrote from prison multiple times that this was. Kind of politically motivated that he was not schizophrenic and that a couple of other psychologists had analyzed the same results and found. That he was saying he didn't obviously score higher in a lot of these things. Like, avoidance and he obviously battled depression and so on. And he had. This was it autogynephilia, where he had fantasies about himself as a woman, considered speaking to therapists, but changed his mind, but certain. A somewhat disturbed individual in his early life. You know, kind of reminiscent of John Nash and or very talented mathematician. But yeah, there's there's a lot of speculation. To what extent was he? Was he motivated by these things? To what extent was he? Was he thinking clearly? I think if you read his right and I mean he, he certainly makes a very rational case. So I definitely wouldn't write anything off from Kaczynski based on these psychological reports, that's for sure.

Kaczynski's Arguments

Now Kaczynski's argument. Very simply, I took this from the metaphysics of technology by scrubbing a because this is a good summary, humans evolved under primitive low tech conditions, and it is these conditions which we are genetically and psychologically best suited. Modern society is radically different than our natural state and thus imposes unprecedented stress on us. The stress will increase in the coming years as technology advances, and therefore we will have to adapt. Therefore, we will have to take increasingly drastic measures to adapt to it. Measures that will include genetic, physiological and psychological manipulation, and #4. There is no way to reform the technological system so as to avoid such a dehumanizing. Outcome, which obviously leads to. His radical conclusions about the way forward. Now in the. He outlines the basis. This is really kind of the core basis for his worldviews power process. I've got a little typo there, sorry about that. But humans having an air biological need to engage in the power process, which very simply is expending physical effort working toward goals autonomously. And Kaczynski outlines 4. Components that need to be there in the power process, which is goal and effort expelled to get there, the success and then a feeling of freedom that comes afterwards. And this is for kind of. Simple biological needs, right? Knocking down a coconut or. I don't know. Hunting a hog or. Something right? But. That's how we're satisfied. That's what we're evolved for. We're not evolved to sit watching media content for two hours. We're supposed to be satisfying these basic biological needs, and that's what our. You know, that's what our our system rewards us for and gives us happiness for and that's really the point of happiness. And everything else is is kind of downstream of that basic biological programming. We're not just satisfied by the object of desire, but by the process of attaining it. A man who could have anything he wanted on command would be deeply unhappy. Blaise Pascal talked about this. And his writings about sort of human condition and happiness, like the

gambler would not be happy if you just gave him the day's winnings at the start of the day. He wants the process of having to strive for those winnings. He wants the feeling of success about competing the other players and so on. Basically what he wants is to partake in the power process. And Kaczynski makes a similar. Analogy when he talks about leisured aristocrats versus martial aristocrats, he says that history shows that leisure aristocrats tend to become decadent. This is not true for fighting aristocracies that have struggled to maintain their power but later to secure aristocracies that have no need to exert themselves, usually become bored, hedonistic and demoralized, even though. They have power. This shows that power is not enough. One must have goals toward which to exercise one's power. So, like I said, this is really foundational to his worldview because. One thing about Kaczynski is he's very popular with. Obviously, people that have this kind of. Deep green tendency, ecological concerns, and that's what you find on kind of the radical right is you. Find people that are sort of. What would you say like Pagan and outlook or or even have a kind of, a more spiritual like panties view of nature and abhor the desacralization of nature that's brought about by industrialism and the modern world? That wasn't Kaczynski's critique, right? Kaczynski is very much human focused. Nor is manifest. So is he. Is he making some kind of deep ecological critique he's talking about? The inherent value of diversity of life and so on. I I'm sure this obviously entered as a concern to him. People say he decided to take the radical actions he did when he saw that a road he regularly walked on, or sorry, a path he regularly walked on was having a road built on it that that kind of pushed him over the edge. UM, but in terms of his critique of technological society, it's quite utilitarian. Actually, it's not this spiritual or desacralized nature kind of thing. It's this is how humans are adapted and programmed for happiness. This is how technological civilization undoes that, and this is the process that's going in that's going to make this worse and cause more suffering, and therefore we need to turn to primitive state. So it's a pretty human focused critique, which is not something you see that much in these kinds of deep green circles now related to the power process is surrogate activities due to technology. The effort to satisfy biological needs has been reduced to triviality, but despite the lies of comfort provided by technology. We still having that need to feel like we are engaging in the power process. The system that's term he likes to use rather than, liberalism or capitalism or any of this, it's just as a broader technological system provides harmless surrogate activities to satisfy this need instead of working to find food, which here for football team or study marine biology. And that's kind of important as well. I know people here, surrogate activities from Kaczynski. And I think he just means like I don't know. Star Wars figurines or something, but really includes everything like philosophy. He uses the example of marine biology. When he talk, I think he was talking about the Emperor of Japan. But yeah, any any of these intellectual activities? I mean, Kaczynski was a mathematician and I think you would even consider mathematics A surrogate activity. Any of these. Intellectual pursuits that are not immediately related to satisfying biological urges, he says. We use the term surrogate activity to designate an activity that is directed toward an

artificial goal that people set up for themselves merely in order to have some goal to work toward. Or let us say merely for the sake of the fulfillment that they get from pursuing the goal. Leftist psychology this is obviously. One of the things Kaczynski is most popular for in the radical right. His critique of the left, which is quite on point, and there is a little bit of originality here that's very insightful from Kaczynski. He offers leftist activism itself as an example of a surrogate activity, and from leftism isn't a set of political beliefs so much as a psychological type with identifiable traits. These threats include over socialization and feelings of inferiority, Kaczynski says. Deep inside, the leftist feels like a loser. And anytime Kaczynski talks about leftism in his right hands, he is talked about a certain type of people. You know, he's talking about keeping leftists out of the anti tech movement. He's never he never lets it to any belief, anti capitalism, anything else. It is like a morphological type. But the two? Key aspects of left of psychology are feelings of inferiority and over socialization. Let's break them down. Feelings of inferiority and the rest Kaczynski includes low self esteem, feelings of powerlessness, depressive tendencies, defeatism, guilt, self hatred. It's no coincidence that left us identify most with the groups who are considered inferior in some way. In fact, leftists themselves actually consider these minority groups inferior, which is why they identify with them. He says leftist tend to hurt anything that has an image of being strong, good and successful. They hate America, they hate Western civilization. They had white males. They had rationality. So the left is superior, the left is hatred of superiority actually extends to denying the validity of IQ tests, mental illness, and even rationality itself because. If you accept the existence of truth that employs an inferior side, which would be untruth. So I think this is a pretty apt observation by Kaczynski that they're just constantly at war with hierarchy, he says. In in one of his one of his essays. You know, if the left has got every demand they want, if you ask the leftists, what do you want to see implemented in the next two years? And you just gave them everything they wanted, right? All of the redistribution, all of the social justice and so on. He said nothing would really change in terms of their activism because they would just find something else to attack. They'd find something else to destroy because they have this psychological urge. There's no end point. There's no ultimate ideological goal of the left is, they. As we focused on economic justice and the working class, and that was the. Kind of skin suit they wore. And now it's. About racial justice and LGBT. And then it became about transgender rights and so on. So it's this constant need to engage in the power process. Ultimately, that sends them on this. Jase and uses leftism as a means of expressing their desire for power, which we'll get into a little bit more here. But the other aspect is over socialization. Now socialization is the way people are trying to behave and think in a way that fits in with society. Right. Obviously you socialize children to, respect their elders and have manners and so on. And one way we do this is true shame. But of course, in some cases this goes a little. Bit too far. And the child internalizes the shame, and they become ashamed of themselves rather than their actions. Now, the psychological leash of being over socialized results and feelings of powerlessness and self hate. Leftists are

over socialized. They deprive themselves of freedom by over assimilating to the system, but this creates a need to identify with an ideology that embodies the agency they have denounced. The over socialized leftists has a need to assert their autonomy by rebelling, but they cannot challenge the most basic values of society. Thus, they tend to do exactly what society demands, even if they claim radical opposition to the system. Again, this is a good insight. But yeah, essentially these people, they have related to his feelings of powerlessness and feelings of shame they have. Internalize these feelings of shame. They're very kind of married to the system values, but they still need to participate in the power process some way, and if anything, they have a greater desire to. Participate in something that's like tangible and powerful and aggressive and like symbolically powerful precisely because they've divided. Denied it at that individual level. So it is a kind of cope. It is a kind. Of compensation leftist radicals, then it's no surprise, tend to come from the bourgeoisie rather than the working class. They advocate for things like race and gender equality, pacifism, freedom of expression or values, which the system itself encourages. Kaczynski uses that as kind of. Validation for his theory, right. You would expect these people to be. Very much kind of wedded to the system and that they've they've internalized values system so much and you know, lo and behold, it is these kind of privileged that's SJW types that that engage in this. Is insight about their, their feelings of superiority over the groups to advocate for is, is, is interesting as well. I'll get into that a little bit in, in a couple of slides, right, but you? Know basically they secretly or maybe subconsciously, see some of these groups that they're advocating for as. Inferior, even if they would never admit it. You know, they maybe see some of these racial groups that advocate for us is less intelligent and so on. But that's actually why they advocate for it, even though they'll claim equal. Ability they are identifying with the inferiority and they kind of want to act out against the norms or values that would enforce that distinction, right. Even though they kind of know it. On a deep level. People are spamming in the chat, Jeff Gary Eppie Jeff can do responses. I'll watch it and I might do response to him as well. But if you're just going to like spam, my chat people should just you should just ban people. Honestly, I get free rent to ban whoever you want my mods. So this is the systems need as trick. Because leftists are too over socialized. Really challenge the values of the system. Most leftist demands are simply demanding the system be true through its own values. For example, the system doesn't want religion, racism, or other prejudices. Get in the way of assimilating new workers into the techno industrial. Some and all leftists do actually, is make the desire for equality explicit, and they work to realize that through their pseudo rebellion my left is push for affirmative action, for moving black people into high perceived jobs for improved education in black schools, and more money for such schools the way of life of the black underclass they regard. And social disgrace, they want to integrate the black man into the system, make him a business executive, a lawyer, a scientist, just like upper middle class white people. Achieving total political control through revolution and dismantling technological societies. Incompatible since this kind of political control is only possible with technology.

Due to lapse of psychology, they could not be trusted to dismantle the system, even if they did gain control. Now we see there's plenty of examples of this today, and since Ted wrote this. I mean, this is just kind of a common thing on on the right now, right? And even in the center to point out how the left kind of reinforces the values of the oligarchs, right. And, it is the ridiculousness of the SJW's claiming that. You know, capitalist oligarchs are somehow like conservative Christian, like stuffy Christians that want like some kind of fascist closed borders dictatorship. And so they go out and they advocate for equality, and they advocate for absolute feminism, where, women can be in the workplace and open borders where there'll be masses of of, of migrants to lower wages and among the native workforce. And they see this as rebellion. And Kaczynski's claim is simply that all of these forms of pseudo rebellion. They're basically based on integrated people more deeply into the technological system, right? The leftist wants to enforce human rights. They want to enforce equality, they don't want. Any corner of the world to have sort of backward, bigoted beliefs that the now LGBT people or other minorities, their rights. And so in this push for equality, this, this sort of noble push for fairness and justice, what they're actually pushing for is to break down these, these divisions, these barriers that exist for the oligarchs to turn everyone into kind of Western consumers that can work long hours and purchase. The junk that the technological system produces. And then ever stop to question if this is a real rebellion against the system, because of course, if deeply internalized these values. He also writes against conservatism. Pretty briefly, he mostly focuses on left of psychology, but he's also scared. You know, conservatives, he says. The Conservatives are fool. They whined about to decay of traditional values, yet they enthusiastically support technological progress and economic growth. Apparently it never occurs then that you can't make rapid, drastic changes in the technology and the economy of this society without causing rapid changes in all other aspects of the society as well. And that's such rapid changes inevitably break down traditional values. I don't think I need to get too much into that. Obviously you can. Think of ample. Conservative that supports technological progress and you can think of the revolutionary effects of things like technological advances like birth control and so on. And of course, is his final conclusion. Is the anti tech revolution right? He advocates an immediate revolution. He has the system. The more the system grows, the greater it will be. The destruction brought about by an eventual collapse. We can't embrace accelerationism because the end technology is accelerating towards is actually the end of our species and the irreversible destruction of the biosphere. This isn't really in the manifesto. What he wrote about this in other writings, he believes. That we're inevitably heading to a future where humans themselves are replaced by machines and we become surplus requirements. Any arguments about reform or about accelerationism? They're kind of mad move, but I mean, it's like you want to accelerate and you think that will bring about the collapse of the system, but actually what you're accelerating towards is people being totally replaced by robots. And then there's no future for us, right? We also can't rely on political revolution. Because political revolutions are directed

against some system, that isn't the base of all of this, which is the technological system, but instead they're directed at some secondary system like capitalism, but not source of the problems. And your aspect of it is if leftists got control because of their psychology, if this was a Marxist revolution or something because of their psychology, they couldn't be trusted to use any of this for good means or to reform it because they're so power hungry. They're so spiteful that if they were the ones in charge. They would just throw away all their principles and just use the power for their own ends to destroy their enemies and to grant to gain greater power and influence for themselves. So there's no hope of any leftist revolution bringing any real change to the system. That's the basis of his worldview, right? Like I said. What's interesting is that. Like Ted's a mathematician. And you can see in the system. Somewhat in in the manifesto, but in his later writings he gets a little bit more into it where he he's trying. He's doing this. He's taking this like pinoza like approach to these problems or like Euclid or something where he starts with few propositions. And he tries to kind of, abstract this into like a. complex system and say right, what's the key components of? This how do they interact? And what are they like? if we kind of put these together an equation, what's the? Endpoint of this. That's the basis for his worldview, right? It's a very kind of scientific approach. It's not really a deep, like spiritual sociological critique. It's like, here's what humans are adapted for. Here's what the system has created. This is the gap between those two things. Therefore, people are going to be happy under the system and you know. Here's what the system is inevitably heading towards based on these principles underlying it, and this will be the endpoint. Therefore, we have to stop it, right? it's very. It's very logical, it's very mathematical and you can see the way he kind of tries to construct that with like as few propositions as possible. On that, it's interesting to look at his influences and how he formulated this. So while the ideas in his manifesto appear as novel insights, they're largely drove from. Tree thinkers, right? There's the French philosopher Jacques Lulu, the British zoologist Desmond Morris, and the American psychologist Martin Seligman. Kaczynski owned annotated copy of the Little The Technological Society and also in the 1996 letter, Kaczynski recommended two books that seemed to give some support to the manifest as assertion about the power process. Desmond Morris, the Human Zoo, and Martin EP Seligman. Hopelessness and depression, development and death. No, this is kind of. This is little discussed in the story of Ted because he didn't really talk about his influences. There's kind of good reason for that, because if he. Had in the manifesto if he had used citations and cited these authors, it would have given more clues to the FBI, especially if using correspondence, sending letters to any of these guys. So he kept that quiet, and you'll also see he changed some of the terminology. A lot of these ideas are kind of adopted directly from these thinkers and he. He adds a new term for it that isn't even that different from the original term. But it's not like conspiracy that he was driven from these sinkers. he references to writing a lot and a letter to scherbina from prison. He also referenced Seligman when he was talking about some of his theories about learned helplessness and over socialization. So yeah, Kaczynski hit us intellectual that's these

authors and inventors on terms for some of their concepts, as you'll see over socialization, power, process, surrogate activities. And so let's take a look at these individually, right. So the most obvious influence on Kaczynski is. Jacqueline's idea of technique and I think Jackall is really the best rider philosopher that tackled the technological question. He obviously had very different conclusions from Kaczynski. Right along was a. Christian kind of a Christian honor. Christ, you certainly opposed to revolutionary activity, especially violent revolutionary activity. But he's best known for his book *Technological Society*, and his basic argument is against you in technology as a neutral tool. Instead, we should think of technique, which is the term he uses as encompassing all the methods and practices created by technology. Well argued that technique was autonomous. Self-perpetuating and had its own deterministic logic that transcends human age. Which we have now surrendered to. And also this logic has certain tendencies like universalism, efficiency and quantification. If you want an example, you can think of right technology advances. You start having air travel, you have airports in different countries. But of course, to make the system work, you have to have similar processes for directing these plans, right? You have to have similar kinds of runways and similar methods that the air traffic controllers use and so on, and similar security procedures. So in that sense you can see how technology which we see as neutral we see is just something we use like Latin and that is certain universalizing processes where we have to adopt universal standards between countries as an example, but also other things as well. I mean the most obvious one is efficiency that technology Nexus. Start to think in terms of efficiency. Technology is obviously constantly perpetuating itself towards more and more efficiency and this kind of. It's like a reverse feedback on our own minds where we start to view everything. Technically, Heidegger made similar kinds of critiques right where we begin to see everything as new resources be extracted, we start to see the forests as. Stand in reserve and there's a passage that Kaczynski cross referenced. That was annotated in his in his copy of the *Technological Society*. Well, this is the human abilities in this strange new environment and attention demanded of him was heavily in his life and being he seeks to flee and tumbles into the snares of dreams, he tries to employ and falls into the life of organizations he feels maladjusted and becomes a hypochondriac. That's obviously key to Kaczynski's worldview, right the maladaptation. The mild option between the way we live and technology and what we're programmed for biologically. Obviously Kaczynski's a little bit different from a little. Alola's writing this very much from a sociological perspective. He doesn't have this sort of evolutionary biological inside. That's not the way he's looking at this. He's looking at this much more from his perspective as a Christian diagnosing these problems, but you can see obviously, the basis for Kaczynski's critique there, which you would build on. A little critique of radicalism. Now, interestingly, people tend to see Kaczynski's critique of the left as like his most novel insight, right that say well. Of course, Jacqueline, we're about technological society and. So on but. You know, Kaczynski's critique of leftism is very original, and a lot of it is, to be fair. But this is also influenced by a little because in another passage because Kaczynski cross

referenced a little argued that none of the intellectual movements of the 20th century, whether that was communism, pacifism, realism, anarchism. And had, in his words, achieved their own goals of recreating the conditions of Freedom and Justice. However, they have been successful in pulling the teeth of aggressive instincts and in integrating them into the technical society. So obviously you can see the basis for Kaczynski's idea of the systems needed trick is is also there. In a little. But they diverge in that little roots's explanation. That should be your way around. Kaczynski diverged from all and reading his explanation in biological rather than sociological study. He also differs from the law and arguing for a violent revolution of minority a lower Christian condemned revolutionary activity, and he advocated a return to contemplation. A low rights that it would present vital breach in the technological society for truly revolutionary attitude of contemplation could replace frantic acts. So solution as a question is for individuals to return to Christ, return to your contemplation, and he had his own critiques of minoritarian activism of the kind that Kaczynski supported. All was very much against the idea of minority Vanguard. Leading the revolution. Used very against any kind of political terrorism. So I said, Kaczynski takes a little, but he kind of switches from the sociological critique of him towards a more biologically rooted critique. And basically he adds to a little with. Morris was a zoologist best known for writing the naked ape and the Human Zoo, the latter of which influenced Kaczynski. I quoted him in a previous slide where he recommended that book if someone wanted to understand the manifest. So, Kaczynski adds Morris's evolutionary insights to Ella's sociological analysis, Morris Rd. Behavior exhibited by animals and zoos removed from what he called the stimulus struggle. So that's the. 1st place we see one of Kaczynski's concepts in a previous thinker. This is what Kaczynski calls the power process. Because these species have evolved nervous systems that abhorrent activity. They have to find ways of maintaining a certain level of simulation, even when all of their other needs have been satisfied by the zookeepers. Otherwise they will become bored and listless and eventually neurotic. Morris wrote about the behavior of these animals that they harass spectators that they over groomed themselves. They do all these kinds of surrogate activities when they're removed from from the stimulus struggle. Morris argued that we see a similar situation in urban urban zoos, but which means cities, of course, where people are overcrowded, they have all their survival needs met and they can't express their territorial nature. And of course. Bunch of other ways people's biological essence is denied in urban environments. And then we get to surrogate activities, which Morris calls survival substitute activities, which is a more kind of self-explanatory way of putting this right. Kaczynski's idea of surrogate activity is based on Morris's idea of survival substitute activity. Morris observed that many animals engage in distractions such as excessive grooming or rusting spectators, in order to maintain stimulation. The argues that all human hobbies and pursuits, from stamp collecting to philosophy and art, serves the same survival substitute function for human beings. And the human zoo, this creativity principle is carried to impressive extremes. I've already pointed out that disillusionment can set in when the survival substitute activities of the similar

struggle began. Often because the activities chosen are rather limited in their scope, and avoiding these limitations men have thought for more and more complex forms of expression forms which become so absorbing that they carry the individual on to such high plans of experience that the rewards are endless here, removed from the realms of occupational trivia to the exciting. Worlds of the and my screen is covered, so let me enlarge that of the first philosophy and pure sciences. So it's a very reductive idea by Morris where he. It's a more popular perspective today, right to just totally reduce everything to survival value, but obviously Mars is extremely reductive, he says. Philosophy to art, to science. Everything is just a survival substitute activity and these ones that we glorify, like art or literature or science. There is especially satisfying because we have very large brains and they keep our brains very active. So yeah, quite reductive, but very influential on Kaczynski. This is where he gets the idea of surrogate activities. Even the title isn't very different from survival substitute activity. So you can see Kaczynski takes a little technological critique and instead of rooting it in. Sociology or Christianity? He roots it in this evolutionary psychology basis. And then lastly, we have Martin Seligman, who's a psychologist best known for the idea of learned helplessness. Again, it's a pretty popular it's one of those like pop psychology ideas, probably a. Lot of people have heard. It's what an animal comes to believe that its behavior can't affect a set of outcomes. It then experiences psychological distress and becomes demoralized. And Seligman's experiments, dogs were subjected to series of inescapable shocks. When these dogs were later subjected to sharks that they could escape from, 2/3 exhibited learned helplessness. Instead of trying to escape, they lay down. Quietly and joined. The process was that they. Are obviously very agitated at 1st and do everything to avoid these shocks and then they get very depressed. And then at a certain point the depression goes to acceptance. And they just. Accept their fate. They stopped trying to change it and basically give up on life. And Kaczynski concluded that modern man is put in the same state as these dogs are by technological society, and this explains many of the psychological problems of the modern world. Leftism is the political manifestation of learned. Business the leftist, who has been over socialized to internalize helplessness, tries to gain a vicarious sense of power. True participation and powerful social movement. Yeah, like I said, the way we socialize people is with the degree of shame. And you know, it's not the electric shocks of the dog, but at a certain point, people are so ashamed or maybe just because the biological leftist, the biological makeup of the leftist they. Shame and despair so heavily that they adopt this kind of learned helplessness, aggravated by the system. And that's an important idea that Kaczynski comes up with himself, that leftism is like, it's this sublimated social movement where you have these people. That have deeply internalized this learned helplessness, and like. Physically, psychologically, constitutionally can't revolt against the fundamentals of the system they are. Slaves, technological society, they are defeated. They are basically lashing out all that they can do because on some level they know that they're kind of slaves to the system. They they know that they've internalized this gem, they know that they've kind of surrendered to this larger process.

And so all they can really do is find something to. Kind of alleviate the shame and give them a some sense of being in a power process, even if they don't have an individually which they can do collectively through participating in these mass social movements. So that is Kaczynski's influences. I'm going to talk about what I think. Kaczynski got. Rd. Let me check the Super chats. Take a break for this for a second. Vessel for \$5 is a great content. keep it up, homeboy. Thank you. Vessel sovereign of seas says. I remember reading the manifesto and being utterly underwhelmed. The amount of times quote I recognized some would argue against, ex. Against what I've just said, but here at. FC, we still hold X arguments came up, just met in world of you more vague than explain. Yeah, sovereign seeds is saying Kaczynski is very much not just the foreign a lot of his arguments, all of the. Deeper justifications from I actually agree with that. And I'll get into my problems with Kaczynski and where what I think the limitations of his critique is in a bit. But yeah, that's certainly key to it is it's. It is this kind of naturalist like utilitarian critique. And he does like appeal at certain times to concepts of fairness and morality. But he really has no basis for appeal to any of this, and even his his appeal to. Like lure flying. The lives we experience in technological society, obviously he has this critique based on a kind of utilitarian logic, but he does seem to have. A deeper sense of like a natural freedom that we have to recapture. And I don't think you can justify that ultimately. North Sea for 15. North Sea, I think as you and Joe have pointed out recently, most online right wing men use politics. That's just another way of consuming content surrogate activity. I will become a shill. Thank you for being a shield, Marcy, especially for me. I appreciate it. I mean, it's funny. Like people are in my chats and they're gonna well, like 5 people are gonna boycott my channel and stop watching because I, because I'm gonna disagree with Ted Kaczynski. No, these people are very serious. Like I said, if they were, I don't think they'd be on a YouTube comments section speaking out about someone. In a slideshow on. On this guy who died this week. Yeah, it is. That's The funny thing. The ironic thing is that is that is a surrogate activity by by Kaczynski. If anything, Kaczynski would like resent them more, right? Because Kaczynski was totally opposed to any kind of. Moderate political activism or. Partaken and some kind of like something like nationalism like police supposed to. Obviously we know the we know exactly what he advocated for in terms of action. Right. So yeah, these people are like, hanging, hanging around these circles. They're on YouTube, they're on Twitter. And their thread. Is that they're going to boycott a YouTube channel. See, I don't take them. But yeah, it's a certain activity. Like you said, people just hold these views. They don't really do anything with them. Most people just are passive consumers of this content. They don't contribute in any way. You know, they don't donate. Most of them aren't even bothered to. Like make a Twitter account and just repost stuff they agree with, so I don't think there's much respect for now. Obviously we have to encourage people to participate, but it is a surrogate activity. Three, JB said. I was disappointed to miss your 50,000 Subs celebration stream. Glad I managed to catch this one. Thank you, Serena, JB and yeah, you're doing great work on on Twitter, actually, I think she's up to, like, 10,000 followers

on Twitter. It's funny, she just posts some solid, like nationalist talking point. This is constantly racial and anti whites on Twitter. that's good stuff. Anonymous. She sent \$5. Thank you, anonymous. Let's see also anonymous in the stream last week, another anonymous and a big super chat. At the end I never acknowledged. But thank you, whoever that was. Reggie Mac said, saying Uncle Ted was wrong, Unliked and Unsubscribed. Keep up the good work. I visited Ireland despite being a secret Ulster Scott and nobody knew the difference. Very best people. That's great, Reggie Mac. Yeah, I think also Scotts visiting Ireland is probably the least of our worries right now. And yeah, thanks for the donation. Take a quick look at the YouTube chat. The chat looks very. Other than this point with the chat lately I've gone man. Someone said Keith, be careful handling your mail. OK. Not much going on with Chad. Let me tell you. Look at cozy. Actually, I haven't opened. I haven't opened cozy since this started. Where are we in? Viewers. Hey, top of the cozy charts, 261 viewers. Is this going to make noise if? I open it. Oh, there we are. OK, take a look at the cozy chat. Organize him from Twitter. See which groupers are nice tonight. I saw Fuentes got his dear live channel, Mac. That's pretty cool, right? Yeah, I said a few days ago. Think like we'll see the. We look back and think the censorship peaked in chosen 21 and it's looking like that I saw Trovo was sending e-mail out to people they banned, like begging him to come back. And it was a stupid move, right? Because obviously they have. Rumble to compete with now they have kick which is going to be a competitor to Trovo. Sorry to what's the one that Amazon owns? I've never used Twitch, so it's never really been. In my mind, until recently, little kick came out. But yeah, like what, what a what? A screw up with those platforms early on to kick? Everyone off like Delive is a totally dead platform now. Trovo is totally dead. And I mean for a while, like Deli, I've actually was getting some pretty decent views and it. Was because, went as did an election. From there I got like 100,000 views. Other right wing content creators were doing well. They're bringing in a lot of money. And yeah, they they decided they didn't want any. Any anything controversial, anything political and kind of dead platforms now, but look, it's small positive to see all this censorship reversing. OK, let's carry on with this. Going off on a. So what I got right now? He was right about maladaptive modernity and I'm kind of focusing when I talk about what he was. Right. I'm kind of focusing on things that I've kind of vindicated him since then. Maybe things they didn't even foresee when he when he wrote this. But as technological society has advanced, there has been a compounding effect of maladaptive behavior. Humans have never had it easier by conventional metrics, but physical and psychological well-being continues to decline while alienation increases. Now obviously I can post. 1000 different graphs studies whatever to back that up, but I think everyone realizes. Yeah, things have progressed technologically. People are more depressed than ever, more suicides than ever, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera, addiction. We know all these problems, right? It's pretty inescapable. Technological advances have also led to propagation of people with heavy mutational loads who would not have survived at modern medicine. This is an insight by Edward Dutton. And his colleague. Is it Michael Woodley or is it Toronto,

the Woodley guy or yeah, this is something I don't think Ted would have foreseen at the time, but this idea that there was a high childhood mortality rate in pre industrial societies and that this had a eugenic effect because people with high mutational loads. Of weaker immune systems. And so they were more likely to die. Things like premature birth or infections at a young age and half the human genome is in the brain. So if you have a high mutational load in your immune system. You'll have high mutational load in your in your brain and you get these quite dysgenic people that tend towards the quite maladaptive belief systems. No, maybe I'm. Totally butcher network. Whenever you talk about these concepts, there's very fine distinctions, but there's certainly a lot of dysgenic effects. Of industrial civilization and of having like no childhood mortality, pretty much now, and modern medicine and so on. And there's all sorts of factors effects downstream from that that Kaczynski did not consider, but really kind of back up his point. Michael Woodley of Menie. What was I thinking of a Tyrone Woodley? Where is that from? Yeah, that's it. It's kind of hard to remember like Michael Woodley of mini. It's quite a. It's quite a yeah, it's an interesting title left of psychology. I think he's also been very much vindicated on this, he said. And this is very interesting. Tyrone Woodley, UFC guy, is he OK? That does ring a bell. OK, that's kind of funny. Kaczynski, you are compassion and moral principle cannot be the main motives for leftist activism. Hostility is too prominent A component of leftist behavior. So as the drive for power now, this was very prescient because there's been recent psychological research on this. I actually did. A thread on this that that's when Rogan retweeted. I think it has like almost 10 million views or something, but just talking about this insight on how it's been vindicated by recent psychology. This paper came out in March or so that showed that there's a high correlation between radical left wing ideas, narcissism and psychopathy. Suggesting radical leftists do indeed use compassion as a mask for their power fantasies, studies showed that. Hold on, I have to ban someone in the chat. Keep seething racists. OK, you're banned. The correlations between the constructs of antagonistic narcissism and left wing authoritarianism are so high that they're almost the same. So that's what was interesting. The research was they studied what they call left wing authoritarianism, basically left wing radicals. And they found that they don't have any higher levels of compassion. Actually, they have lower levels of compassion. And they're not especially motivated by social justice or by the plight of the downtrodden. But what they do score very highly in is antagonistic narcissism and psychopathy. Clearly, the activism they're engaging in is to satisfy kind of the needs of their ego. To have power and dominance over people. And there's vindicated some other researchers and writers from the 20th century, as well as some of whom I covered in that thread. Who made this observe observation about the Bolsheviks? And so on that. People involved tend to be very psychopathic. Have very odd personality traits and really lack a sense of empathy. What a cash is owe to is they want the power process of being part of an ascendant movement where they can bully and dominate people. So this certainly vindicates Kaczynski's insights, and I notice they show the feelings of inferiority Kosinski described there. Indeed, much

more prominent. And leftists who have very elevated levels of mental illness. So that's this is today. I posted to my telegram a while back. And it was basically how many people have been diagnosed with a mental illness. And you can see like the difference between liberals and conservatives and then. Young white liberal women. Adding to 2956% have been diagnosed with a mental illness. Which is majority. So obviously this is fairly consistent in terms of correlations between leftism and mental illness. And another one of his insights that. Pretty impressive, I think. Come up with this. You know, while we're giving Kaczynski his due. he talked about this process where the I guess the critical restory folks would call the kind of white savior ISM when it's some. By white liberals, but. That implicitly, subconsciously, they see these groups that advocate for as inferior, and there's there is also research that backed us up. It was a Yale study that found that white liberals actually dumbed down their speech when they talk to minorities. They have a they use a massively smaller vocabulary than they would when they talk to white people, whereas actually, conservatives, Republican voters actually used. Saying speech patterns, talking to black people. Conservatives in the study were actually true believers. Inequality, you could say, right? Like they they. Assumed that they had to simplify their language for minorities, they were talking to the leftists too, which is kind of interesting. Because of course the left says claim absolute equality between everyone, right? Why would you? Why would you make that assumption? So that's another aspect of his theory of leftist that's backed up by research. Another thing Kaczynski is correct about, of course, is leftism in the system. His idea of systems need to shrink. Leftist rebellion has proven very compatible with the system, and the left is pushed for equality means universalizing and marginalizing humanity into fungible mass of individuals. Which is the same goal as neoliberal capitalism alternative means of authority and meaning to liberalism come under intense attack from the left religion, the family, the nation's leftist wedge war against the strong gods of all to clear the way for the open society that capitalist oligarchs want. You can watch my recent video on Karl Popper, George Soros, the open society, but yeah, that's. The purpose of leftism and the kind of post war order is they're they're battering ram for for the oligarchs, right, they. They're the kind of acid that just turns everything into sludge that can then be repackaged as fungible tokens, be traded around the globe, and you can just look at how the values of the counterculture of the 1960s was adopted as the dominant culture of neoliberalism. Everything the 60s radicals were demanding, all of the values that's culture today, right? And they think they won. They think they, I guess some of them do anyway. You know, they think they kind of rebelled against their stuffy Christian conservative parents. But of course to use Kaczynski's way of describing it. They were really just kind of actualizing the desire that was already there on behalf of the technological system to move towards this more fluid. This, like post forward this form of capitalism that's much more fluid. That's much more based on financialization and the free transfer, the free movement of of capital, of Labor and, breakdown of traditional conservative institutions. Like done in the family of the nation said all these things that would be barriers, globalization. And that was the

so-called counterculture. But it happened to be exactly what the system, the direction, the. System was moving. Towards which you know, from Kaczynski's point of view, isn't because essentially because the oligarchs didn't like falling up. The hippies and say this is what we like. We need people to have these values by the 1980s, but it it's at the leftist on some level like sensors. Senses the direction things are going, senses the implicit values of the system and it makes them explicit and actually demands them. So in this way they kind of force along the process that's latent in the technological system on its own on the basis of its own internal logic anyway, they. They externalize it, they make it explicit. And that's a great insight by Kaczynski is right, and that is really interesting. But now, of course, while you're all here, right? What Ted got wrong disagreements with Kaczynski. I'll take another quick look at the Super chats.

OK, I should read this at the end so I can. So I can put this video up on it on its own. I won't have to cut this out. Yeah, I think I'll leave that for the end, uncle a thank you. You said that twice, by the way, but thank you for. The two donations. So OK, I guess I'll just keep going, right. Maybe I'll take another quick look at the Super at the live chat. Not much happening. Not very interesting. Oh, there's Jeff. I'm guessing that's the real Jeff. the pressures on cause I've got this, like high IQ. Autistic French Canadian is going to like pick apart everything I say, but I'm going to make. I'm going to make like a small stumble and use the wrong term and Jeff is just going to, like, butcher me for three hours on a live stream. So that's why I tried to do some prep for this because. You know, when Jeff comes at you with a video response. That's been a career Ender, right? That was, creating tea. That's how Jeff got famous. You're too young. You won't remember this, but. Jeff got famous because he entered into these rest realism debates that were happening in the old days at the old rate. And this guy Croton Tee was like a liberalist central centrist. He was like, in that kind of Sargon crowd, he went hard attacking the alt right, trying to prove like race realism is fake. And then Jeff this. High IQ battles just comes along and he starts doing these well prepared essays and it's totally embarrasses this crowd guy. I think there was a famous quote about fish getting pregnant that that showed the crowd just like, totally didn't understand biology at all. And but yeah, the Jeff video I said right, you got to be. You gonna be on top of your game if you're if you're preparing for one of those coming out you so people ask me to debate them, but I gotta say actually like the it's more like old school YouTube. Like the video response, like again, that's kind of something I remember from the old days as sort of the, distant right on on YouTube like you used to be able to do a. Direct video response for. You tagged their video in it. And yeah, that's the famous quote. Pull that up. But yeah, you used to get these grow back and forth between all these. All these Youtubers, I like the idea of that. Like I like the video response where you can actually like take someones argument and spend a week like just deconstructing everything that's said just totally like turn apart their entire worldview. I like that it kind of keeps everyone on top of their game, right? There's a lot of like in the bed. Sometimes it's just the the best debater that wins when you have, like the videos that are up and there's, like a permanence. And

I think it's a good way to kind of work out these questions, but. Yeah, I'm sure Jeff is going to totally tear this apart. I already know, like the issue he's going to have is. Send the bed. I've had what you asked before about like materialism versus idealism. The basis for materials was used, so unfortunately I think we're going to be. We're going to be retreading old Crone. We're we're destined to do this forever. You and I, Jeff. It's going to be, we're going to be. Going back and forth on materialism forever, so Kaczynski's ethics, I wanted to just do this as a bit of background. So like to get deeper into his worldview. While I presented Watson the manifesto, what his basis of critique is, and you can see already, like I said, it's not this kind of spiritually based technology is desacralized in things or like the more ***** linkola the inherent beauty of undisturbed wilderness. It is a very kind of human centric critique. And it's kind of utilitarian and that you suck my human happiness. But let me just get into this. I'll put this full size so I can read it. So I wanted to get a bit deeper into what's actually underlying this. How does he justify any of this? What's his presuppositions now? Kaczynski warned that conventional morality is a means of system control, but he did distinguish between this and what he called natural morality. What is this? Well, Kaczynski's materialist, so he didn't believe in a transcendent basis for ethical statements. So what is the basis for Ted's ethics? Ted's seems to believe that there are ethical norms. We can all Intuit. And he writes in one of his letters and in discussion of this kind, one must rely heavily on intuitive judgment. As an example, he identifies good purposes such as discouraging child abuse or racial hatred. He thinks that these are obviously bad things that we can all agree on, right? Child abuse and racism. And finally, Kaczynski seems to hold suffering as the greatest evil. This is kind of the ultimate foundation of all of. This he writes of the immense suffering caused by technological society and justifying his actions, writes that quote it is not at all certain that the survival of the system will lead to less suffering than the breakdown of the system. So Tad is a materialist. Secondly, he's an ethical intuitionist. And thirdly, he seems to be guided by a kind of negative utilitarianism. And then lastly, although I said Kaczynski has a very utilitarian critique, it isn't very. Airy fairy look at the beauty of the undisturbed nature he does give some intrinsic value that he never really spells out to the kind of freedom we experience in a more natural environment, right? It's not just. That it's our natural power process and it satisfies our basic needs. He does seem to. To attach like an intrinsic value to. Animals, humans being in their natural state rather than this artificial. But like I said, he never really gets into this so much. But that's kind of the fundamental basis, right, because in his in his final justification for the kind of revolution he advocates for, his final justification is about suffering. It's about the system is causing this much suffering. Obviously, he spelled it out with the power process. Why the technological society causes suffering and its basis for calculating the justification for revolution as well? If we collapse it now, that will be less suffering than if we let it go on and accelerate. And so on. So. I don't think it's very. Worked out ethic, I mean. My contention would be that if you're materialist, you can't have any kind of ethic and there's really no basis. For any of this good purposes,

such as discouraging child abuse, racial hatred, or why is child abuse bad? If you're materialist, why is racial hatred bad if you're materialist? He thinks we'll all agree to that and. OK, maybe everyone reading it agrees that racial hatred is. But that doesn't mean that there's some objective basis for that beyond individuals agreeing on it. And he that's my contention is that he fundamentally can't. Bridge that gap. He has this naturalist ethics and he doesn't seem troubled by the traditional problems of holding the naturalist ethics. In fact, he doesn't really seem to be aware of the. Many philosophical presuppositions he's bringing into play here. He talks about, talk about the natural ethics that he describes versus conventional ethics. And he does outline this a little bit. I think it's in another one of his letters to scherbina, maybe or maybe he was, I think. It was a separate essay, actually, but he identifies like 6 planks of this like natural morality, which is like, you don't lie to people. To fulfill contracts. You know, in a very basic way, you do unto others as they would do unto you, but again, this is very subjective. You can always find a tribe of people or an individual that doesn't share this ethical intuition, and even if they do, even if everyone shares it, if it's. If we're just. if we're just meat sacks, as Ted thinks we are, all of this is just an evolutionary adaptation to it and survival. So it's not binding on anyone. why? Why would you follow any of these principles of fairness? Anyway, back to the slide. So ethics involves normative claims about how we ought to behave, while the world of the materialists is in perpetual flux with no objective meaning purposes or ethical value. Zinski doesn't explain how he bridges the gap from the is of nature to the art of his ethical prescriptions. This is the. a very standard problem in philosophy. How do you bridge that gap? OK, you can say people have an intuition of fairness. You can say you want people to adhere to that. Why should they? At that point, to go from the off to years, you just have this kind of infinite regress, they'll say, well, it's good for survival, you say. Well, why is survival a good thing? Well, if we're if we survive, then we can perpetuate species. Why is that a good thing? Say, well, we can enjoy XYZ. You said, well, why is that an ultimate? You really can't bridge that gap, and so it's just kind of so many words when Kaczynski says we have this natural morality that everyone ought to follow and that we ought to reduce suffering and that, we ought to return to more traditional, pre industrial way of life. It's just so many words. Ted's appeal to shared moral intuitions can't bridge the gap. What may be considered morally abhorrent for one people and one time, maybe normative, and another, and Kaczynski illustrates this problem himself when he uses the example of racial hatred and child abuse as things we all agree are cases of evil. Though there may be general agreement on this in the modern West, this is far from universal. Treating racism as especially evil or unnatural is itself quite a modern idea brought about by technological society. While primitive cultures are certainly not free of what we would consider child abuse. He kind of gives the whole problem away there, right? He's a he's a naturalist. He's a materialist. He wants pre industrial civilization and then to ground. His worldview, he says. Well, OK, I don't know. Some, like, transcendent based for ethics or something, but. Obviously we can all agree on right and wrong, right? And then what's his example? It's like,

OK, well, that's been considered like evil for the last, like, 70 or 80 years of all of human history. And you know, we didn't have a word for it until like, last Thursday. In the grand scheme of things. But you're taking that as like our sort of fundamental A fundamental ethical intuition we have. I mean, that itself kind of throws shade on the whole process here. Because it is that just something we discovered was evil in the 20th century, we only discovered it was evil through industrial society and the ways of life that encouraged. So it's I think it's. Possible for him to bridge that gap. And what we consider child abuse? You could point to plenty of of. Examples in in primitive society someone says child abuse has always been wrong though. Yeah, but there are tribes where like you know, children literally get eaten, right. And to them, that's not wrong, because that's something they do for whatever reason. They do it whether it's. What about the tribes in the Amazon, where they believe that kids, some children born, have an evil spirit inside them and they go off and, like, leave them in a hole in the Amazon and just leave them to die? Right. And even not that long ago on history yet. Some things like happen like this with infanticide, right? So we can all agree child abuse is wrong. We'll can we? Well, not every people in the world does. Not every people in history did. Certainly not every primitive people. Yeah, I mean, like you have this guy in Chastain what's obviously wrong. Well, to you, it's obviously wrong. But what happens if someone disagrees with you well? I don't know. Maybe you're religious. Maybe you have some kind of appeal to make. What's Ted's basis? If someone disagrees and there's a tribe. That says that if your child is is born with a club foot that you have to bury them upside down in a hole in the Amazon. I mean, that's. What's you know, what's the kind of? What's the best for normativity in any of this? Again, it's just so many words. And like, that's the whole problem is the kind of distant right it's like. This is such an insightful critique, but it's there's no like foundational basis for any of it. So at the end of the day. It comes down to one man's preference for utilitarian ethic, which not everyone shares. And this is obviously rooted in this materialism, which has other effects on his worldview, musinski's Kaczynski wrote a letter from prison that he was a materialist, plain and simple, and that all human behavior can in principle be explained through the laws of physics. Since he wrote that he believed machines could eventually replace human minds completely, writing quote, I'm enough for materialists believe that the human brain functions solely according to the laws of physics and chemistry. In other words, it is in a sense a machine, so it should be possible to duplicate it artificially. This justified Kaczynski's pessimistic views about the. Future of AI? Like I said, he wrote of his belief that humans would eventually be totally replaced by AI, and that then the system would have no need for humans and we would likely go extinct. Well, again, I think the foundations of this are rather weak. There's a number of reasons to reject materialism. I've done videos on this in the past. I mean, this is obviously again like a pre. Right. Topic in philosophy. I'm not gonna do this. Will obviously be the main focus of like Jeff disagreeing with me, but I'm not going to an entire. I mean, this could be A to our video itself, but yeah, there's the hard. Problem of consciousness that is. How can how can matter? How

can the natural world produce something that is quite qualitatively distinct, which is consciousness, which, regardless of what its relation to the brain is, it has? This unique first person ontology where there is a nature of subjective experience that is not identical to the physical processes in the brain associated with it, and so therefore a materialist, reductionist picture of the world leaves something out. Which is that. First person ontology that has to enter into any picture of the universe. Schopenhauer says something like materialism is. The philosophy of the subject that forgets itself, right, that's very true. Ultimately, any truth, any equation, any observation happens in consciousness and materialism, and with the denial of consciousness. Just can't get off the ground as a worldview epistemology. If you make a claim to truth. If you say that the brain is just a machine that is programmed by evolution. Then it's just programmed for survival. Then you can't really make a claim to an objective truth. What would a truth even be? What would the laws of logic be? What would truth or falsity be? These aren't these aren't physical, spatial, temporal things you're appealing to something and immaterial and universal and eternal in a sense. And you can't make that appeal on materialism because it wouldn't make any sense for that to exist in a materialist universe. So you can't make any claim to truth, so therefore you can't claim materialism is true problems of emergence. How do more complex? What would you say? Complex forms or complex substances emerge from very simple physical processes? Materials again has. Very hard time explaining this, not least when it comes to consciousness and of course ethics. Some of the aspects that discussed with Kaczynski's issue grown in his ethics. How can any normative statement come from a materialist worldview? Everything is in flux, everything is just an evolutionary adaptation for survival. Nothing is inherently. Better or worse than anything else, and so trying to have any kind of ethical worldview on the basis of this can't get off the ground. Now, if reductive materialism is not true, the mind is much more complex than the materialist imagines. If the mind can't be reduced to physical processes, it's unlikely that it can be recreated by mimicking these process. But many of the arguments for strong AI assume that the processes of the mind can be replicated by computation. Leave out the many aspects of cognition intertwined with our embeddedness in the world. Again, I won't totally get into this because I've talked about this before in videos, and it would just be too long of a detour. I'm just having a look at the chat. I'm curious's peers always has some interesting comments on it. When I see his name pop up, it kind of can catch my I. Want to see? What he's saying, but more importantly, if we are just deterministic meat sacks and technology can solve the problems rather solve the causes of suffering. Kaczynski identified what reason would Ted have to reject it? Why not opt for a life of bliss? In the singularity, use no metaphysical basis on which the privilege agency or natural life. This is really the. This is what it all comes down to, right? This is the fundamental problem. And you know, me and Jeff, me and Jeff will never agree on on materialism, but I'm not sure he can answer his question either, right? Kaczynski says the system is bad because it causes suffering. It causes suffering because there's a mismatch between what we're adapted to. If you look at evolutionary

psychology and what the technological system provides, and the fact that it provides for our basic needs, we can't enter into the. So it comes down to this critique that it's inevitably going to cause suffering. What? If we could have less suffering by the system at some point in his writings, he says he doesn't write off that. That's possible, but to get there would be so much suffering along the way that it's not worth it. But what if we could fast track to that point, right? What if you could create the power process? What if you could create the simulation of a power process? What if you could enter the singularity and a perfect transhuman happiness? And if you say, well, transhuman happiness wouldn't satisfy the power process, well, what if you can just simulate the power process, but in a way that's even more satisfying? That's even more of a sense of freedom and more of a sense of autonomy than the real thing. Ted seems to hold that the naturalness of doing this in a pre-technological state, there's an inherent goodness to that that actually isn't reducible to any of the material utilitarian calculations. What's the basis for that? If you're a materialist and if all you care about is eliminating suffering? Why not take the Yuval Noah Harari position, that we can totally eliminate suffering with enough chemicals, enough chemical adjustments of the brain, and the proper simulations to give people a happy life? I don't think Kaczynski ultimately has an objection to that. That isn't just. You know, trying to push it back further and say, well, this ultimately would still cause more suffering because XYZ, but if you can satisfy that hypothetical and say with the technological system, you could eliminate suffering, I don't see how a materialist opposes that. No, not a problem, obviously. It's just not realistic. I think Kaczynski wanted someone said underwhelming. My moral preference, my moral preference? Well, that's kind of like the, I mean, that's kind of the basis for a worldview is like having an ethics. I mean, if you're going to make claims that you think are universal, that you're telling people they should do actions. Towards you kind of have to have a basis for it so. It's actually kind of is. It's pretty, it's pretty, it's pretty significant. If someone has no basis for their worldview, right? It's not exactly. Like you know, as a small detail that this one of you is totally arbitrary, I think that's pretty significant actually. But yeah, burning something like a nuclear Holocaust is difficult to envision. How the pre-technological world he desired to come about it would cause the deaths of billions almost certainly, and require global effort. And certainly his actions didn't bring us any nearer. I mean, a lot of people have read the manifesto because of it, but it had no real. I consider it pretty much a pointless waste of life. And anything you outlined, I just don't see it as. Anywhere close realistically happening. So what would collapse technological civilization? Like I said, it would just be a nuclear Holocaust of the kind that we can't even fathom. And certainly we can't do anything to bring about. And the other problem with this is technological development is not something we can collectively just forget. If technological civilization rules once, why would it not arise again? Certain people groups like the Japanese, immediately modernized on encountering technological civilization. That's one of the real problems. Everyone has a revealed preference. Most people have a revealed preference for this stuff. I mean, most

people could go and live a much less technological life. Most people could live with a smartphone. Most people could live whatever washing machine if they really wanted right. But we have this revealed preference for all of these things now. If technological civilization collapsed, are we just going to collectively pretend? That that stuff doesn't exist so that we can't, like, get back to that state. I just don't. See how that would happen? You'd have to have. Followed brought a hood of steel type thing, right? But Kaczynski doesn't want a global revolution or a political leadership to any of this. So again, I just don't see any of this is feasible. Primitivist answer that for most for species history, we existed out civilization. But like I said, we would return the memory of technological innovations and our species. The self has been changed by civilization. And again, this is something to get. Like much deeper into in terms of. You know, you could look at Julian James and the city of the bicameral mind and that we were like, psychologically, spiritually, like different creatures prior to the axial Age like we. We didn't have this sense of an ego of a self that we had a separation between the right and left hemispheres, and people would just hear commands from the right hemisphere and immediately act on them, thinking it was their ancestors or gods or spirits or something. So we are like constitutionally changed by civilization. Even if you don't accept those theories. You know, we have been adapting in this artificial environment for thousands of years now. Yeah, it's all to under score. Like it's difficult to envision how you just kind of come out of that on the opposite side. Green Frog Goods says it's not arbitrary. You're just refusing to engage in good faith. No, it is arbitrary. What's the basis for a naturalist? What's his basis for saying that suffering is bad and we should eliminate suffering? If you're materialist, if it's all just flux, why is suffering any worse than anything else? What's not good faith in this? I've pretty much. I've pretty comprehensively gone over his his justifications and gone into his letters and everything for how he justifies it. But I don't think what, arbitrary. Means and philosophy and ethics. If you're saying that's bad faith, yeah, there's no, really. If there's no realistic path to Kaczynski's desired outcomes, we should pursue alternatives. And then, of course, there's a Marshall incentive. Most technological development was driven by warfare. If humanity collectively disarms itself. There would be a massive incentive for any one people to regain the technological advances of all leaving others defenseless. There would simply be no way to prevent this, except the world police. This is not something I saw, Kaczynski wrote about, much as the way. Conflict and warfare and the need for defense against other countries. Technological developments drove technology. You know, you look at how many. Technological innovations that shaped this century were developed by like U.S. military and related branches. I'm getting distracted about a chat again. I've got I've got. I've got a some more. Focused, but yeah, this isn't something he really discusses. But again, why would this disappear? Right there'd be seemingly being no way to prevent this except the world police. Again, he doesn't. He's against a political solution. He's against the political centralized leadership to any of this. But there's always going to be an incentive. Like I said, people can't just forget this. There's always going to be an incentive for one tribe when people group to reengage

in that, like, Faustian, civilizational process. That is iterative. That is expansive. That ended up where we are now. And Kaczynski just doesn't seem to really think about how you would prevent that kind of cyclical development. An ecological this is something that you never really discussed as well, right? You have all of these deep green people under this and right that they're they're eco fashion. They love nature and they're pagans, and they love Ted Kaczynski and they love ***** linkola and, poor Uncle Ted died and. They're gonna plant a tree in his honor. The problem is most of well, firstly, I guess it's true problem. The first thing, like I said, most of Kaczynski's arguments are focused on technologies effect on human well. But of course, he was somewhat moved by environmental destruction caused by technology. We'll never know to what extent, but like I said, the story is that he saw his favorite walking path being destroyed by Rd. building, and that that's what set him off. So he clearly had some sense of ecological harmony that he was deeply concerned. But the problem is, if one really has a biocentric view, there are a number of reasons to think a collapsed industrial society would be a net negative for the biosphere. Now remember his whole justification for bringing about collapse was it will cause a lot of. But if we don't bring about the alternative, which is a continuation of technological society, is going to be much, much worse. But I think on ecological grounds, that's not the case. Collapse is actually bad. It's really bad for the environment, and this could be. This list could go on for that you could list 100 reasons here, right? But if the breakdown of technological civilization were to occur, it would create a desperate rush to extract available resources, and this would likely be exacerbated by conflict, right? The amount of our food supply, the amount of things we take for granted that exist thanks to these very complex supply chains. Industrialization and the green revolution, and these pesticides that are transported across the world. If that disappears, obviously there's going to be a massive rush for resources. And that's going to be that's going to be bad for the environment that's going to be bad for ecology, the collapse of technological infrastructure would also lead to massive immediate increase in pollution, for example, disappearance of waste treatment technology, polluting water exploits that would be another immediate effect. You'd have an immediate massive. Pollution of the water systems. But consider technology considered nuclear technology consider nuclear waste and how we dispose of that. You have all of these very complex procedures and facilities dedicated to that, that would decay and dilapidate over time. You know, think of something like the. The safe zone in Chernobyl that was set out that massive like concrete structure. But that's kind of an obvious example, but there's so many like pollutants chemical pollutants that are produced by the industrial system. There's just there's so much infrastructure and processes that would collapse overnight that would have really, really unforeseen consequences on the environment, existing infrastructure for conservation would disappeared. There would be no barriers to exploiting vulnerable ecosystems, infrastructure and regulation controlling the proposal of pollutants. Will also disappear. The remaining human population would likely be way beyond pre civilization levels. Without the technological basis for mass food production, populations would resort to

over hunting and exploiting available food resources. There would likely be a rush out of urban areas for farmland causing deforestation and soil erosion. Sorry again, I'm reading the chat. Yeah, he was. Taijutsu was against Primitivism, and he wrote a few essays in response to primitivists like John Zerzan and some of these people that want to go back, like Kaczynski said, the Industrial Revolution has consequences, have been ZAP served human rights Zerzan corrected him and said. She was the agricultural revolution and we need to go back to like Hunter gatherer. Since he didn't favor that, he said there's too much population for that to be possible, so people will just go back to farming low tech after the. Collapse of industrial society. Now if you have that many people trying to farm with their industrial technology that counts, I think. Yeah, I think the green revolution and what that makes possible in terms of the industrial processes and like artificial ways that food is growing, it accounts for like 95% of the food production in the US at least. But that's really across the developed world. Now, if all of those gone, and if all these supply systems break down, right, everyone's going to, they're there would literally be like billions of people starving to death. And they're going to interrogate anything they can. And that's not going to be very good for the environment or for the ecosystem or for the survival of threatened species or forests. It's definitely going to be worse than in in the long run if you just have a sort of decline in population that we have now with industrial society and future advances in conservation efforts mean possible by technology will be lost forever. you can write some of that off in terms of how weak conservation efforts are compared to the destruction being done by the industrial process, but there are technological innovations that. Is going to lessen the strain on various environmental systems and there will be loss. And like I said, you have all of these other factors that would force people to exploit the environment worse than anyone could ever imagine. So collapse would actually be really, really bad for the environment. Especially the kind that Kaczynski wanted to bring about, which was instant, not politically organized, not driven by a state, but just this kind of anarchistic collapse. Technology and decentralization I also think Kaczynski got wrong the direction of technology and necessarily. He didn't write off industrial society, eventually reaching what he called a low level of physical and psychological suffering. I think I already mentioned this. But he believes that that could only come at the cost of permanently reducing human beings and many other living organisms to engineer products and mere cogs in the social machine. Kaczynski warned that in the future point you to improve techniques, the elite will have greater control over the masses. is manifested at the peak of the nuclear edge when information was being consolidated into a handful of sources. Since then, several devolutionary trends have called into doubt the proposition that technology would inevitably strengthen the light control. Mass proliferation of certain technologies can contribute to the flourishing of less alienated NEO tribal communities. And I believe the majority of the chat will probably disagree on this. But I think if you look at the way technology has gone, I talked about this in my video on AI. That the process has really kind of reversed where instead of having these sort of Orwellian super states that have very expensive

centers of technology and information. Everyone has a smartphone in their hands. Mass proliferation of technology is tending towards. Decentralization and having it making it more difficult to have these 20th century means of control. I think the Kaczynski claim that techniques inevitably head in the direction of centralization and elite shaping of the masses. I think that's. Being proven wrong and I think the chat will probably disagree with that, but I think we'll see more and more that that will be proven wrong. In years and decades to come. And I think you can agree or you can think of a lot of different technologies in terms of the innovations. Now they're extremely devolutionary whether. Crypto or you think of the way media control has gone and the collapse and centralized media institutions and a lot of these things seem quite small. It's like, OK, well, the elites still have, they still have the banks and the governments and. So on but. We're in a very sort of early stage of this process. I think it's going to accelerate. I just I think Kaczynski's Central claim there about you know, the kind of mathematical inevitability of that process. It's not as deterministic as he believed. No, the gods of civilization. This is another thing, as materialist Kaczynski considered science, philosophy and art and everything else you can think of as surrogate activities, he recognizes no inherent value in the pursuit of transcendence, reducing it to the same status as any other hobby. And Scherbina actually asked Kaczynski about this. One of the letters he said, hey, well if. Industrial civilization collapses if we go back to the more primitive states you want, and we lose all of these. Cultural productions, wouldn't that be a great chairman Kaczynski? He didn't say that he wants to destroy him, but he just said, well, it's not really a, it's not a goal to destroy them, but if they are destroyed like, whatever, that's just kind of a side effect. What would happen if industrial civilization stays around is worse anyway, so kind of. So he doesn't see it as a gold to the throne of great artifacts of civilization, but he doesn't seem to have attached any value to actually preserving them. And why would he in that sense, he's just being kind of consistent in his sort of utilitarian, like materialist point of view here, that art, philosophy, literature, they're just surrogate activities that. These highly evolved apes did to distract themselves from having their basic needs satisfied, and they don't really have any ultimate value. And also technology unleashes potential in the national and civilizational collective, which would not otherwise be possible now. I'm going to shame there. I really shouldn't have left that one sentence. That's like probably worthy of a much longer discussion. Which I don't think I'll expand on there, but. Yeah, if you value a kind of tribal collective success or kind of ethnic consciousness or the achievements of civilization as Old City, Kaczynski doesn't touch any value to any of these things. And this is, it's kind of a final like fundamental. Like what is the point of all of this? Right, because Binsky doesn't have a very developed theory of freedom. What constitutes human freedom is he's no higher state for the individual than satisfaction and natural environment. And again, in terms of like his basics, in terms of what's underlying his worldview, he appeals to freedom a lot. He never really explains what freedom is. I think he takes for granted this model. And utilitarian view that freedom is just like choice. It's like consumer choice or it's like you can just. Choose choose to be what you want.

And in the case. Of the in the case of Kaczynski's more primitive idea of freedom, it's more autonomous. It's about autonomy. It's about that you are providing. For yourself, it's not that you push a button on the machine and your day's calorie intake comes out, it's that your. Autonomously, independently providing for yourself. And from that inextricable utilitarian argument against civilization. And of course he would, because he sees no higher state for the individual than satisfaction and a natural environment. But of course, if you're not a materialist, and I believe in a kind of perennial view on things, I have a kind of religious pluralist perspective that I think all of the Axial Age religions have. An underlying metaphysics that is based in mystical revelation that does and did unveil fundamental truth about the human condition and about the purpose. Of life here, that is, that all of these spiritual systems about their differences? They're all directed at directness, away from an ego centered perspective on life towards the real, towards a reality centered perspective that is transcendent, that is outside the individual. and in the traditional view, the purpose of high civilization, which is related to that is contemplation. Civilization should provide the necessary conditions to explore the mysteries of existence, seek transcendent truths, and contemplate God. I bet Jeff is smashing his desk right now. It should encourage practices such as meditation, prayer and self-discipline, which help individuals transcend the limitations of ego and connect with the divine or higher aspects of consciousness. These are not surrogate activities, but the fulfillment of man's life as a spiritual being. Leisure is the basic precondition for religious and intellectual life. So my basic contention is that there are higher states of consciousness than the animal is 6 state than immediately satisfying the biological urges that our process of development has been to integrate and transcend previous lower states of existence, and that in the Axial Age. We took one such leap where we moved to a more reality centered universalizing perspective and that this is actually a development. And actually we fundamentally can. Go back from that even if we wanted to, according to all Axial Age religions, true freedom is near the absence of external constraints or the ability to satisfy immediate biological desires without hindrance. The first of those would be the transhumanist idea of freedom. The 2nd IS, is Kaczynski's idea of freedom. Instead, genuine freedom lies in the liberation of one's true self, from the bonds of ignorance and desire. And aligning it with higher troops. So in conclusion, Kaczynski's insights were left psychology are brilliant. Though they owe debt to other thinkers, that's often overlooked. While Kaczynski was correct about the determinism of technique, which he. Took Malone, who's a fantastic thinker. It's not quite moving in the direction he foresaw. I do believe it's not as centralized and dystopian as he foresees, and I think there are decentralized and disintermediate and friends and technology. That will encourage more tribal forms of existence. Kaczynski could see no inherent value in the achievements of high civilization because it's the limitations of the philosophical outlook. And even if it were possible to bring about the collapse of technological society, the cost to the biosphere would be immense, and it could be all for nothing, since there's no reason to expect technological society to emerge after collapse. No reason not to expect that should be the anti tech revolution.

Kaczynski desired is not feasible. His violent actions did not bring in any closer and it was a pointless loss of life. After two hours of this presentation. You kill people, right? That is a. I didn't get that in there, right? You know, people were saying that was the only argument against Kaczynski. But look, if it's not feasible, which I don't think it is, if it would come back again, and that would ultimately all be for naught if it would cause the massive ecological catastrophe that is greater than anything. Industrial society is causing, and if Kaczynski is actually wrong about that utilitarian calculus about, it's better to collapse it now than wait for it to get worse. If collapse and now it's actually way worse. If all of that is true. And not even to mention all of that, but also his individual actions like didn't bring it any closer and didn't really fundamentally change anything. Well, it was a pointless loss of life. It wasn't justified, blowing up a guy in a computer store. I'm against that word. I know it's controversial, but I'm against it, right? But that's my take on Ted Kaczynski. Thanks for attending my Ted talk. Yeah, hope you enjoyed it. I think it was pretty fair. I mean, like I said, I've read his writings extensively. I've read Chad Hagg, who is really a serious, serious guy that's really getting serious thought to Kaczynski and Samuel scrubbing. Who's a trained philosopher. Who had correspondence with Kaczynski? Worked really hard to understand as well. If you have looked at all of them, I think I've pretty fairly presented a view here. Some people were complaining that I was just going to. Do the typical attacks on them, but I think I think this is pretty fair. Look, he wanted people to engage with his ideas. He wanted, he wanted discussion around these things. I do think it's important discussion. Like I said, I've was influenced myself a lot by Jacques Little. And it's a question of our time in a sense, for that's why. Musk was commenting on on his debts, and maybe he was right. That's why everyone is talking about the threat of AI and so on. So you're certainly relevant questions. I think Kaczynski, Mr. Mark, for the reasons I outlined. No, I may upload this as single video to YouTube, so if that is the case then thanks for tuning in. And take care.

Keith Woods Misunderstands Kaczynski by JF

Source

June 16, 2023

4,191 views

JFG Tonight

6,245 followers

Source

So we're going to talk about. Keith Woods and Ted Kaczynski. I'm going to do a full review of the argument of Keith Woods. I knew I wanted to do a response about this because Kit Woods had announced that he would be talking against that on Twitter, and I had said I'm going to do a video response to this. So here we are. He just did

his life. Stream few hours before this show began, so I'm going to review all of what Keith is saying and I'm going to mostly bring context to the quotes that he takes from Ted Kaczynski. And here's the general message that I want you to take home. Ted Kaczynski was a very special mind that you cannot. You cannot try to have him attribute to. You cannot attribute to him a meta ethical position. A form of minimalistic moral nihilism, and not even might his right positioning now what do I mean by not even might his right I once said something very important, which is very important in understanding Ted Kaczynski. It's that Ted Kaczynski is not even. Might is right. It's more like might is. When you are a mind like Ted Kaczynski, you really care. About the physical world, the world of truths, the world of the real universe in which we exist. Ted Kaczynski wasn't into superimposing metaethical frameworks to all of his preferences. To him, what mattered first and foremost is that whatever exists. Is going to be the space of morality like. It really doesn't matter if you want to get into arguments around what should be what ought to be. There is no ought in the view of a moral nihilist. It's more like you are. You want things and Ted Kaczynski. You wanted things you wanted things and he knew why he wanted them. He wanted them because. Is part of a species that evolved to be selected to have those psychological features that such that he wants ABC. That is how you need to understand Ted Kaczynski, not as someone who feels the justification is needed for his moral framework, but to the contrary. Someone who will openly tell you that justifications are tools of manipulation that all of these moral principles you can hear about. Those are just layers upon layers of brain mechanisms that we developed to manipulate others. So that's the view of morality of that case. I want what I want. You want what you want. We can all make ***** about what I want and what you want, but we. But I know it's ***** , and ultimately what matters is if I can impose my principles on you, I win. If you can, you win. And therefore it's not even that might is right, because there is no right. It's that might is, and the moral principle of the mighty will be the moral principles that are effectively imposed on 2 reality independent of what you think about it, or what the philosophers can discuss while drunk. That is how we need to approach Ted Kaczynski, and it seems that Keith Woods doesn't fully understand this. He tries to extrapolate from Ted Kaczynski that he is a utilitarian, is not. That he cares about harm. I mean, he does to some extent, but only to the extent as a moral nihilist. He doesn't like harm, but he understands that the whole world the way deploys itself there will be harm and so whatever you do is going to play in the balance but in very unpredictable ways. So what I'm going to do today is listen to Keith's words. And then I'm going to. Bring the full quotes of Ted Kaczynski so that we get to know who he was. What he was talking about exactly. Covic Killer Clown, says my father turned out to be a heroin addict. But a great piano player, how can a father not love a son? Well, I wouldn't worry too much about this COVID killer clown. I know it can be hurtful, but ultimately. There are broken people on this earth, and probably your father was just one of those broken people. And you know, if his own mother was receiving electroshock therapy, it's probably because she was. Broken her too, in some

way. Not, not not saying that she deserved electrotherapy, but she probably did some crazy stuff that led her to be in psychiatric hospital in the first place. So what you have to look at it from is you're not so bad. You are in the current world. You exist because of these people. Doesn't matter that there were broken machines. You can do better for the future and you carry jeans. That are reassorted so you don't have to be as sick as your father was. And as your grandmother was, **** them. Restart the world from scratch and you're probably going to be better parents than. Either of these people who abandon you so. Don't worry too much about it and keep going with life. All right, let's start the review of Keith Woods. The philosophy of Ted Kaczynski was Kaczynski wrong about industrial society. Well, that's a change of title already. Because when I clicked on this video, it was why Kaczynski was wrong. So we already have a step back from Keith Woods. That is, that is very interesting. Already hit change. Now it's in the interrogation form with Kaczynski wrong about industrial society.

Argument and spend a week.

Like, oh, and I should say that for a whole hour. Kid goes into what Ted got right and he says Ted was right about left. Ted predicted properly a lot of things, so I'm not going to review that part because I tend to agree. What Keith Woods tries to I liked in this part is that well, there were 10 curves from whom he was inspiring himself from. And to me that that doesn't matter as long as we agree, me and Keith, that he was right on these things. I'm not going to add anything to what Keith has to. So when Ted got wrong, let's talk about this part.

Just deconstructing everything that's said, just totally like tearing apart their entire worldview. I like that it kind of keeps everyone on top of their game, right? There's a lot. Of like in the bed. Sometimes it's just the the best debater that wins when you have, like the videos that are up and there's like a permanent system. I think it's a good way to kind. Of work out these questions.

He's talking about the potential that I will do a full video response. He likes the idea of stand alone videos.

Yeah, I'm sure Jeff is going to totally tear this apart. I already know, like the issue he's going to have is. Send the bed. I've had what you asked before about like materialism versus idealism. The basis for materials we've used, so unfortunately we're going to be. We're going to be retreading all grown. We're we're destined to do this forever. You and I, Jeff, it's going to be, we're going to be. Going back and forth on materialism forever. So Kaczynski's ethics I wanted to just do this as a bit of background, so like to get deeper into his worldview. When I presented Watson the manifesto.

So Kaczynski is a moral nihilist, a reality first, moral nihilism that cares about the existing world by definition basically doesn't have an ethics above this. It doesn't have a meta ethics position other than saying. Whatever the world is is what is what's going to happen. It's like the ethics that cannot be are not worth talking about because they won't be. And the attacks that could be but aren't, aren't worth talking about because they don't exist. And so you see how the meta. Critical discussion is useless to someone

who has a descriptive approach to the world because. None of this matters. None of this matters, and therefore there's only one thing that matters. It's what the world ends up being, what the creatures in the world end up preferring, and therefore the description of reality, the description of physics is sufficient. To have a full appreciation of the moral world, including the delusions you have in your head about what kind of rational system led to it. But you're wrong about them.

So what his basis of critique is, and you can see already? Like I said, it's not this kind of spiritually based technology is desacralized in things or like the more Pentti Linkola like the inherent beauty of undisturbed wilderness. It is a very kind of human centric critique and it's kind of utilitarian. And now you suck my human happiness. But let me just get into this. I'll put this full size so I can.

Here there is an error. Uh, we'll see. Uh, what Kate was asked to say later about kind of utilitarian. But Ted Kaczynski is not trying to maximize a measurable thing that everyone would agree with that Kaczynski is just an agent in the world. He has preferences and he's sharing those preferences with us through his manifesto and his books. That's how he sees it.

Can read it. So I want to get a bit deeper into what's actually underlying this. How does he justify any of this? What's his presuppositions?

To even start talking about presuppositions you're already getting out of the moral nihilism sphere. The moral nihilist is simply saying. The morality that exists is all there is, and anything else is a construct. Now you can engage in these constructs, but those are your subjective human constructs and some other people are gonna have others, and ultimately there will be no way to sort out who's right, who's wrong. There is no right and wrong in morality. There's just a bunch of people who prefer things. That is the moral night disposition, and there's no presupposition about it other than. Understanding that the axiomatic system created by concepts of right and wrong is unsupported, unless you accept some basic axioms, it's the realization that there's going to be something that has to point in the direction of right. Harm well-being. The well-being of conscious creatures, there's going to have to be something that points in the direction of wrong. Harm, or perhaps the ontological considerations, and therefore a system of right and wrong, must rely on accept, pre accepted presupposed axioms. In other words, the moral nihilist position is to say. There will always be a presupposition to an ordered moral system, and Keith Wood says, well, I think that Ted Kaczynski doesn't realize the presuppositions of his system well. His system merely states that there are presuppositions in other systems. Is he right or wrong on this?

Now, Kaczynski warned that conventional morality is a means of system control. But he did distinguish between this and what he called natural morality. What is this? Well, Kaczynski's a materialist, so he didn't believe in any transcendent basis for ethical statements. So what is the basis for Ted's ethics? Ted's seems to believe that there are ethical norms. We can all ensure it. And he writes in one of his letters and in discussion of this kind, one must rely heavily on intuitive judgment. As an example, he identifies good purposes such as discouraging child abuse or racial hatred.

OK, so taking out this part of the manifesto from Ted Kaczynski, good purposes such as discouraging child abuse or race hatred and concluding, as Keith does here.

He thinks that these are obviously bad things that we can all agree on, right, Charlie?

That is not the context in which he wrote this, so this is not Ted Kaczynski writing this in the manifesto. Let me show you. The context in which he wrote this. So the sentence that Keith is talking about is here. Propaganda, for example, is used for many good purposes, such as discouraging child abuse or race hatred. But if you look at the wider paragraph, he says. This was following 152 where he was saying, generally speaking, technological control over human behavior will probably not be introduced with a totalitarian intention or even through a conscious desire to restrict human freedom. So he was saying there don't expect that the evil people of this world. Will know that they're evil, that that they will go at it with intent. Now he gives an example in 153. Thus, control over human behavior will be introduced not by a calculated decision of the authorities, but through a process of social evolution. Rapid evolution, however. The process will be impossible to resist because each advance considered by itself will appear to be beneficial, or at least the evil involved in making the advance will appear to be beneficial, or at least the evil involved in making the advance will seem to be less than that which would result from not making it. See paragraph 127. Propaganda, for example, is used for many good purposes, such as discouraging child abuse or race hatred. Sex education is obviously useful, yet the effect of sex education to the extent that it is successful, is to take the shaping of sexual attitudes away from the family and put it into the hands of the state as represented by the public school system. So this is not Ted Kaczynski saying child abuse is wrong, in my view, for a reason. ABC or race hatred is wrong for reason ABC. That's Ted Kaczynski playing true. What will the normies do? What will the technophiles do? Will they intend the evils that they impose onto the world, or will they be brought by stepwise advances, each of which will be justified in their own moral sense? So this is not Ted Kaczynski saying the basis of my morality commends me to say that child abuse is wrong or that race hatred is wrong. He's saying when society imposes more and more authoritarian controls, they will justify these authoritarian controls with stepwise things that. Most people can say, Oh yeah, I hate race hatred and I hate child. So already here looking at the greater context, you can see that it's certainly wrong to attribute the way Kid Woods does this sentence as indicative of Kaczynski presuppositional state in his own ethics. Kaczynski here was strategizing for the technophile. He was strategizing for the army and trying to think how will society get to a point of control? Now, perhaps Ted Kaczynski doesn't like race hatred, and perhaps he doesn't like child abuse, but you cannot take this part of his manifesto and affirm what Keith Woods has been affirming. It's totally out of context.

All abuse and racism, and finally, Kaczynski seems to hold suffering as the greatest. Well, this is kind of the ultimate foundation of all of this. He writes of the immense suffering caused by technological society and in justifying his actions, writes that quote

it is not at all certain that the survival of the system will lead to less suffering than the breakdown of the system world. So Ted is a.

Materialist so here. That's another quote out of context. Let's get to the part of. The manifesto where this is stated. the sentence that Keith Woods has just referred to as right here. In the 3rd place, it is not at all certain that survival of the system will lead to less suffering than breakdown of the system would cheat. Woods is looking at this sentence in isolation and saying, oh said Kaczynski cares about human suffering. Because he's making arguments based on suffering. But that is incorrect. Let us go back two paragraphs back and see what kind of context was Ted Kaczynski arguing in. And you have to capture that sentence right here. Is it therefore crew to work for the breakdown of the system? Maybe, but maybe not. Notice the very important carelessness here. Maybe, but maybe not. So Ted Kaczynski is saying you should revolt against the technology. You should you should organise the revolution against technology. Is it cruel? So that those are not the words of someone who seeks to minimize human suffering. Those are not the words of a utilitarian or consequentialist. Those are the words of someone. Who has his own preference against technology? For his own reasons, which we'll get into later. But he's trying to answer to the factual question here of is it cruel to work for the breakdown of the system? And he's trying to develop a case within the mentality of the technophile or within the mentality of someone who would read this text and perhaps be unconvinced yet, and is trying to put them into a. State where a. You care about human suffering, right? But Are you sure? Are you really sure that it would be cruel to destroy technology? Are you really sure you've properly counted all of the suffering that would go if technology kept going and all the suffering that would go on if it was destroyed? Basically, he's holding the technophile to their own principles. And holding the radar to a potential principle. And he's saying, even if we agreed. That we must reduce human suffering. It's not clear that destroying technology would increase human. Offering. So that's an even if argument. It is not Ted Kaczynski's view and again, Ted Kaczynski has been taken out of context. Let's read the full thing until we reach the point that was taken by Keith Woods. Maybe, but maybe not in the 1st place, revolutionaries will not be able to break the system down unless it is already in enough trouble, so that there would be a good chance of its eventually breaking down by itself anyway. And the bigger the system grows, the more disastrous the consequences of its breakdown will be. So it may be that revolutionaries, by hastening the onset of the breakdown, will be reducing the extent of the disaster. So air is saying. It's not clear that it would be cruel, factually cruel. He's not meaning ethically cruel. He's saying factually cruel. And when we say factually cruel. What do I mean by this? And you think of pain and harm? In the normal conception of the term, so and you're saying pain and harm in a way that would have been avoidable. That is what he means by cruel. And when you frame it that way, you understand that Ted Kaczynski was on a factual extrapolation here. He wasn't trying to ask himself, is it morally right? To destroy technology, he was asking himself if I destroy technology, will I cause more harm? Which someone would

describe as croon. And its first argument in the 1st place is, well, the harm that you might think of yourself as having caused. Might actually have occurred on a longer time scale anyway, so by speeding it up you may actually reduce the total amount of suffering. In the second place, one has to balance struggle and death against the loss of freedom and dignity. To many of us, freedom and dignity are more important than a long life or avoidance of physical pain. That is a very key statement that Keith Woods should not have ignored. Heard that Ted Kaczynski is saying. I prefer other things than avoiding pain. I'm not all about avoiding harm. There are things that are more important than he's saying here. Freedom and dignity are more important than having a long life for avoiding physical pain. So that's his second argument, that maybe it's cruel from the perspective of harm only. But would it be cruel if it helped to liberate people from something that is much more important, which is the crushing of their freedom? And it seems to be much more important to Ted because Ted has the ontological lists and stinks. He has the ontological preferences, even if he's a metaethical moral nihilist. And finally, in the 3rd place, the sentence used by Keith Woods comes in. It is not at all certain that survival of the system will lead to less suffering than breakdown of the system. Would the system has already caused and is continuing to cause immense suffering all over the world? Ancient cultures that for hundreds of years? If people is satisfactory relationship with each other and with their environments have been shattered by contact with industrial society, so here is still on the factual issue of cruelty. Is saying it's not at all certain that what the technophiles think. It's not at all certain that you guys are right. The technophiles that, by abolishing technology, we will cause harm because you're not properly computing your own harm, your own suffering that you've caused. That snapped at Kaczynski, subscribing to a methodical framework that puts an emphasis on harm that SIM arguing with the technophiles on their own criteria of cruelty and harm. So those two things that kit would point as the basis for his belief that Kaczynski is a moral. List consequentialist utilitarian lists are absolutely taken out of context and wrong. Kaczynski didn't think like this, and when I suck, it would come up with this. I was like, wait a minute. I have to go read again because it seems to me that if Ted Kaczynski. Meant something like this. It seems to me that I would remember, and so I had to go reread those passages and I was like, no, that is not at all what he was saying, James says. What I mean by materialism is everything is made of matter. No mind, body distinction. And he says, what the **** is this materialist attack? Whoever is not a materialist is living in a delusional state. I would agree with this, but it actually doesn't matter. Keith Woods has misinterpreted Ted Kaczynski. Whether he's right about his idealism or not. So I'll try to stay out of the whole. Of the whole argument that we've already had him and I on the question of materialism, physicalism, I don't think it's the most important here. What's important is that. Keith Woods is not properly representing Ted Kaczynski.

Second, he's an ethical intuitionist. And thirdly, he seems to be guided by a kind of negative utilitarianism. And lastly, although I said Kaczynski has a very utilitarian critique, it isn't very. Airy fairy look at the beauty of the undisturbed nature he does

give some intrinsic value that he never really spells out to the kind of freedom we experience in a more natural environment, right? It's not just. That it's our natural power process and it satisfies our basic needs. He does seem to attach like an intrinsic value to. Animals, humans being in their natural state rather than this artificial.

And the answer of Ted Kaczynski on this is. I don't have a justification that is just who I am. See the moral nihilist who has a focus on the factual reality, is aware that any sort of justification will just be a made-up virtual puppet to dangle in front of you. And so Ted Kaczynski. Will not then go that virtual puppet in front of you. Did I properly mute myself as I was coughing? I hope so. Ted Kaczynski will not dangle. This virtual puppet in front of you because he respects you too much and he knows what he stands for us from his perspective, he believes what he believes. That is that is might is right is. So to him, it's just his preference. He will not support them the way you expect because he knows there is no such support that will be valid in any way. I have some notes from the book of Ted, but we're going to get to them. Soon, but just to introduce you on on this aspect of his view, his view is that things are and there are certain moralities that will just show up across human societies that differ very much. And so he identifies common moral grounds. Across societies, and is not telling you. Therefore, these principles are true, or therefore you should believe in these principles, these saying those principles are likely to emerge again and again in human societies. So one do not harm anyone who has not previously harmed you. Or to do so. You can harm others in order in order to forestall harm which with which they threaten you or in retaliation for harm that they have already inflicted on you. 31 Good turn deserves another. If someone has done you a favour, you should be willing to do her or him if comparable favor. If and when he or she should need one. For the strong should have consideration for the weak five do not. 5-6 abide faithfully by any promises or agreements that you make. And he goes on to say. It goes on to say these principles are all going to be in conflict with each other, and there's going to be a million ways in which you can say, oh, well, in a situation #5 is more important than #3 and. There's going to be millions of different individuals who value these things in different ways, and some of them are willing to lie at times and will justify lie based on some other principle they hold. And he says there's no truth there. It's just this is really elementary morals that are likely to emerge in some form. When you are an evolving species like human beings, A socially evolving species.

But like I said, he never really gets into. This so much. But that's kind of the fundamental basis.

Now on the question of does he get into defining freedom? He's pretty clear in. Is pretty clear. In the manifesto on how he defines freedom now, he won't get. As I explained, he won't get into. Making a case of why you should care about freedom, because from the perspective of Ted Kaczynski, he only cares about it. And he's trying to connect with other people. Who cares about the same thing as he does. But he does provide a very precise definition of freedom. By freedom, we mean the opportunity to go through the power process with real goals, not the artificial goals of

surrogate activities and without interference. Manipulation or supervision from anyone, especially from any large organization. Freedom means being in control, either as an individual or as a member of a small group of the life and death issues of one's existence, food, clothing, shelter and defence against whatever threats there may be in one's environment. Freedom means having power, not the power. To control other people but the power to control the circumstances of one's own life, one does not have freedom. If anyone else, especially a large organization, has power over one, no matter how benevolently, tolerantly and permissively that power may be exercised. It is important not to confuse freedom with mere permissiveness. So that is what Ted Kaczynski wants. To maximize, he wants to maximize freedom and basically you can see that he has a social conception of freedom. That is, freedom is the entire social position. The antisocial control Ted Kaczynski takes issue with control by large systems. And he sees he prefers the human individuals to be liberated from as much control as possible from the hell. The others, as Jean Paul Sart would have it.

Right. Because in his final justification for the kind of revolution he advocates for, his final justification is about suffering. It's about the system is causing this much suffering. Obviously, he spelled it out with the power process. Why the technological society causes suffering and its basis for calculating the justification for revolution as?

So you have when you read Ted Kaczynski, you have to understand that everything he says about suffering is a statement of fact. He's not saying suffering is bad all the time and suffering shouldn't exist and my feet as if it tries to minimize suffering. No, no, he's saying. Suffering is kind of the symptom, the tip of the iceberg that shows when something else is problematic, and to him technology is much more of a problem because of its arm to liberty than it is because of its suffering inducing processes. In other words, it may be a side. That technology harms people, and that technology makes peoples lives more unbearable compared to the fact of the freedom invasion that is happening to him. That is the real problem at the source of eventually an observed form of suffering.

Well, if we collapse it now, that will be less suffering than if we let it go on accelerate and so on. So I don't think it's a very. Worked ethic I mean. My contention would be.

Because it's a non meta ethics, it's an ethics of preference, so it's never going to be worked out because the working out that you describe to Ted Kaczynski to a mind like him like is. He calls the ***** of rational philosophy. He says there's nothing rational about it. All that matters is what kind of creature we become in reality.

That if you're materialist, you can't have any kind of ethic and there's really no basis for any of. Good purposes such as discouraging child abuse or racial hatred, or why is child abuse bad? If you're materialist, why?

Well, he, he. Didn't say that child abuse was bad. As I indicated in my response earlier.

Those racial hair drop out if you're materialist. He thinks we'll all agree to that and. OK, maybe everyone reading it agrees that racial hatred is bad. But that doesn't mean that there's some objective basis for that beyond individuals.

That was just that, Kaczynski making factual statements about society. you can say. Most people would agree that child abuse is bad. Therefore, let us use the concept of child abuse as something not good as part of an argument in which I'm trying to deploy your own thought processes into an argument, just to show you that you are wrong. That's what he was trying to do with the technophile as he was. Thinking like them, arguing like them to show them. See, you are led to a good purpose. But this good purpose you ultimately result in a bad end.

Agreeing on it. And he that's my contention is that he. Fundamentally, can't bridge that gap. Yours is not.

But he never will bridge this gap because the gap between art and is. Is an imaginary gap because the world of art for Ted Kaczynski and for people like me is a is an imaginary. So you can bridge the gap in 1000 different ways. Or you can just say it will never be breached in an objective way. But that's just because the thousands of ways in which you can bridge that gap is to basically make assumptions and use axioms that predefine your moral system as being true and right. That Kaczynski knows this, so he's never going to try to bridge the is add gap. All he cares about is what is. And then he has his preferences about what could be.

Trust ethics, and he doesn't seem troubled by the traditional problems of holding the natural aesthetics. In fact, he didn't really seem. To be aware of the. Many philosophical presuppositions he's bringing into play here. He talks about, talk about the natural ethics that he describes versus conventional ethics. And he does outline this a little bit. I think it's in another one of his letters to scherbina, maybe or maybe he was. I think it was a separate essay, actually. But he identifies like 6 planks of this like natural morality, which is like you don't lie to people, you fulfill contracts.

So those are the six points we've reviewed.

You know, in a very basic way, you do unto others as they would do unto. You, but again, this is very subjective. You can always find a try Abe people or your individual that doesn't share this ethic.

But Ted Kaczynski acknowledges this in the very writing that you're talking about. He actually lists exceptions to those rules. This tribe doesn't do that one. This guy didn't do this one. And then he says, in spite of such examples, I maintained that the six principles tend toward universality. They tend toward universality. They are not universal. They tend, so he's saying they reemerge in various societies in their own ways. But whether or not one accepts that the six principles are to any extent universal, I feel safe in assuming that almost all readers of this article will agree with the principles. With the possible exception of the principle of retaliation. In some shape or another? Hence, the six principles can serve as a basis for the present discussion. I argue that the six principles should not be regarded as a moral code for several reasons. First, the principles are vague and can be interpreted in such widely ways that there will be no consistent agreement. As to their application in concrete cases. For instance, if Smith insists on playing his radio so loud that it prevents Jones from sleeping, and if Jones smashes Smiths Radio for him, is John's action unprovoked harm inflicted on Smith?

Or is it legitimate self defence against harm that Smith is inflicting on Jones? On this question, Smith and Jones are not likely to agree all the same. There are limits to the interpretation of the six principles. I imagine it would be difficult to find anyone in any culture who would interpret the principles in such a way. As to justify brutal physical abuse of unoffending old ladies, or the rape of four year old girls. So basically what he's saying is it's all relative and he's not claiming those statements as a moral code. He just wrote it. Those statements should not be interpreted as a moral code. What does Keith? He interprets them as a moral code. He thinks, Oh my God. Well, Ted Kaczynski is laying out a very inconsistent, very loose moral code. No, that is not his moral code. That is Ted Kaczynski's factual observation. About where societies stand toward. And he's not saying you have to accept these six principles or I've defined them well, he's saying when you look at societies across planet Earth. They all have some version of some of these.

Intuition, and even if they do, you have everyone shares it. If it's, if we're just uh. if we're just meat sacks, as Ted thinks we are, all of this is just an evolutionary adaptation to it and survival.

That's what they are. They are evolutionary adaptation and denying that they are evolutionary adaptation has no bearing on changing Ted Kaczynski's view on this. It's just that you don't know that they are evolutionary adaptation, but that's what they still are.

So it's not blinding on anyone.

While Ted Kaczynski does not claim that his moral framework is binding as a moral nihilist, it doesn't believe this. So you are asking for something that kept Ted Kaczynski is telling you he can't provide you. There is no moral binding system that Kaczynski doesn't have it. The only way to bind someone else in Ted Kaczynski's framework is to be more powerful and willing to impose your force onto them. That is the only way to bind someone else to your moral principles or to deceive them into manipulating them through some way. So that they end up following your order, even if they don't know it's from you. But those are the ways Ted Kaczynski is very clear about this in the path to revolution. A letter to David that's curbing. Have been able to identify only three ways apart from modest reforms in which human beings and tensions concerning the future of their own society can be realized successfully. One intelligent administration can prolong the life of an existing social order. Two revolutionary action can bring about, or at least hasten the breakdown of an existing social order, and three an existing social order can sometimes be extended to encompass additional territory. So he's talking here about. Power, politics and power. That's how Ted Kaczynski. Now he doesn't see his revolutionary movement against technology as a political movement. Is seized as we are a minority of the world. We'll never convince people again that that it's in their interest to listen to us, but we can play in various ways to favor a foul of the already existing system. So it's mostly into #2. Revolutionary action can bring about, or at least hasten. The breakdown of an existing social order, so the revolutionary dynamic that he sees is to impose your desire for society onto others

as they put themselves into their own troubles. And as you see them walk into the traps that they shouldn't walk, you can set. Further and further traps for society to disintegrate and for social order to change the world. What you want it to be. But it's all happening in the real world. it's all about what the physics, what, what physics you can induce to impose your control over others. It's not about persuading or about. Principles that are abstract or dictated by God. Aquanaut says Jeff, I'm really grateful you have the proper understanding of Ted care with your treatment. I respect Keith, but he often misrepresents people. He reads and his audience never pushes back. Well, yeah, that's the goal of this show. We're going to set the record straight.

You know why? Why would you follow? Any of these. Principles of fairness anyway, back to the slide. So ethics involves normative claims about how we ought to behave, while the.

Or if you are a moral nihilist, it involves claims about what you prefer as an individual, while acknowledging that there is nothing binding or objective about them.

If the materialists is in perpetual flux with no objective meaning purposes or ethical value.

That is unmetered. It will tell you that there is no objective meaning to morality. But the question remains. I'm an agent in the world. I still see vanilla ice cream and chocolate ice cream. I still can prefer that one of them I taste better for me, I prefer vanilla ice cream. It tastes better to me. Now I acknowledge that there is no objective nor binding aspect to my preference, but I can still have that preference just like the moral nihilists can have subjective moral preferences while acknowledging that there's nothing objective or binding about the.

Sinski doesn't explain how he bridges the. Gap from the. Is of measure to the art of his ethical prescript.

It doesn't have an art. It has a preference and he is trying to shape the world so that the world. Heads toward his preference through chains of causality.

This is the. a very standard problem in philosophy. How do you bridge that gap? OK, you can. So people have an intuition of fairness. You can say you want people to adhere to that. Why should they? At that point.

That there is no. Why they should. And they won't. That that's point they won't. You won't convince them. So you have to. Make commit actions in the world that will bring the world to where you want it to be, and dependent of whether it's right that the world beheaded that way or another.

To go from the old tree is you just have this kind of infinite regress or so. Well, it's good for survival, you say? Well, why is survival a good thing? You'll say, well, if we're if we survive, then we can perpetuate species. Why is that a good thing and said? Well, we can enjoy XYZ. You said, well, why is that an? You really can't bridge that gap. And so it's just kind of so many words.

There's no claim that he bridges that gap. He's very aware that he is an agent with certain preferences that Kaczynski is not saying you should be convinced by what I say is saying what I say is what I feel. It's a fact of the world that I want this. It's a fact.

It's a true. That my brain wants this direction for society and therefore I'm producing this manifesto with the idea that perhaps there are some people out there who think like me and they will be influenced by me and they will find out. Oh, well, now that I see Ted's manifesto. I understand that there are other people who think just like me, those are all factual issues. See, we haven't entered the world of art. Because there there's nothing that ought to be.

From Kaczynski says we have this natural morality that everyone ought to follow and that we ought to reduce suffering and.

Though those are false interpretations of Ted, as I've made the case earlier.

Not, we ought to return to more traditional pre industrial way of life. There's just so many words. Ted's appeal to shared moral intuitions can't bridge the gap. What may be considered morally abhorrent for when people and one time may be normative in another, and Kaczynski illustrates this problem himself when he uses the example of racial hatred and child abuse as things.

Again, have made the case that those were taken out of context and Ted could have preferences. About racial hatred and child abuse without claiming that these preferences are binding to everyone else.

We all agree are cases of evil. Though there may be general agreement on this in the modern West, this is far from universal. Tree racism is especially evil or unnatural is itself quite a modern idea brought about by technological society. While primitive cultures are certainly not free of what we would consider child abuse.

So that's key towards gotcha. That's all I did. Well, you assume that racism is bad. Do you realize how recent this thought is? It goes on on this gotcha.

He kind of gives the whole problem away there, right? He's a he's a naturalist. He's a materialist. He wants pre industrial civilization. And then to ground his wealthy, he says. Well, OK, I don't know sound like, transcendent base for ethics or something, but. Obviously we can. All agree on right and wrong, right? What's his example? So racism.

Well, that wasn't how it went, Keith. This is a series of straw men right there. I've already described this, of course, but just to repeat, Ted Kaczynski wasn't saying racism is inherently and objectively bad or binding, or that entire racism is binding. He wasn't even saying that his entire racist he was processing into. The thinking process of an army of a technophile, and it was saying they will be brought about by little stepwise agreements to things that they agree with, like anti racism. He was talking in their mind, not in his own mind, Thomas Howard says. I remember mentioning to Jeff. Some years ago, that industrial society and its future was very insightful at the time, based on his response, I never thought I would see him defending it from low tier attack one day. Yes, I came to Ted Kaczynski very late and it's because of you guys. Thomas O'Hara, I don't remember specifically if you were the first to talk about this to me, but I know that it comes from the chat that so it might very well be you who caused me to discover Ted Kaczynski. I was dismissive of it. and I regret being dismissive of it. But back in the days I was dismissing of it because I couldn't talk

about this subject on YouTube, I would get banned. And so that that's a way in which censorship gets into you. Because it makes you not want to engage with the subject, not because you don't agree with the writings, but because you can't talk about it. And so you're like, oh, well, if I can't talk about it, then why think about it, you know? but yeah. Thank you for making me discover Ted Kaczynski. James says I'm losing my mind. Every time he add-ons materialism, it does a lot. That is too bad.

It's like, OK, well, that's been considered like evil for the last like. 70 or 80 years of all of human history.

He is trying to present Ted Kaczynski as a modern kook of anti racism when it is not even what Ted Kaczynski was writing. It's all based on a strong and interpretation of his statement.

And you know, we didn't have a word for it until like, last Thursday. In the grand scheme of things. But you're taking that as like our sort of fundamental A fundamental ethical intuition. I mean, that itself kind of throws shade on the whole process here. Because is that just something we discovered was evil in the 20th century?

Like when you have to pinpoint and pick on a single sentence out of a huge manifesto in books, you have to think, kid, you have to wake up, shake yourself and say, am I being unfair here? Have I took something out of context because I showed that only. Showing one or two paragraphs above or below the statements that you take. You can understand what Ted was saying. Now when you have to base your entire case against that Kaczynski by picking on these out of context sentences, it's very frustrating. Maybe next time, says Jeff. Technology cannot be given to anyone. Some tech is too dangerous for the common man. This is, I believe, the crux of the argument of Uncle Ted. No, not at all. Ted Kaczynski doesn't have an elitist conception of technology should be given to the powerful, and the common man is not willing. No, Ted Kaczynski sees that the common man at the bottom of society doesn't control technology, but that technology is used. By the man, the elite at the top of society, to control the common man. So it is not his view that the common man shouldn't have access to some technologies and it should be reserved to the elite that Kaczynski is totally anti.

We only discovered it was evil. True industrial society and the ways of life that encouraged. So it's always possible for them to bridge that gap. And what we consider child abuse? You could point to plant.

But he hasn't set on a path to bridge that gap, nor has he claimed that he was. Bridging that gap.

Examples in in primitive society someone says child abuse has always been. On the, yeah, but there are tribes where, like, children literally get eaten, right. And to them that's not wrong, because that's something they do for whatever reason. They do it. Whether it's what about the tribes in the Amazon, where they believe that kids, some children born, have an evil spirit inside them and they go off and, like, leave them in a hole. In the Amazon and just.

All irrelevant, and the fact that Ted Kaczynski hasn't said that it was is philosophy that child abuse is wrong.

Leads them to die there, right? And even not that long ago. In her own history, yet some things like happened like this with infanticide, right? So we can all agree child abuse as long, or can we? Well, not every people in the world does. Every people in history did. Certainly not every primitive people.

He has acknowledged that there were exceptions to his six moral rules, and anyways, the six moral rules he wrote right after listing them, though this is not a moral code. This is just my observation of planet Earth and where it converged toward general.

Yeah, I mean, like you have this guy in the Shasta and once, obviously wrong. Well, to you, it's obviously wrong. But what happens if someone disagrees with you? Well, I don't know. Maybe you're religious. Maybe you have some kind of appeal to make. What's Ted's basis? If someone disagrees and there's a tribe, uh, that says that if your child is is born with.

Thomas Howard says. I think this misconception of suffering is where woods really falls short. Thanks for pointing out the majority of the flaws in this process. Jeff, this is an unconscionable error that cried out for correction. I have a lot to say on this topic. Yeah, I mean, The thing is we have Keith Woods telling us. I read everything about Ted Kaczynski, his letters, his book. and he makes a whole intro that suggests to me that yes, he did read a lot from Ted Kaczynski. If he was able to trace back all of these thoughts and where they were sourced and other fit as affair with thought like him, but then it's like your interpretation of the ethical part of Ted Kaczynski shows a complete misunderstanding. It's like you haven't integrated what you've read somehow you. Don't rationally process what you've read. Rather, you tried to isolate little sentences that you thought there was a way to present away from what Ted really thinks.

Club foot that you have to bury them upside down in a hole in the Amazon. I mean, that's what's you know, what's the kind of, what's the basis for normativity in any of this? Again, it's just so many words. And like, that's the whole problem is the kind of this and right is like this is such an insightful critique. But it's there's no like foundational basis for any of it. So at the end of the day. It comes down to one man's preference for utilitarian.

But that's what it is. With moral nihilism. He's telling you I'm not going to justify it. I just am this way.

Ethic, which not everyone shares. And this is obviously rooted in this materialism, which has other effects on his worldview, Kaczynski's Kaczynski wrote a letter from prison that he was a materialist, plain and simple, and that all human behavior can in principle be explained through the laws of physics. Because if you want to believe machines could eventually replace human minds completely writing. Or I'm enough for materialists to believe that the human brain functions solely according to?

OK, so now that we are moving to the subject. Of the AIS aspect and the replacement of technology, I just want to go through a few other sentences that I that I had

highlighted from Ted Kaczynski's book. Which support the points I've been making for the last few minutes, a claim of morality often serves as a cloak for what would otherwise be seen as the naked imposition of one's own will on other people. Thus, if a person said I am going to prevent you from having an abortion or from having sex or eating meat or something else just because I personally find it offensive, his attempt to impose as well would be considered arrogant and unreasonable. But if he claims to have a moral basis for what he's doing, if he says I'm going to prevent you from having an abortion because it's immoral. Then his attempt to impose his will acquires a certain legitimacy, or at least tends to be treated with more respect than it would be if he made no moral claim. People who are strongly attached to the morality of their own society often are obviously oblivious to the principle of fairness. The highly and Christian businessman John D Rockefeller used underhand methods to achieve success, as is admitted by Allan Nevins and is admiring bio. Prophecy of Rockefeller today's screwing people in one way or another is almost an inevitable part of any large scale business enterprise. So here you have the third totally rooted in reality, where is like the moral principles. They're there to put a veneer. To put a cloak around what we do, and sometimes they're useful, sometimes they're not. But leisure is a modern concept, and the emphasis that anarcho Oh no. This is a quote that will come later for a later point of Keith Woods. Morality merely provides the excuse in some anyone who takes a detached look at modern society will see that for all its emphasis on morality. It observes the principles of fairness fairly poorly indeed, certainly less well than many primitive societies do, allowing for various exceptions. The main purpose of that morality serves in modern society is to facilitate the functioning of the techno industrial system. So again, morality here used as a cloak as an excuse to get to other places. Though revolution will necessarily involve violation of the principle of fairness, revolutionaries should make every effort to avoid violating those principles any more than is really necessary, not only from respect for human decency, but also for practical reasons. By complying with the principles of fairness. To the extent that doing so is not incompatible with revolutionary action, revolutionaries will win the respect of non revolutionary. Trees will be able to recruit better people to be revolutionaries and will increase the self respect of the revolutionary movement, thereby strengthening its Esprit acore that is fascinating, because you can see you can see what it leads to, a kind of morality. Without binding and without obligations is like. So I just listed very important principles. Let's try to respect them as much as possible within the space of the feasible. And like when we violate them, let's try not to be hassles about it. That is a completely different moral discussion than what you get with these uh? These philosophers who think that there is something like moral realism, so that is what you get with a moral nihilist. Yeah, it seems that these principles are guiding most humans on planet Earth. And so since we're going to have to violate some of these principles, let's try not to be ***** about it. Because in a ways it will just **** *. Too much people. That is what Ted Kaczynski is saying. Is not saying those principles stem from reason? And here's my here's my fundamental axioms and why I why these axioms

are justified? And no, he's saying none of this he's saying. We are added toward revolutionary action. There's going to be a bunch of people who may hate us for it, and So what would be the strategy that maximizes the potential change that we can induce to society while not turning everyone against us so that we're eliminated? Basically, that's how Ted Kaczynski thinks it's a very strategic, pragmatic. Set of philosophical consideration rather than per rational 1. And Ted ultimately sees it as all natural selection. Here are purposes merely to describe the role that natural selection plays in the development of society. We do not mean to suggest any favorable value judgment. Concerning the winners. In the struggle of power. In the struggle for power. And this will be important as we move toward the AI technological takeover section. Because Ted Kaczynski is again misrepresented, in my view, by Keith Woods. It is not because Ted Kaczynski. Beliefs and materialism that he ends up having pessimistic views about AI. I think the shortcut that Keith is taking here, that the sin that he's committing is to think that Ted's materialism. Justifies Kaczynski's pessimistic views about the future of AI. You don't have to be a materialist. To have pessimistic views about the potential. That technology may replace humanity. Technology may not be able. You could believe that technology is absolutely unable to reproduce the human mind, and that yet technology can occupy the ecological niche of humans and replace them even without the mind. So I don't think that it's OK for Keith Woods to suggest that this is the rationale of Ted Kaczynski. This is Keith Wood's interpretation here.

To the laws of physics and chemistry, no words. It is, in a sense, a machine, so it should be possible to duplicate it artificially. This justified Kaczynski's pessimistic views about the future of AI.

I don't think it's what justifies Ted Kaczynski happens to be a materialist. Happens to know that AI and technology can very well be made to create all actions of a human, and even if we were to make robots that don't have the human mind, they could have the human arms and you would have to acknowledge Keith, that there is a physical layer of reality that they can fully emulate. That if it's the elbow, a machine can totally have this elbow. If it's my fingers, a machine can totally have this finger. If it's the particular rhythm and movements of my finger, a machine can totally have this particular rhythm, and this particular movement, so you're going to have to reconstruct. Bound the rays around your idealism. When you go through that process and realize that a machine being able to reproduce all possible human actions in the physical universe, a machine, therefore can replace humans through natural selection if it performs better than them at preserving its own existence. That would be Ted Kaczynski's view precisely based on what is written about natural selection. Here are purposes merely to describe the role that natural selection plays in the development of societies. We do not mean to suggest any favorable value judgment concerning the winners and the struggle of power. So he's telling you. The machines could win. The humans could win the humans of a certain kind could win over the humans of another kind. It's still what happens in the real world that will be it's all that will matter what

the real world comes to be. It is not saying that his materialism binds him toward a pessimistic view.

Like I said, he rode of his belief that humans would eventually be totally replaced by AI, and that then the system would have no need for humans and we would likely go extinct. Well, again, I think the foundations of this are rather weak. There's a number of reasons to reject materialism. I've done videos on this in the past. I mean, this is obviously again like a. Perfect. Topic in philosophy. I'm not going to do this will obviously be the main focus of like Jeff disagreeing with me, but I'm not going to the entire, I mean this could be A to our video itself, but yeah, there's the higher problem of consciousness that is. How can how can matter? How can the nature?

So here I will skip over this part because this is a discussion we've already had. Materialism has no problem. The hard problem of consciousness is a misunderstanding of subjective appreciation of a conscious state. Versus objective creation of a conscious state. The problem of epistemology. There is no problem. The universe can look at itself. Pieces of matter can be arranged in a way that they accumulate information about other pieces of matter. That is not a contradiction. Emergence is not a problem. It turns out that virtual constructs like the human mind. Can be made in the physical universe. There's no reason to assume that it couldn't, and it ticks is not a problem because it doesn't exist. So those are part of the debate we've already had with Keith Woods. I'm going to jump over it because. You cannot say that Ted Kaczynski is wrong because you disagree with materialism, because that's just your belief and he has his belief. For him to be wrong in the way you suggested, Keith, in your original title of your video, you have to show me something in his own reasoning in his own text, in his own beliefs. That is wrong by itself. That is, you have to show me a self consistency issue in the framework of Ted Kaczynski, or else it's not so much that he's wrong. It's just that you think otherwise.

Now another problem, obviously is practicality. It's just not realistic. I think Kaczynski wanted someone said underwhelming. My moral preference, my moral preference? Well, that's kind of like the, I mean, that's kind of the basis for a worldview is like having an ethics. I mean, if you're going to make claims that you think are universal, that you're telling people they should do actions. Towards you have to have a basis for it so. It actually kind of is. It's pretty, it's pretty, it's pretty significant. So there's no basis for the worldview, right? It's not exactly. Like you know, a small detail that this one of you is totally arbitrary. I think that's pretty significant actually.

But it is in his worldview, any rational philosopher system will be equally arbitrary. So it's like, OK, I won't ***** you with non arbitrariness because they don't have it. And the moral realist out there, they will just ask you to assume an arbitrary axiom. And so I'm not gonna ***** you with an arbitrary axiom because we're above this. That's what he's saying, Ted.

But yeah, very simply. Like a nuclear Holocaust, it's difficult to envision how the pre technological world he desired to come about it would cause the deaths of billions, almost certainly, and require global effort. And certainly his actions didn't bring us

any nearer. I mean, a lot of people have read the manifesto because. Of it, but. And I know.

The fact, well, first I will say that in the very start of his sentence here, he has a recognition that it is entirely possible that a fall of industrial society would come from something like a nuclear Holocaust. So Ted Kaczynski, as he writes his manifesto, he knows very well that in the coming thousands of years, there might very well be a nuclear Holocaust. There might very well be moments at which human society is more unstable. It describes these moments again and again in his writings, and he's basically saying. Those will be moments that can be exploited. They can be exploited so that we can hit at the same time in ways that just slowly or in ways that subtly change the situation in the favor of those who object to technology. I'm looking for the part of the text that I wanted to yeah, about revolutionary actions. If I'm right. So yeah, it's listed three ways in which societies can change. You can either try to maintain an existing social order, you can commit revolutionary action that can bring about or at least haste. So in this view. It may be the only thing that you can do to change a society is just slightly pushing it so that it goes a little faster in the direction you want. But that, he says, would be enough. It would be enough to justify a movement so that whenever these nuclear Holocaust happen, or whatever happens, we can use the weakness of the social order then to shape society in the way we want. And he also says an existing social order can sometimes be. Extended to encompass additional territory. So basically the extension of the West power of sphere of influence over other societies. If I'm right, and if we want to exert any rational influence beyond modest reforms on the future of our society. Then we have to choose one of the foregoing alternatives. So because Keith Woods recognizes that such a thing could be feasible after a nuclear Holocaust, we are totally within the sphere of the possible as far as Keith Wood's assertion that. That Ted Kaczynski is murders haven't resulted in anything I believe, and I've expressed this a couple of days ago on the show. I believe that Ted Kaczynski wanted immortality. And I believe he thought it important that he be preserved in the public record and the only way he could see that would bring this full preservation over thousands of years was to kill people. I don't have a quote directly of him, but I've again and again I've read through his personal writings and I've concluded that this is what he was after. He was after immortality for being the seed. Of a movement that would forever have a founding document. Whether you agree with him or not that he should have done this, maybe next time since Ted was stupid to pose bombs. Of course we cannot. We can agree and say this today, but that's what he taught in terms of understanding Ted Kay. He thought that it was necessary for a text, a foundational text, for this revolutionary movement, that it was starting to be far ever available and is effectively right. I think that Ted Kaczynski's manifesto will be in the public record for many thousands of years still. So it was correct. I personally have published my letter on the Bitcoin blockchain and I'm also convinced that my letter will be held by human societies for a long long. You can't say that. That's nothing. From this view, it is very important. It might be causal to a revolutionary movement

existing in 1000 years from now, compared to nothing, no alternative to technological society existing at all. James says that is a great hypothesis. I didn't think of that. I think at some point, he says in in the very manifesto, he says. For you to read these words, I had to kill people. And so he's very conscious of what he's doing there. And what are you think it's moral or not? Of course we're we're not discussing this but. Whether it was factually correct in knowing that he would be immortalized, he was factually correct on this and we yet have no idea whether is immortality will be useful to future outcomes of society.

That are pretty much a pointless waste of life and anything you outlined, I just don't see it as. Anywhere close realistically happening. So what would collapse take?

Well, you see it since you listed here. You say if a nuclear Holocaust does happen, then it would be possible. So you so I will not argue further on this aspect of Keith Wood's argument. I think he's considered it to Ted already.

Driven by warfare, if humanity collectively disarms itself. There would be a massive incentive for only one people to regain the technological advances of all leaving others defenseless. It would simply be no way to prevent this, except the world police. This is not something Sokolowski wrote about much, just the way. Conflict and warfare and the need for defense against other countries. Technological developments drove technology. You know, you look at how many. Technological innovations that shaped this century were developed by like U.S. military and related.

OK, so that is perhaps the best argument of Keith Woods. Because it's an argument that takes Ted Kaczynski at the level that he wishes to be addressed at the pragmatic political level. In fact, I think that it's out of all the things that Keith Woods has said. It's the only argument that stands with the prima facie value of being at all valid. of being potentially valid, of being a valid potential counter against dead, and it's the Sargon of Akkad argument J if you want to do this whole libertarian society. Oh, I have an army. I'm going to take over your libertarian world. And see that shows me that in a way. Keith Woods is capable of thinking like Ted Kaczynski because he felt the need to insert this last argument in his presentation. Yeah, so the idea that a non technological society. Suppose that the revolutionary action works in some way. How can you guarantee that there won't be another society taking the advantage of having technology to just reconquer you and reimpose technology on you? And Ted Kaczynski is not deluded on this point? Ted Kaczynski sees it this way. That might very well happen. I don't know what will happen after the revolution has worked, but what I know is that if a revolution is successful at undermining technological civilization, we're at least going to have some advance. And enjoying liberty for some time. And no matter how much time it takes for technology to come back or for an invader to redominantly us. No matter if that happens, we will have a space of time in which we will have reached our goals and those should be our only goals for now. Then we might care about trying to stabilize the situation and keep it non technological for a long time. But that is a concern to be had later every second that we can have in a non technological imposition world. Every second that we could have would be better than having none. That is what

Ted Kaczynski says when he writes. Until the industrial system must be thoroughly wrecked, the destruction of that system must be the revolutionaries only goal. Other goals would distract attention and energy from the main goal. More importantly, if the revolutionaries permit themselves to have any other goal than the distraction of technology, they will be tempted to use technology as a tool for reaching that other goal. If they give in to that temptation, they will fall right back into the technological trap because modern technology is a unified tightly. Organized system so that in order to retain some technology, one finds oneself obliged to retain most technologies. Hence one ends up sacrificing only token amounts of technology. Suppose, for example, that the revolutionaries took social justice as a goal, human nature being what it is, social justice will not come about spontaneously. It would have to be enforced in order to enforce it. Would have to retain Central organization and control for that. They would need rapid long distance transportation and communication and therefore all the technology needed to support the transportation and communication system. To feed and clothe poor people, they would have to use agricultural and manufacturing technology and so forth, so that the attempts to ensure social justice would force them to retain most parts. Of the technological system, not that we have anything against social justice, but it must not be allowed to interfere with the effort to get rid of the technological system. It would be hopeless for revolutionaries to try to attack the system without using some modern technology. If nothing else, they must use the communications media to spread their message, but they should use modern technology for only one purpose to attack the technological system. Very interesting here and I think we are getting into the ultimate contradiction of all monopolistic system, including the state, and even including monopolistic systems of mines goals. Like when you have a priority in your mind. The wreaths must take secondary importance. But very often in the pursuit of that goal, you will have to do a little bit of what you're trying to eliminate. Look at for example the state. The state handles criminal law. The state has a monopoly over enforcing laws. You cannot go and decide that your neighbor has been evil toward you and punish him. Anything that you do that would be criminal, you will get arrested for it. So the state contradictorily in appearance. Saying we want to avoid violence, we want to stop criminality. But for this so that we can do this, we're going to allow ourselves to have the violence capabilities. So to stop violence you need to do some violence. To stop criminality, you need to do a little bit of criminality in the sense that. The state imposes itself as a monopoly. The state can sometimes shoot people the state can kidnap people. So for stopping kidnapping, you have to kidnap for stopping killings, you have to kill. Ted Kaczynski is telling us here for stopping technology. You have to use a little bit of technology and it's OK as long as you do for the purpose of stopping. The ultimate thing that you're trying to stop, and I think it's OK, it's just an apparent contradiction. I think it's totally fine to say. To have this view that a technological system naturally tends to reemerge. And therefore some amount of technology may be at all time existing and at all time in fact useful to maintain this technology to a minimum, the same way some amount of state violence is needed

to maintain violence to a minimum in society. I think it's totally fun to adopt this view and for finishing as a conclusion. To address kids last point, so he said that Ted Kaczynski wasn't very much commenting on. What happens once we have won the revolution? Wouldn't technology come back at a gallop? But Ted Kaczynski says this to relieve the pressure on nature, it is not necessary to create a special kind of social system. It is only necessary to get rid of industrial society. Granted, this will not solve all problems industrial society has already done tremendous damage to nature and it will take a very long time for the scars to heal. Besides, even pre industrial societies. Can do significant damage to nature. Nevertheless, getting rid of industrial society will accomplish a great deal. It will relieve the worth of the pressure on nature so that the scars can begin to heal. It will remove the capacity of organized society to keep increasing its control over nature, including human nature. Whatever kind of society may exist after the demise of the industrial system, it is certain that most people will live close to nature. Because in the absence of advanced technology, there is no other way that people can live. To feed themselves, they must be peasants or herdsmen or fishermen or hunters, and generally speaking, local autonomy should tend to increase because lack of advanced technology and rapid communications will limit the capacity of governments or other large organizations to control communities. He goes on in other places commenting on, this state may not be maintained forever, but however long we can maintain, this state should just be our goal. Our goal should be to get there and once we get there, to maintain it, as long as we can and then perhaps it's going to come back, but then. Other revolutionary movements will be needed to return the equilibrium to 1 where nature wins again. Nature, of course. Here being the absence of social invasions of our freedom. And you know, Keith Woods moves on to do a whole ecological arguments, claiming that if you destroy society in its current state, you're going to get more ecological collapse. And to argue this, and he also argues that actually the modern society is headed toward a decentralized state, and that we are actually a technology has helped decentralized rather than centralized. So he's saying that Ted Kaczynski was wrong. That is prediction. That things like Bitcoins are proof that technology is creating little communities and decentralized community. And that that is laughable. That is laughable. It is very clear that the history of the Internet is toward the centralization of massive. Big players, we call them big tech. With centralized speech so much. That a joke that you could do in the 90s, you cannot do it anymore because you're going to get banned from Facebook. You're going to get banned from Twitter. The centralization of speech controls that didn't exist at. Has been fully accomplished within 20 years. To say that the Internet doesn't centralizes to not understand it. Now we use a term in the crypto world very often and we say, oh, this is a decentralized finance, but let's. Be clear here. These crypto projects of all kinds have actually. From the definitions of Ted Kaczynski, they are actually part of a centralization movement, because what do they replace? Well, these blockchains that you can download everyone's transaction over the entire history of the world. That's what happens when you download the Bitcoin blockchain. You download the entire

transactional history of the world. That is what I call centralized from Ted Kaczynski's point. We centralized our finances. When we say that Bitcoin is decentralized, finance and other cryptos are D Phi what we mean is that. There's not a single lever of control. That can censor you. But it is not in question in my view, that the Internet generally has been centralizing things that were much more spread because the Bitcoin blockchain. You can download it like. Could you have downloaded the entire history of the banks of the transactions of all banks in 1940? You couldn't. You couldn't. So we centralized ourselves with the Internet. Now we use the term decentralize. But it means a very different thing than what Ted Kaczynski meant when he said the world has headed toward more central control. He was absolutely correct. The Facebook of this world have absolute. Immeasurable power, immeasurable amounts of power, which is exactly why their stock value rises super high, and why they impose so much controls on communications and downloads, and who your friend and what you do. They monitor all of it, said Kaczynski. Was absolutely right about this and the last argument of Keith Woods is well, if we give up all this modern technology, we go into an ecological collapse. The view of Ted Kaczynski on this would simply be that if something collapses because it was dependent on human society, then it was, it was meant to collapse. So be it. You know, Keith Wood says there will be more erosion of the soils than there will be attempts by humans to farm the whole land. Yes, there may be. There may be attempts by humans who are deprived of technology and an unstable society. They might ruin some lands, but then if they ruin it, they won't be able to cultivate it. And they'll die. And they'll be naturally selected out. And eventually the natural capacity of planet Earth can come back to what it can truly support. From Ted Kaczynski's view, if something like a land was to be ruined because modern society cannot be sustained. When it was due to collapse, it was due to be ruined and it will be a much more beautiful future for this land after many generations if we are reducing our populations to what it can truly support. So All in all, what we have seen today in conclusion. Is a misinterpretation, a miss addressing of Ted Kaczynski's words. I'm not particularly an expert of that Kaczynski, but I knew something was wrong as I was reviewing Keith Woods review, I knew that I would go back to the text and not find at all the meaning that Keith Woods attributes to the. So I would recommend to keep words as a conclusion. Be honest, try to try to go back to these passages and try to address Ted Kaczynski on his on his terms. Because right now you're addressing him on your terms, and then your title shouldn't be Ted Kaczynski being wrong. Or even the question was he wrong? Your title could be hi. I'm Keith woods. And I think differently. Here are my thoughts, but we both know this wouldn't gather much clicks, right?

Links used in the show

(4) Tucker Carlson on Twitter: "Ep. 4 Wannabe Dictator <https://t.co/MDcs5g0gxB>" / Twitter

- (4) @amuse on Twitter: "Equity thieves in San Francisco are robbing the last few remaining stores before they close down. <https://t.co/fXetvNazhR>" / Twitter
- (4) Elon Musk on Twitter: "@Hebro_Steele Many Twitter employees feel unsafe coming to work in downtown SF and have had their car windows smashed. They also got such a null response from the police that they rarely even bother reporting crimes anymore, because nothing happens." / Twitter
- The Szaszian Fork: Another Reply to Scott Alexander on Mental Illness
- RARBG Torrents , films , download
- 'If You Love Your Children, Flee The State': California GOP Lawmaker - ZeroHedge
- US government hit in global cyberattack - CNN Politics
- (8) Matt Walsh on Twitter: "ðŸšµ1/ BREAKING: We've obtained internal docs from @FoxNews employees. Fox Corp is celebrating Pride by encouraging employees to read about â€œglory holes,â€œ supporting a group that gives sterilizing hormones to homeless youth, & deployed woke AI to monitor everyone. EXPLICIT CONTENT:" / Twitter
- (8) Disclose.tv on Twitter: "JUST IN - U.S. federal government agencies hit in global cyberattack, CISA "working urgently to understand impacts" â€œ" CNN" / Twitter
- (8) Watcher.Guru on Twitter: "JUST IN: \$9 trillion asset manager BlackRock to file for #Bitcoin ETF, CoinDesk reports." / Twitter
- Biggest Lie In Crypto? How SEC, US Dems Conduct A Psyop Vs. Coinbase And Binance - ZeroHedge
- (9) Watcher.Guru on Twitter: "JUST IN: ðŸ†° Hong Kong tells major banks to accept #crypto companies as clients." / Twitter
- The Philosophy of Ted Kaczynski - Was Kaczynski Wrong About Industrial Society? - YouTube
- washingtonpost.com: Unabomber Special Report
- washingtonpost.com: Unabomber Special Report
- The.Road_.to_.Revolution-Ted.Kaczynski.pdf
- Kaczynski Anti-Tech Revolution Why and How.pdf

- Part-I-of-II-Kaczynski-Truth-Versus-Lies-2013.pdf
- Part-II-of-II-Kaczynski-Truth-Versus-Lies-2013.pdf
- washingtonpost.com: Unabomber Special Report
- washingtonpost.com: Unabomber Special Report
- Technological Slavery - The Collected Writings of Theodore J. Kaczynski, a.k.a. 'The Unabomber'.pdf
- washingtonpost.com: Unabomber Special Report
- washingtonpost.com: Unabomber Special Report

The Old Glory Club

Ted Kaczynski: A Political Obituary

Source Script & Video.

9.56K subscribers. 2,344 views. Jun 15, 2023.

By The Prudentialist

AUSTERE ENVIRONMENTAL SCHOLAR TED KACZYNSKI DIES AT 81

“For dust you are, and to dust you shall return.”

— *Genesis 3:19*

On June 10th, 2023, Theodore J. Kaczynski passed away at the age of 81. Prior to his arrest in 1996, he'd already achieved notoriety as a philosopher terrorist folk hero, and his infamy persists in his status as a meme icon today.

Kaczynski was allegedly a lone wolf terrorist, but also a mathematical genius, supposedly a subject of MKUltra experiments whose life and work anticipated some of the most burning issues of our time. It is no doubt ironic that a man who foresaw the end of mankind and the world as we know it because of technology is now being mourned online by millions across a digitally-connected world, but it also testifies to the acuteness of his vision.

Ted K.'s iconic status on the contemporary Right can be partly attributed to the devastating critique of the Left included in his famous manifesto, *Industrial Society and Its Future*, and also shifts in the critique of technology inspired partly by him. Kaczynski argued that Leftist critiques of technology are purely tactical and therefore insufficient to address the problem. “Some leftists may seem to oppose technology, but they will oppose it only so long as they are outsiders and the technological system is controlled by non-leftists. If leftism ever becomes dominant in society, so that the technological system becomes a tool in the hands of leftists, they will enthusiastically use it and promote its growth. In doing this they will be repeating a pattern that leftism has shown again and again in the past.” Here again, Kaczynski has been proven prophetic.

Kaczynski's terrorism should be seen in the context of a broader climate of violence being instigated by contemporary corporations and governments. Rampant anarcho-tyranny, civilization-destroying immigration, and ecological terrorism are all features of the contemporary regime. Nonetheless, despite his dreams of an Anti-Tech Revolution Ted K died in prison with his vision further away from fulfillment than ever. As

John Michael Greer and others have remarked you can't force a technological regression. It flies in the face of all political reality. Some people will continue to push for technological innovation even if others abandon it. In truth, few people want to return to a hunter-gatherer lifestyle or the cold and bitter facts of nature. Most would rather attempt to adapt and endure, come what may.

Still, one can take a lot from Kaczynski without fully accepting his conclusions or praxis. Ted K's fear was that industrial society would become a self-propagating system of self-correction from which escape was impossible. Writing with a calm, lucid tone he explains: "It seems amazing that those who advocate energy conservation haven't noticed what happens: As soon as some energy is freed up by conservation, the technological world-system gobbles it up and demands more. No matter how much energy is provided, the system always expands rapidly until it is using all available energy, and then it demands still more. The same is true of other resources. The technological world-system infallibly expands until it reaches a limit imposed by an insufficiency of resources, and then it tries to push beyond that limit regardless of consequences."

Back in 2015, Keith Ablow from *Fox News* posed the uncomfortable question, "Was The Unabomber Correct?" Mr. Ablow highlights the disturbing condition of our post-2007 smartphone age: "And having seen Barack Obama elected, in part, by mastering the use of the Internet as a campaign tool, then watching his administration preside over eavesdropping on the American public, monitoring their emails and tapping their phones, denying them their due process and privacy, and making a play to disarm them, Kaczynski must wonder what it will take for Americans to wake up to the fact that their individuality and autonomy — indeed, what constitutes the core of a human life — is under siege (by the very forces he predicted — technology and leftist political leaders)."

Obama's pioneering use of social media in the 2008 and 2012 elections developed to a point where in 2016 Donald Trump was able to tweet himself to the White House. The internet is now where much of our modern-day political discourse flows through and originates. Today, Tucker Carlson, the most popular man in broadcast television has expanded his audience by an order of magnitude by leaving TV for cyberspace.

Kaczynski offers an interesting lens for us to examine this political realignment of the contemporary Right. In one corner is a technologically optimistic faction comprising projects including Curtis Yarvin's Neo-Reaction and Charles Haywood's Foundationism. These projects want to use the tools of capital and their own skills to develop a saner form of modern civic life. Against the gloomy predictions in Kaczynski's "Why Technological Society Will Destroy Itself" these men want to reintegrate technological innovations into a more stable culture.

Kaczynski's critiques these projects too. In the *Manifesto*, he writes: "The conservatives are fools: They whine about the decay of traditional values, yet they enthusiastically support technological progress and economic growth. Apparently it never occurs to them that you can't make rapid, drastic changes in the technology and the economy

of a society without causing rapid changes in all other aspects of the society as well, and that such rapid changes inevitably break down traditional values.”

Against this tendency are a growing number of people using flip phones, little to no internet or proselytizing Wendell Berry’s *Why I Will Not Buy a Computer?* More explicitly inspired by Kaczynski’s warnings this faction features a mix of strange bed-fellows ranging from blood and soil types, religious agricultural associations, new agers, Christians, neo-pagans, neo-luddites, integralists, and disaffected former leftists linked to some extent by a concern with individual health. Notably, prior to his unceremonious sacking at *Fox News*, Carlson covered a myriad of subjects strongly related to health including falling testosterone levels, unhealthy and ecologically damaging farming practices, and calls to expand access to raw milk and regenerative agriculture.

Both of these factions are products of our time. In *The Gutenberg Galaxy*, Marshall McLuhan warns of the coming “electronic interdependence” as the electronic medium supersedes literary cultures. A great fragmentation has taken place in the birth of a homogenizing global village of Tik-Tok gesticulation, mukbang videos of hyper-processed food, and the child abuse cult of transgenerism.

As tens of thousands of people across the world “Pressed F to Pay Respects,” Ted K will continue to live on in strange ways. Through digital necromancy within AGI and LLM or being plastered anytime one makes an ironic remark about screen time. As the man himself returns to dust, we should remind ourselves that much of his criticism and observations of social psychology were correct, and that we must do what is necessary to protect ourselves from this fragmentation. One only needs to look at our current overmedicated, obese, and schizophrenic body politic to find oneself agreeing, “The Industrial Revolution and its consequences have been a disaster for the human race.”

The Prudentialist is a writer and the founding member of the **Old Glory Club**. His YouTube channel can be found [here](#).

The Old Glory Club discuss Ted Kaczynski

Source

Old Glory Club

3.08K subscribers

1,781 views

Streamed live on Jun 16, 2023

Pete Quinones and Paul Fahrenheitt discuss Uncle Ted and his consequences.

****Paul:**** Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, and welcome back to another episode of an Old Glory Club Live stream. I am Paul Fahrenheit. As always in this evening I

am joined once again by my very good friend Mr. Pete Canyon, as Mr. How are you doing this evening, Sir?

****Quinones:**** I'm doing good it. It always seems that we end up on the streams. Together. Very odd.

****Paul:**** Well, people. People tell me all the time and I'm sure they tell you as well, Pete. You know, whatever our whenever something we talked about on one of our streams makes the rounds on the Twitter and the Telegram dungeons. People always tell me, and I don't know if they tell you the same thing, but they tell me that we make a good pair on air and, I think I think don't fix what ain't broken.

****Quinones:**** Yeah, I hear that a lot too. You know, there's, there's the occasional hater here or there, but, they can. Start their own podcast.

****Paul:**** Start your own right wing podcast. I literally did it. Well, anyway, Mr. Pete, we brought, we brought you on this evening to discuss the recently passed Theodore J Kaczynski, a very, very well known mathematician and environmental activist who recently died in his cell. I believe this was the previous Sunday. What day was that? Sunday the 11th. Yes, it was he. He died Sunday the 11th. Uh or Saturday? Actually, it was Saturday the 10th, which is which is, saddening to some, uh, heartening to some others. Pete, you're you're. This is one of your particular areas of expertise. So I, I guess, I guess we decided it would be a great idea to bring you on and. Talk about the life, the personality, the ideology and the, I suppose the now death of Mr. So go ahead, Mr.

****Quinones:**** Just he seemed like a when he was growing up, he seemed like. A normal kid. For except for one thing, his IQ tested anywhere from like 170 to 180.

****Paul:**** So like Yaki levels.

****Quinones:**** And he makes it into Harvard at 16 years old. I mean, kind of psycho that you had to know he was a psychopath from the start. But yeah, he yeah, Polish family seems like it was your typical Polish family. I have a lot. There's a lot of Polish on my mother's side of the family and from everything I've read, it seems like a lot like my family out in Pennsylvania. And yeah, he goes off to Harvard. And 16 years old. It's kind of tough for him. Second year, he enrolls in UM, in they're doing tests, they're they're looking for volunteers. And from everything that we know, it was in, it was a version of MK Ultra. And they were they did tests on him. I do not believe the extent of the tests and what exactly what they did have ever been released. But it looks like after that he was. Not the same. He would go and see see counselors and. Yeah, just a brilliant, brilliant guy. It looks like he just volunteered for the for the wrong thing and did did some rewiring. You know, the way I look at it is if you have somebody who's 180 IQ. And you rewire them a little bit. But they don't lose their IQ. You have no idea what you may be.

****Paul:**** a. Lot of people are skeptics about the concept of MK Ultra, but really it's just and there's a lot of mystique added around it. You know, mostly because the intelligence agency specializes in PSYOPS and misinformation, and that's pretty much the only thing. They're good at. See how they see how they're planned. Assassinations

go. But. But one of The thing is, is that all MK Ultra really is is just 1000 different ways of attempting to manipulate the human psyche. These are the conditioning certain responses. These of the building K lines within your mind and things like that. And so you know. If any of you in the audience believe that you. Are not susceptible maybe. They won't get their desired outcome. They almost never get their desired outcome, and they would even release that say hey, we didn't. Get our desired outcome. However, it does totally like screw up the wiring of how you work and one of the first things I think any man ought to admit to himself is that he can be broken. It's really a matter of when and not if, and Mr. and that includes breaking their IQ. Pete, as if, if what you say is true then. Ted Kaczynski, he didn't lose his IQ, but he did get a little bit. Uh, he did get a little bit.

****Quinones:**** Yeah, he, he ended up getting his graduating Harvard. He got a PhD in math from the University of Michigan and he became a mathematics professor. But at the age of 29. He uh he took off for Lincoln Mt. To live in a cabin and without electricity or running water, and he lived as a recluse and. around. Things started to happen that he. he got got it in his head that. Technology the we're not really technology. Let's let's get this right, because from the reading of his manifesto, I've read a lot of his work. I have a I have a volume that has even has his letters and correspondences in it. Believe that the way I read it is he believed the industrial revolution just happened too fast. And overnight, which really wasn't overnight, it was a matter of years. But in human in the span of humanity overnight. Humans went from growing their own food, tending their attending their land, killing their own food, having to having to kill to protect their land. To not having to do that stuff anymore, getting jobs, working for other people. Going to stores, going to the general store, going to the convenience store to buy whatever they need and. Ted posited that. Because for thousands and thousands and thousands and 10s of thousands and maybe even hundreds of thousands of years, depending on how old do you think the earth is. Man was wired in a certain way and. In in a short period of time, he was forced to change his direction and that caused man problems that that it created an emptiness in men that he had to fill now. With other things and the problem with the other things he was filling it with filling his that what he called there, the power. he man is filling it now with things that don't fulfill, don't live up to what the body and what the genes were used to. So he talks about the first thing he talks about in the manifesto is for the first section, famously right winger. A lot of right wingers love the first section of the manifesto. He basically tears the left apart. And he I've never seen anybody in. This is in 1995. This was released. He had been writing this for years. I've never seen anybody be able to. Basically dissect exactly what the idea of leftism is, and even why they do it. What kinds of people are more apt to be attracted to leftism and just basically, how? Man lives a certain way for a long period of time, and now man isn't living like that anymore. They're actually in a weakened state that people have feelings of. Inferiority and what he called over socialization. Socialization would be properly defined. Somebody who inclines themselves to basically whatever the state tells them,

whatever the whatever truth the state is handing them over. Socialization would be people who you see them now, people who. If Biden, if the White House says you have to go into Ukraine, they they, these are the people who. We're fighting to be first in line to get the vaccine in at the end of 2020 and he points this all back towards the fact that the industrial Revolution basically just weakened men made them. You know, turned made them docile and they were no longer. They're no longer physically strong, but they're also no longer mentally strong, so they're always looking for something to replace that with. Does that make sense?

****Paul:**** Yes, Sir, it does. it's like. This is kind of in a nutshell what all of the you can find this in literature. Actually this this thing get tracked in literature pre pre industrial literature had a whole different sort of. Feeling to it almost. And then you do you do get this, this, this leap around the industrial Revolution and immediately after the first, like really it kind of comes to its apotheosis, it sort of flowers in World War One which wasn't so much a war as much as much as it was, the most trite characterization of it as a factory of death. Because, it was, it was almost literally assembly line like with just how the flower of Europe of. Of I think. Two generations of European young men and older men were just kind of. Eviscerated over the course of about four years and we still haven't recovered from that. We're we're only just starting to come out of that like today in 2023. We're only just starting to see the end of that of those ripples and. And I'm just talking like. Pete, that kind, that kind. Of makes sense this sort of. What is it going to bring this back to the over socialization? People fighting to be first in line to get the vaccines you.

Speaker

It it it?

****Paul:**** Also kind of it a lot of people say it was the absence of religion. Yes, that was probably the number one part of it, but it wasn't the only part of it, but it definitely probably was the most important thing that was lost, because what do people need of wonders from from the book if they're being displayed in front of them? Maybe it's it's almost like a strange kind of cargo culting, the people who, the people who are over socialized, like they say, like you say, rather they think if they get enough vaccines, support enough things for the Ukraine, they're going to have all their problems fixed and. All this other stuff so. Does that make sense to you, Mr.

****Quinones:**** Yeah, it makes sense the UM. A lot of it goes towards you know, what he would say? he would say that. When you looked out at the society, even back when he was writing this, you had already seen pharmaceuticals that were coming out to basically alter people's perceptions to make you know, happy pills, anything like that he saw. The people because they. Are not working with their heads. They're not doing anything anymore. They're not being challenged. They he saw that they all had feelings of inferiority. Things like low self esteem, feelings of powerlessness, depressive tendencies, defeatism, guilt, hatred and you know. He said that modern leftists tend to have some such feelings, possibly more or less repressed, and that these feelings are decisive in in determining the direction that leftism would take. He says so like if

somebody interprets as derogatory almost anything that is said about him or about groups with which they, he identifies he would conclude that they had inferior feelings of inferiority and low self esteem. And he said this tendency. Like of leftist to become all about minority rights, whether they actually belong to the minority groups which they were defending or not. Not they were hypersensitive about words. You know, like the like, he says directly in the manifesto. Words like *****, Oriental, handicapped or chick. Broad and chick guide, dude and fellow. All these things mean something, but actually change over time. The leftist would. Make it make things derogatory that weren't derogatory previous you know, chick wasn't always something that was considered to be, hey, can you just call me ma'am or something like that? He said he also said that those are who are most sensitive about politically incorrect. Terminology, he said. Using this this exact. They're not the average black ghetto dweller or Asian immigrant, abused woman or disabled person. But like a minority of activists, many of whom do not even belong to the oppressed group and most of the time come from the privileged strata of society. And he said political correctness and he knew this from spending so much time in. That it was a stronghold among university professors. You know, he's writing this in the 80s. So he's saying this, people who have secure employment, comfortable salaries and the majority of whom are heterosexual, white, white males and females from up, from middle and upper class families and. They he also said that that for some reason to fulfill, I guess this what whatever it is empty inside of them they have they would have an intense identification with the problems that have an of people of groups that have an image of being weak like women. Defeated like the American Indians, repellent like homosexuals and otherwise other groups that, were, presented as inferior in the cult. And, he particularly, I don't think he liked feminists at all, he said. They're desperately anxious to prove that women are as strong as capable as men. He said that they were nagged by a fear that women may not be as strong as capable as men and that was their whole purpose. Of saying that they were strong as strong and capable as Ben is because they just knew that they weren't and they could never. But if they said it enough, it would somehow it might. Manifest itself so. No, he the terminology he gave to people who well to the activities that people would engage in, like political, political activities, things like this, that these people would engage in as he called them surrogate activities. So basically the activities that. Man used to have before the Industrial revolution of, like I said, work in your own field. Wild killing your own food, milking a cow every morning, basically going out there and doing work and you know, possibly having to hold off an Indian attack or, another or any other sorts of. people who might attack around the world that any groups like that. That they replace that because they don't have that. To do there is no sense of purpose, real purpose of survival. They replace it with things like politics and those are surrogate activities on the on the right. Surrogate activities would be, like a lot of sports, a lot of hunt hunting, things like that. He would say church because he was a staunch atheist. That's one of the things when you when you study. Ted, like I've done, and you're somebody who has faith. You have to be able to,

you have to constantly remind yourself that, Ted was a staunch atheist and everything he's talking about is coming from a purely scientific. Point of view and I think one of the one of the great lines in the manifesto is and I'll never forget, it is line 22. It's basically broken up like Bible verses. It's really weird the way it came out, he said. If our society had no social problems at all, the leftists would have to invent. Problems in order to provide themselves with an excuse for making a fuss.

Speaker

I mean a lot.

****Paul:**** Of it just kind of sound. I don't wanna. I don't want. To say a lot of it is insightful, particularly to the time period, but it sounds a lot like the kind of things. That Nietzsche and Kierkegaard would write about.

****Quinones:**** And he would be the first person to tell you he was inspired by people like Jacques Lull. And, he. This is, he would say, that he's not. He is not original in a lot of this thought, but the. The way he is able to. I think the most important things are his concept of the left. I don't know if anybody really nailed it like that and not only nailed it like that, but I mean really like he could have been writing this today. You know, my, my friend Ryan calls him the Prophet because so much of what he wrote in 2005, he wrote the systems needed trick which basically describes the modern what we're seeing. The modern Antifa movement will become the modern Antifa movement, almost to almost exactly. And he saw all this stuff coming. So like the his descriptions of the left over socialization, the power process, I think these are these are important to. For people to understand, if there were only, a few things from Ted, I would take away. I would want people to take away is that. the concept of over socialization. Too much reliance upon just the crowd and almost knee jerk, an almost knee jerk reaction to bowing to anybody who is preaching that ohh this person is being. Oppressed and we need to help them. And then, examine what surrogate activities you are. You're engaged in that, you're that you do on a regular basis and what your power process is supposed to look like. What exactly do you need to be doing in life to achieve that so that you don't? you don't end up on SSRI's and you don't end up, feeling. You know, sitting on your couch and wondering, when the world is going to end or when, when the feds are going to knock down your. Door or something like that. I think once I understood his concept of the power process, it helped me a lot. It helped me to see things that it helped me to stop doing things I was doing, which were just me wasting time. And just feel and trying to fill a void and to concentrate on things that were more that could push forward. Not only like any success that I would have, but more importantly how I would feel about myself.

****Paul:**** I'm trying to find. Trying to find a. Way I could, I could even even come in on that, I mean. A lot of. Obviously, miss Mr. Kaczynski. Some of his, like any, like any sort of high IQ individuals, great works, they're really like half one foot in the world of genius, 1 foot in the world of sheer insanity. And too often people on our side are willing to hold up both the insanity as the genius.

****Quinones:**** I mean, he, he thought. The answer was to destroy technology down to down to the atoms, to the point that we we got back to. The Bronze Age.

****Paul:**** And so, as always. Many people are great at the descriptions. It's the it's the prescriptions that that seem to give us trouble. And that there there's another word for that. It's called Luddite ISM. You know, I'm. I'm sure he had come across it, but. he. He was not the first to recommend Luddites, ISM.

****Quinones:**** And but why did? What was the? What was the impetus for Lud-dites? I believe that had to do with their faith, right?

****Paul:**** Well, yeah, I mean. I believe so, yes. However, the instinct, the instinct that both of them had was kind of the same. And there's a reason that, they call it neologism now, but. it's really it's, it's this idea that it's like I'm a. If we're going to. Conceptualize this in a in a sort. Of time framework. We gotta reset the clock. OK. Well and I'm. I'm this is this is just me slightly critiquing critiquing this idea that he had at least the conclusion he comes to I mean what's resetting the clock going to do if maybe this is because we're trapped in the progress narrative whether we want to be or not but. Someone else may just find the same tools and just just do the same thing over again. So so yeah, that is that is it. It is certainly. He's pointed out a lot of good things and. I'm I know a lot of people talk about zihan with some snide and I you could take him or leave him. But in his book was at the end of the world is just the beginning. He makes some very interesting points about the 20th century. He goes at it from some angles I hadn't considered before, which is kind of. the first thing you said about Mr. Kaczynski's work is. The industrial Revolution happened too fast. Well, Zihan says that not only did it happen too fast in some countries, it happened faster than others. the United States, actually. Compared to every other country on Earth, the United States handled the industrial. Revolution the best. Like we had at least comparing ourselves to other. That's why the United States still seems like a coherent culture at the moment, and almost all of the rest of the world just doesn't, Japan and Germany. It happened over the course of a single. You know, and This is why This is why in the Second World War, you read about Adolf Hitler talking about living space. Well, that's because German cities were so utterly packed during the interwar years and the pre World War One years that you actually did need more physical space. For these massively overpopulated cities, and the farms in the countryside were being chopped down. More and more and more and. More the thing about the United States. The United States had just like, had the space. It had the space to kind of absorb most of the shocks of industrialization, at least better than other countries. It did have some serious consequences, but you know, so yeah, I mean The thing is though, is is you can look at the United States as a case study of well. Even if it did come through, even if it did come through this sort of period with, with a, with a shot culture and of course susceptible to certain politically mature groups moving in and. Causing all sorts. Of problems, there's still like a underlying live. Thing spirit and I don't mean to getting the ***** German idealism here, but like there's there is still something

underlying there that you probably can't find another place. Maybe more than. One thing who knows, so maybe go.

****Quinones:**** Well, there, there is a problem with that too, is that if you had, if you had this industrialization. Happening in a monoculture. The that would seem to be. Something that you'd have a better chance of handling it. You know, the United States being multicultural and then while when this revolution. It's hitting its peak and. It's, the agrarian lifestyle is, is all but disappearing for most. You have people who've been deracinated from, who they are. I mean you. You had several kind of movements up north of Black Southern blacks? Moving into cities to find places to find places to work, I don't think that was good. For them at all.

****Paul:**** No, of course not.

****Quinones:**** I mean, and I don't. Yeah, I'm one of those people who believes that, actually, from living in the South and growing up in New York City and living in big cities and living rurally I think that it, it seems like black. People have a much better chance of thriving in a rural setting than they do in an urban setting. Urban settings seem to be completely against their nature, but I would say also against most of our natures. Almost all of our natures. I can really only think of one group that seems to be to do very well in cities. Yeah. And so. I think the idea that. You know, we had when this is really taking off, we have people pouring in from everywhere and then we have this multicultural soup and we adopt, the Prussian system of education, which is designed for a monoculture and now is. Is dealing with a with a multicultural situation and is not only stripping away the the the. The identity of the wasp, but the identity of anybody who enters into it. it's pretty easy to see how, a few generations later, we are the country in the world. I think that that like times 5 the next. Is consuming pharmaceuticals and a great deal of those are mood enhancing or mood leveling?

****Paul:**** That's fair enough. And you know, I'm not saying that that was I'm not trying to say that the United in many ways the United States is worse than. Some other countries, that's not what I'm trying to say, it's. The thing the thing. Is is to. I'm I'm getting images flashing in my head. I'm trying to find the the right words to sort of to sort of express them. I'm seeing how I would. It's like it's like the industrial revolution. It came along and all of a sudden it caused this sort of mass amnesia over the course of a couple of generations because people flooded the cities to. to fill the work to sort of economically advance. And then in doing so, they completely forgot their ability to sustain themselves. And you know, this happened in waves, of course. And then and then, the cities, they got too crowded and then law and order started breaking down. And all this other stuff and you had all the violence in the in the 60s and. The 70s and. But The thing is is is now and. Ted Kaczynski wrote the kind of immediately after that the worst of that had kind of settled itself, and now we're seeing a trend back towards more and more people are are moving out of cities that are moving into cities, yeah.

****Quinones:**** I was going. To bring that up, that was that. That was that was my. Next point to bring up. Yeah, go ahead.

****Paul:**** Yeah. Well, and Thomas talks. About this like the the concept of cities is like these massive worker barracks are not really a thing anymore. Because, we don't really have mass industry or the industry that we do have is becoming more and more just able to be generally decentralized. You don't need to have all the industry in one place anymore just because for for reasons of infrastructure or for automation, or for even even like reasons of not even. Requiring a sort of central grid other than like access to electricity, which is ubiquitous at this point, maybe even access to Internet. You are seeing this, this this to the point where the the idea of work from home became a thing that people would say in all seriousness and could and could be reasonably expected for a large enough portion of the population and so. Yeah, you are. I guess seeing this the thing is though is that it's not quite there yet. Yeah, you're seeing an exodus from the city. But it's largely 2 suburbs, be they the suburbs surrounding cities or the suburbs, in like rural areas. And this is capping on a trend that's been ongoing since the early 2000s. You know, just these these perpetual buildings of subdivisions for a variety of reasons and. You know, and so yeah, you are seeing this, this flight from the cities. However, it's not quite there yet.

****Quinones:**** Yeah, I mean and I it's something that I noticed when I did a reading through of the manifesto a little bit over a year and a half ago. I at the time I was living in a I had been living in Atlanta and then I moved someplace a lot more, I mean. But with like. 3% of the population of it. Answer and I noticed that I was talking to people who were like, yeah, we had to get out of the city. You know, we're getting more rural and I realized it was like a very modified version of what Ted was talking about. You know, he's talking about, your return, the return with. Not the return with a V, but. With the return and. I noticed that that's what I was doing and that's what I'm still doing, that's the new house is to grow food, to have, to have chickens to work from home and be able to also have, time to tend the land. And in the worst of cases. Is be able to, support be able to live off of it. Now it's almost impossible unless you're putting in years and years of work. So 100% live off the land. But if you have. Also, if you're in a very small community, people tend to be a lot closer and people tend to be a lot nicer. People tend to be a lot more friendly, they pretty much. I remember, the realtor said. Within, I don't know why she picked this number, but she said within 34 days everyone's going to know your business. And yeah, I was fine. Yeah, I was fine with that because. You build in times of trouble like this. The only thing that I can think of because no one is going to be able to change Washington, DC. I mean one day. But they're going to have to do a lot of that work themselves, weakening themselves. You're going to have to.

****Paul:**** Real, real, real quick, Pete, real quick. Pete, a lot of that I'm. I'm from one of the. Wealthiest suburbs of DC. Nothing's going to fix that city. It has to be nuked off the. Go ahead, Pete.

****Quinones:**** Well, I was going to let it's OK for you to say that. I've been saying some stuff lately and probably and I don't want to pile it on.

****Paul:**** But it but it needs to. It needs to stop. Right at the border of Fairfax County, no further.

****Quinones:**** So yeah, so. That's what I see happening. I see a lot of people who don't even know, who just think that Ted Kaczynski was a maniac who sent bombs, which he kind of was. But he also wrote a lot, and he wrote about, returning. To the land and I see that I think it's very interesting that without knowing that people are instinctively doing that. And I think that's and most of the time when I talk to somebody who's doing that, it's somebody that I have a lot in common with. It's somebody who, I could share. I I share some form of culture with and that's promising that it's not you know. That that it's not a bunch of ***** ***** libs who are, who are who are coming out here.

****Paul:**** You know, part of this, I think part. I think we're starting to see the limits of what a human being can sort of conceptualize and maintain, a sort of healthy lifestyle. TS Eliot is the is the considered like. The Paradise Lost and the paradise were, his his Paradise Lost is the wasteland, and his paradise regained is is the 4 quartets and he has a very big difference of tone in both of them. what? What TS Eliot kind of call? You know, the two words he uses to describe what we're in, what Spangler calls the sort of World City, the megalopolis, Unreal City and all of that, because that's what it is. It's not a it. It feels like it's a fake place. it doesn't feel like it's. You know, you go. I don't know, Pete, if you've ever been to Arlington or to Alexandria or allowed it in Fairfax counties or to Southern Maryland, surrounding DC or to or to even DC itself, Foggy Bottom, Lafayette square, places like that.

****Quinones:**** I've been I've been to I've been to DC and I've been. You know, as far out as like an hour and an hour north and an hour.

****Paul:**** So that's kind of my whole stomping grounds. And let me tell you what, once you get like about an hour to the West of DC, it's the most beautiful place in the United States, Northern Virginia, really. I understand why. Robert E Lee and or. Well, even his father, Richard Henry and George. Anton and all great Gentry who very much were in the real world. I understand why they picked that piece of Earth to place all their plantations on. It's just amazing. Harper's ferry up there as well, but. The thing is now is if you go to, if you go to these places, these, UM, these and I'm. And that's just the area I'm familiar with. It's the exact same in places like Chicago. Although Chicago feels like a real place. But that's the unique thing. But you go to LA, it feels like terrible. You go to San Francisco, it none of these places feel like they're real. They feel like you're in like some sort of weird, warped version of reality where none of the rules apply, but once you leave the cities and you go to a place where you can see. Tree lines and little houses people can. 100%. Understand little houses dotting the dotting the IT seems natural to us. You know, people can with tons of space between them, people can understand not only that, they can understand even little towns. Little towns or or, or even small cities which you can look on a hill at least. And see the whole thing. But you can't do that with any of these megalopolis, as these world cities, but it's a it's a scaling problem, Pete. You know, the human brain

can only comprehend something at its fullness up to a certain point, and then it's just it's just gone. You can't do it anymore, and I think there's a reason for that. I think God coded. Us that way for a reason.

****Quinones:**** And my wife grew up in the South and she, she the closest she's lived to like a big city is like Atlanta. Yeah, I I. I told her the other day. I said, we can go to, the grocery store here and pretty much night, if we said hi to 99% of the people walking around, they'd smile and say hi. And yeah, I told her. I said you're just not going to get that in New York City. Like when you walk around New York City, people have they have tunnel vision or they are just they're checked out. They're they'll look, they'll look behind their eyes is completely checked out, and that is not. I don't think it's natural. I think it is a reaction to their to the environment that they've subjected themselves to. And that's not it. It's the furthest thing from the environment that human beings should be comfortable in. You know, considering, what we're what we're 202 hundred looks like 200 years after. The Industrial Revolution, I mean we're still you, you still see in peoples faces that when they're walking around a city, a major city, that many of them are just don't they they don't belong there. They know they don't belong there. And I think it's really evident and it's really scary sometimes. It's really scary to see how. Like if you go to New York and you see somebody who maybe coming up out of the subway and you bump into the like, if they get bumped into how they react to it, they don't react like ohh. Or you know, they just. They take it. They keep on going, they keep their. Eyes straight ahead and you know, I mean, there are some psychopaths. Don't get me wrong, there are. Yeah, there are plenty of subway riders that aren't going to be able to. Quote, quote UN quote subway subway riders that aren't going to be that are going to lash out at you, but for the most part, people who you would think are just normal. Normal people, they. You it's so clear that they're they're not supposed to be there. They they that that a human being is not supposed to be in that environment.

****Paul:**** You know, I couple of years ago, actually, I think it was on a Sargon stream of all places. He made this claim that I'm, I'm not going to say one thing or another about him. I'm just going to talk about this, this thing that was. Set on one. Of his streams, they made the claim that I'm that cities are the natural habitat of humans. And that seemed very strange to me, even even back then is it's cause it's like. I mean, when I, Pete, I don't know about. You, but whenever I imagine a paradise like or or. At least not. Not even like a paradise, but like a everything is as it is supposed to be, right? I imagine some version of, like, medieval Europe, rolling, rolling. Fields and in hills. Houses dotted all along the horizon. Little towns dotted here and there, maybe a small city with walls around it that the. Count lives in. And that all of the big businesses or not the big businesses, but like the Super specific businesses are? churches every now and again. That's the castle. That's what I imagine, Pete, right. I do do. Do you imagine something similar?

****Quinones:**** Well, I mean, I imagine even something more. I'm just green, lush and also just probably because of, the Spanish side of me, a beach. I'm looking for sand.

****Paul:**** Well, and that's and that's because, freaking Scotts Irish. So I imagine I imagine some like amalgamated version of the Shenandoah with whatever my whatever blood memory of Ireland Slash Scotland is.

****Quinones:**** I get it. I love it.

****Paul:**** So, but yeah, I mean and that's the thing. is it's like is it? We all have within us this kind of picture of well, OK, what is reality supposed to be? OK, where am I living now? What can I do to reconcile this now? I'll be honest with you, Pete. One of the ways you can do it is money. One of the ways you can do it is money. If you are lucky enough to become one of the most. Successful people in. One of these big megalopolises, of course, you don't want to leave. Right cause that's cause. That's that is how you've reconciled yourself with how screwed up this reality is. But you know, for the rest of us, we gotta we gotta move. We gotta literally change our environment, change our scenery and. Perhaps you know, perhaps that's what Mr. Ted Kay was kind of talking about. That's why he did it. He went to Montana. He went as far. Away from civilization as he. Could go. and. He lived, I think, and probably the most autistically simple way you could possibly live. Just just no running water, no electricity, nothing like that, just in the middle of the woods, hunting your own food all that. Now The thing is is. I would say this, Mr. Pete, much like industrialization, changed like agrarian humans to industrial humans far too fast. I think the same thing can be done in the other direction, because at this point we're more or less industrial, whether we want to. Be or not? if you do have this mass like Exodus, there is a such thing of people filling up the countryside too quickly and they don't know how to do agriculture and not not, it's already happening. It's already happening. I've I've talked. To people in. The Shenandoah Valley, where my family comes from, and. You know, all sorts of people from Northern Virginia are going down there buying plots of land and just letting them sit and do nothing because they own the land and it's an asset on their balance sheet. They don't live down there. And so the land just sits there and it's not. Used, and that's that could be a serious problem because agriculture and livestock and all that other stuff is extremely land intensive. I don't know. I don't know, Mr.

****Quinones:**** You think about that. Well, I mean, I. I think we. I was thinking about this the other night and it would. It just seemed very. it seemed like there are a lot of people who are leaving the cities will. Become more like the Eloy and the people who are gonna stay in the cities are gonna. Become more like the Morlocks. Where you know, are you?

****Paul:**** Is this is this is. This the time traveler.

****Quinones:**** Time machine by well, yeah.

****Paul:**** Or the times. Yeah, they have The Time Machine. Know what you're talking about.

****Quinones:**** Yeah, and it's. It almost seems like in a way it's that way. Now you know, obviously not by look, not by looks. Although physiognomy is something when you look at the Washington DC set and I'm not just talking about a certain group.

****Paul:**** like let let let me bash on let me bash on how much I hate where I'm from some more like this is this is like a whole like sub cast of people. You know, not all of them. Way, but they just. They all start to get a certain look, a certain physiognomy about them, a certain like tone of voice. All this other stuff I. Couldn't stand it. I had to get out of there.

****Quinones:**** Yeah, yeah, it's it it. It seems like they're going to, the people who move out and go into the country have a better chance of just living in peace. And having peaceful lives and you know, the in in well in wells novel, the Eloy were almost childlike in a way and the Morlocks were like more savage and. Yeah, it just, I mean, it's not. You're not going to have the there was a certain class distinction in in the wells novel that I ignore for these purposes. But I mean I just can't see how. The people who stay in, it's going to be better for people who stay in the cities. You know, I mean, unless you're, unless you're just a freak of nature like a Thomas 777. Who just, yeah. Who thrives in it, who is is like a soldier in the wasteland.

****Paul:**** Well, there is and I have a good friend of mine whose last name translates to city Dweller and his whole family have been dwelling in cities back when they were in the old country and ever since they came here. So so like there is a sort of human experience, a kind of human, a niche of human, that can they can exist in these mega megalopolis, in cities. But like, they get just as displaced as the rest of us, like, even though they're from the cities they grew up in the cities, they're still kind of displaced within their own cities. You know, it's like, you're a stranger in your own place because cities themselves, they do have a sort of way about them. They are meant to be this, like, almost jungle. This jungle of humanity, where any niche more or less, as long as it's it's, properly supported and all that can be supported. And that's what jungles are. The thing is, is there's a such thing as just an overgrowth, like a thing that is an ecosystem that has just gotten to the point where. It's just too complex and it's going to collapse at some point, so so that's I don't mean to, uh, no, I'm playing hard and fast with ecology. And there's some people who might get ***** *** at me for for doing that. But like, that's kind of you need to look at different sex of humanity, the. Way you look at different ecosystems. There's a set of humans that thrive the best in the cities. And that's not just like one race that's actually subsets within a race. You know, every every race, every tribe has their city dwellers. Every tribe has their, country bumpkins. Every tribe has their in between. You know, and some some may tend one way, some may tend another way, but this is just this is just how it is. There's there's circles all the way down.

****Quinones:**** No, no, I agree. There are people from every, every, every race, every culture that can thrive in, in cities. It just seems that. There are, there wouldn't be, I don't know, the population of New York City right now it might be thirteen million I would say, yeah. Out of those 13 million, how many of them can really survive? And

you know, as somebody who did grow up in the city and didn't leave the city. Until I was. Teen you know, I will tell you that it is a it it's different if you grow up in there, it grow up there than if you move there from somewhere else. But it also that comes with its own problems because you have different kind of mentalities you have. Cities have a more rental kind of mentality versus owning, you can grow. You know, I grew up my. My whole my whole childhood, I knew maybe like 3 people who, three or four people who own their own like house and those are people. Three of those didn't even live in the city. They lived outside the city, so it seems it. It almost seems impossible for you. It very much keeps you in. A certain mentality of. Where you may have a family kind of culture, but you're the IT really seems like unless you leave. You there's no real progress made. If that makes sense to you, if that makes sense at all.

****Paul:**** Of course you know, and I mean once again. Once again, like there's there's there's. There's different sets. There's I don't wanna. Wanna like I don't want. To sound like too non controversial here. That I'm like, trying to appeal to everyone, but no, I've met people who I've met, people who moved to the countryside, couldn't stand it, moved back to the cities. it is. It is what it is. There are some people and you know. And The thing is is I think everyone would agree it's probably going to be a lot more helpful if. There were just less people. Concentrated in one spot. One of the things I learned from the service is that. The one thing that will cause violence the quickest is you. Pack another dude. In the room. The more people that are just in a room, the more guys, especially the more men that are in a room, every single man you add to that room, violence goes up exponentially or the possibility of violence goes up exponentially cause cause we're territorial, we all need our own little space.

****Quinones:**** And can I mention some? Can I mention? Something real quick. Go ahead, we got 9089 people watching right now. The PIN suite and the PIN comment and the chat is our entropy stream link. If you want a super chat, please go right ahead. It's very easy. With entropy and they are they are a full on free speech platform as far as. I can see.

****Paul:**** And I appreciate you pushing that. we haven't, I don't. I think we could do a lot better about that in the future. Yeah, if you if you all send in a super chat, we will read it live on the show and we'll talk about. What you have to say? but yeah, Mr. Pete, I mean. I mean I. Don't really have much else to say other than. Continuously talking in circles.

****Quinones:**** I mean, I think we're, I think I think we've exhausted this. You know, Ted talked about what the Industrial Revolution did to us and you know, I think one of the main things that it did was it pushed people into cities and we don't belong in cities. Most of us don't belong in cities, and I think that, yeah, I think that's why we see where we. What I mentioned about pharmaceuticals, just happiness levels and. Yeah, I just don't deracinated from culture. From your culture, the. And he makes a lot of sense. I don't read him and read him like, and as every word. I'm getting the spirit. I'm getting this well. I mean, I've read every word I've read every word more than once, but I'm really getting the spirit of what he's saying. And then I'm turning

it into I'm trying to. Interpret reality according to what you know, the ideas that he's putting out there. So I know sometimes people are like, what do you? I read the manifesto. And you're you're. You're not following it to. The letter I'm like. Yeah, I'm not going.

****Paul:**** You know, there there's there's only one book you're supposed to follow to the letter, and it was not written by Mr. But I'm but well, yeah. I'm in complete agreement, I think. I think he did. He did raise some great points and he would admit he was not original but he did give us some. Great insight into into how the state works, how the system how the system keeps itself fed, and in all honesty, he certainly did a lot of moving the dial even in his very violent way that he did it. But sometimes that's just how history is. It turns through violence.

****Quinones:**** Yeah, well, I mean. I'm trying to figure out what I'm trying to say, something about civilization and being civilized and how we've been, how we've been civilized. And yeah, then I just think about Ted and it's like. And he basically says by us becoming civilized, we've it's one of the reasons why we're in the. Condition that we are now.

****Paul:**** I'm reminded of the Rush song I know you this how to tell someone someone is a freaking nerd with jennex parents. He listened to rush growing up. I'm reminded of the Rush song about hemispheres and part called hemispheres rather about, the whole thing is like it's talked about, the two gods of Apollo and Dionysus. Is representative of the right half and the left half of the brain, or really just about the concept of instinct versus reason. And I really just think it's an eternal dialectic between the two. It's a it's an eternal dialectic between too much reason and too much instinct, right now we're figuring out that, hey. Little bit much little bit too much. Little bit too much. How should I say? Civilization a little bit too much sophistication. Now it's time to start cutting some of the delay. Start bringing back a little bit more instinct, a little bit more reason, a little bit more life, but then there's a such thing as too much reason, too much or not too much. There's such thing as too. Much instinct too much you. Know feeling too much? All that other stuff. Maybe, maybe, maybe that's just my my dumb reading of a rush. Wrong, but I think it's just an eternal dialectic between reason and instinct.

****Quinones:**** Ohh what I see is. I see a lot of subjectivity and rationale rationalism to turn that subjectivity into something that people embrace. And when we're there, which is where we are and we've been here for a while. We need to turn to things that are objective and. Maybe not so rational, perhaps.

****Paul:**** and maybe that's maybe it's the time for. That I I'd certainly say so. Pete, where can people find you?

****Quinones:**** The Pecan Yetta show any pod catcher Odyssey Rumble bit shoot YouTube. I just put up. I just put up really quick little sound bites and Pete substack.com.

****Paul:**** And UM, you can you all know where to find me. Catching Paul on Twitter. I'm. I haven't been on Twitter for a while, but after the US event next week

is it's coming real quick. Pete once again, I know you had a schedule conflict. You couldn't make it, but and you will be very sorely missed there. But for all of you who are going. it's coming quick. It's gonna be great if you have not yet gone. I do believe there are still very, very few tickets left. Very limited tickets. So go check it out. Go buy it now if you have it already, you will meet myself. Many other individuals there. The prudential is Mr. You'll meet all of us there. and. Support support that. Support the Old Glory club. Like subscribe hit the bell. You know, whenever? Whenever the Old Glory club. We do these live streams weekly. Every Thursday we publish articles weekly, Monday, Wednesday and. So that's, I mean, that's pretty much it, more or less, Mr. Pete, thank you very much for joining me this evening.

****Quinones:**** Yeah, I appreciate it. Thank you very much, Paul. It's always a pleasure.

****Paul:**** And thank you to all of you, the listeners for spending your evening with us. We greatly appreciate it and go out and learn what your nature is.

Mad at the Internet

Destiny and Null talk about Kiwifarms Drama

Source
TomDark
184K subscribers
72,131 views
Jan 25, 2023

Highlights

Tom: Listen, you were you were planning, at least in some form, to gear up for a lawsuit against couples, right? You sent her a cease and desist.

Destiny: Initially, when I sent that cease and assist my. Goal was to retraction. She didn't post the retraction, probably, but she hasn't said anything. So basically the next step is I have to decide if I want to, like, basically, reinvigorate her whole Internet career. To attempt to go to court against her. I think that right now her trajectory is kind of like to fade into irrelevance because she's very boring. She's doing good content and if she's not, like, actively fighting with larger figures, nobody cares about her. So right now I'm just kind of like sitting in the, like, maybe I could just let her fade away. I don't know if. It would be smart to do the like the full litigation. ...

Destiny: Why do you deny banning me? It's like 4 years ago. I know this, huh?

Null: I never banned you. Look to the logs. There is no record. Of the ban, OK.

Destiny: Someone's tampering with them in the back end, I guess.

Conversation starts

Tom: What's up, Destiny?

Destiny: Hey, what's up? How are you doing?

Tom: Doing good. How are you doing? OK, this is the conversation. No, meet your idol. Steven Bonnell the 2nd.

Null: Well, we already know each other. We used to toss Zerg back in the day.

Destiny: Yeah, those two videos were wild, man.

Null: Right. Right.

Null: So we've never, we've never actually spoken. I know of him through my site and just through either and he knows of me through my site. So we have like a vague, probably a vague understanding of each other and that's about it.

Tom: Cool. The real question is.

Destiny: Why do you why do you deny banning me? It's like 4 years ago. I know this.

Null: I never banned you.

Destiny: I know I got suspended from Kiwi farms for like a year. It happened when I started posting my thread. You still deny it to this day, huh?

Null: Yeah, I don't think. I mean I could look, I looked through the logs there was. No record of the ban.

Destiny: OK, well, someone's tampering with them in the back end I guess. What are we?

Destiny: What are we doing here today?

Tom: This Turkey, Tom all right.

Null: I want I want I want to reach out to your audience of 10s of millions of gamers and explain to them that everything's going. To specifically, the Internet is going to.

Destiny: OK.

Tom: Why is it going to Josh? What's your perspective on that? Why is it over? It over why are we not back?

Null: OK, so Destiny's people are familiar with drop Kiwi farms because kettles made the genius decision to try and implicate him in all of my sins through one post where he said that we played StarCraft together. And the irony of this post is that it was designed to troll me and it is. Succeeded because he said something like we were best friends and I would curate his thread to make him look as favorable as possible. And people actually. Believe this and they gave me for it and say Destiny says that your best friends and you're going to make his thread look super nice for him. Is that true? And the real irony was that many years later, like six years later, this comes around in the form of Levels using this post as conclusive evidence that that Destiny is a complicit in the form active on the forum. Best friends with me probably finances it in some way. And definitely was in some way forced or given reason to defend the forum. Ironically, even though I don't think he particularly cares for it in the form of his gigantic manifesto. Is that all accurate, TM?

Destiny: With this to me or to Turkey, Tom? I think to me I mean yeah, it sounds that good, I will say. Oh, I got kicked. The sorry, I will say that I don't defend Kiwi farms. OK, I just spend the idea that if you want to take a website off the Internet, it should be like breaking law or something. I don't like the idea of like public, like, public pressure campaigns to get **** shut down, so he's not breaking a law. There should probably be allowed to stand is what I would say, but that's the only. Minor clarification I would give.

Null: Do you know the extent of the damage that dropped Kiwi Farms has done?

Destiny: To you, Kiwi farms or the Internet or what?

Null: The infrastructure, just like the total sum of all things that have dropped in the in the wake of the what I consider to be like an organized harassment campaign, cause the ship. That they did. Was was crazy.

Destiny: Yeah, man, I mean, considering how often the site was going up and down and the different providers you to hop through everything, I imagine it was quite extensive, yeah. The damage done, I lost.

Null: My Google Voice number, I lost my registered agent for the company in Wyoming, which I still haven't replaced. I lost my mailing address in Florida, which I used to collect mail from banks and stuff and send it to me where I actually. I lost cloud flare which in turn expose my IP addresses and then I lost my tier one ISP hookups to Zio. I could not host the site through any website that or any ISP that use voxility and then major tier one ISP's like are Leon Lumen and by extension, CenturyLink and Quest. For blocking their own customers for connecting to. Like and this was not because of any. Wait, wait, wait, wait.

Destiny: Can I just ask on that last one? Mm-hmm. ISP's were blocking like customers from accessing the website.

Null: Yes, if you are a customer of CenturyLink or quest, you were blocked no matter what possible routes existed, they would actually prohibit their own customers from accessing the Kiwi farms or any website that I hosted on my.

Destiny: IPS. That's interesting. Wow.

Null: It's insane and I'll get into net neutrality later because I have, you know. Sure, but it should concern everybody. This was like 4 different Mac like what they're called Internet backbones. They're ISP's that are massive and they connect to one each other without any fees. And this is essentially the web of trust that makes up the Internet. So the fact that these companies dropped at all without a court order should scare people. The fact that. CenturyLink, which is also Quest Lumen, formerly Layer Three, was blocking their own customers from accessing sites should scare people and even in places with net neutrality like Sweden and Norway. There Aryon was blocking connections for their customers and also transit through their company to the Kiwi farms.

Destiny: Just as like a due diligence question, just relating to that, when you're saying they blocked them, this wasn't like some random ***** emailed you and said I'm blocked like you had like multiple people testing to confirm like, OK.

Null: Yes, I gave them instructions on how to test the connectivity and you could see where it drops off and would always be on these specific ISPs. And then I had people actually within the company, which I can't verify, but I believe them based what they were saying they were telling me that there was like especially in early on that there was a. People in the US that were doing this, but the people in Europe were trying to combat it. I had and this the thing that really frustrates me. About this is. That never, not once. Not a single one of these companies at any point pointed

to specific content and said this violates this part of our UP. It's always just you're. Dropped. You wake up and.

Destiny: It's like this.

Null: Not even no contact I received.

Destiny: Whatever. Oh, sure. OK. OK.

Null: I received no contact at any point with cloud player, not once at any point did any of them reach out to me and explain what the situation was. Just every single one of these people, with the exception of my registered agent, who quoted some weird thing about an executive order about Russia, which was not applicable at all, but said that I they had a drop for that. But for the rest of them, it was silence. Things went on and off. They took us down and brought us back up, you know, a week later, without any explanation as to what the **** was happening. And it was all the whims of, you know, just whatever data engineer happened to be on on shift that day, or who brought it up later. And it was completely, you know, unaccountable unappealable, completely opaque. No, not even a an effort to try and stipulate AP. Violations cloud Flare said that we had a threat to human life that was visible on the site. He did not tell me personally and he did not report it to law enforcement cause I received no contact from law enforcement about any posts related to an imminent threat to human life that he said would be actionable by the police. So I know it's ***** and I. This I mean this. This is unprecedented. I've never heard of an of a US legal website being pulled apart like this just because of complaint volume, and that's what it is. It's not specific TOS violations or app violations. It is people people called up the CEO. From what I was told, somebody in particular and want to name names. I don't know if I'll get you in. But someone in particular called up the CEO's wife of GTT, A tier one company, and said let's have a girl talk about the Q.

Destiny: If you're worried by getting in trouble for naming names, you can whatever name you.

Destiny: Want. That's fine. As long as you're not using slurs, whatever, go for it, OK?

Null: Liz Fong Jones was a is a friend, was a friend of capitals, but they parted ways after Capitals decided that they were done with dropped Q farms after cloud flare. Liz Fong Jones has been after the site since about 2017, I wanna say. And they allegedly called up the CEO's wife of GTT and said let's have a girl talk if you don't know Liz Fong Jones is trans, so and they called up at about 6:00 AM in the US time where this person was located. And it was. It's purely a combination of harassment complaints and intimidation and. That that's kind of segues into what I want to say about net neutrality. I am a proponent of net neutrality, even though that's not very popular on the right because Trump put in that ***** ***** pie who was a Verizon CEO. Of course, when he revoked net neutrality, but net neutrality gives. In this instance, if they could not have a justification, a legal justification for black holing the site, these people would be able to reply to the complaint volume and simply say my hands are tied. I don't have legal standing to disrupt the Internet this way, so I can't. No matter

what you. Say or do to me. My you know, I'm. Not at liberty to do this, and that's a very good thing. for people to have in their their pocket as a. Card to play. When these deep platforming campaigns happen, but for whatever reason, people on the right are convinced that net neutrality is just like a. Scheme to give.

Destiny: Like communism for the Internet is like ***** stupid. Which is funny because in a way they almost are like begging for net neutrality when it comes to social media companies. They talk about revoking section 230 and ****.

Destiny: So it's kind of funny.

Null: It's and you know, I don't know to say. Yeah, it's like they think that it gives Netflix free money or something and it's completely misunderstood. And it's very tragic because it's something that everybody desperately needs. There's no reason why you should want the post office, the electric company, the water company, the disposal companies, the roads or the Internet to or the telephone. As was the case with the Bell Telecommunications Company. Break up that you should want these essential services to decide who can and cannot do what with who you.

Destiny: Know I made this joke like I think a year or two ago.

Destiny: But I said that with the direction that we're going, I think we're gonna get to the point to where there are certain undesirable figures where people are putting pressure on, like leasing management companies and **** to like, not rent you an apartment. If you're like too extreme or something where people. Yeah, dude, don't rent to that guy. He's a Nazi. Do you want a Nazi living? And then, like, whole management companies are gonna start, like, doing background checks and **** on people to figure out who's like, blocked from renting apartments?

Null: I'm sure if I tried to rent, you know, an office building to do a registered agent at in some state for the like, they would kick us out immediately, even if I was paying rent. Like just for the, you know, an address to put the company to it. It's like we would lose that.

Destiny: It's also really extreme too. Because like when you talk about things like cloud flare, you talk about things like registered agents like these are literally things that exist to give to some extent, like some shield of anonymity, like a lot of people think of cloud flare as just DDoS protection, which it does. But Cloudflare also like masks your, you know, you said your IP address. There a lot of information that you can get behind. What would be the cloud for stuff. So the idea that they're dropping somebody for like what you said, complaint volume because it's not like there's like if there was like a terrorist shooting or something that originated from a site. OK, I can. I could kind of see that or if there were like violent campaigns being organized or child **** being hosted or whatever like this starts to make more sense. But for just like complaint volume, because people just don't. Like people bullying people from a site. That's really scary. Yeah, I.

Tom: And so you.

Null: Can go just real quick. I'm gonna reiterate this. I mentioned this with Kirky. Tom when we spoke. But Matthew Prince effectively made a statement that the Kiwi

firms was the worst website that he had seen, something to that effect. It was really extreme and I know for a fact that right now cloud flare protects multiple sites related to ISIS that do funding and you know publications, propaganda related to ISIS. And they host websites dedicated to animal torture. If you wanna go. If you wanna go see an animal, get a hole, drill through its head. You know a. Living monkey baby. There are websites for that that are known to Cloudflare that they choose to protect, so the backtracking to say that it was an imminent threat to human life is ridiculous. It was simply to save. Face because they had put out a statement. Happened by the way, between the end of August where they said we're not, they clarified policies and said we're not going to do this because this is really a terrible idea. It increases censorship. Causes totalitarian dictatorships to complain that we should take down human rights organizations, yadda yadda. And then two days later, on Labor Day weekend at 6:00 PM West Coast Time on as I. Every day they decide **** Kiwi farms and they drop us and say that there was like some urgent issue that obviously never happened because Jeffers is alive and well and I received no complaints from law enforcement. The Irish police reached out to didn't know, you know.

Destiny: Sure. Yeah, let's be so let's be a little clear cause I want all of the thing that irritates me is that when people talk about a lot of this stuff where they're not like 100% like what's happening the thing. So the imminent threat referred to was on Kiwi farms. There were two threats that were posted and then taken down within the course of I think 15. Units and those are the things that are being referred to by by cloud flare. I believe when they did the drop, I think they don't refer to them specifically. They just said imminent threats. The one question I had before we get into those did did you end up removing both of those or were those taken down or deleted by OK, gotcha.

Null: OK, to clarify the post that was actually on the site was deleted by the user and you know you can explain why you delete a post when you do and the user chose to provide a message that was along the lines of bad joke. Sorry so there that that was deleted by the simply and the user deleted it because. Using the you know as you described it, Reddit Karma. System people chose. To give it negative ratings, so it received a ton of negative ratings. Calling the post you know idiotic and said, oh, people don't like this. They don't get the joke that it's not funny to them whatever. And he deleted it by his own choice. And then it was action by a moderator within, I think 30 minutes there after. This was was up for 15 minutes and yeah, it was deleted by the user and it was a joke. The other one was posted to poll. It wasn't even on the Kiwi farms. It gave a shout out to the Kiwi farms and I think also hit. It wasn't on my ***** website, so it's like.

Destiny: Was that the weird, the weird, the one kid?

Null: It was the note in front of the apartment. It was like kicking outside of kefla's like a part of my friend's apartment in Northern Ireland and it just some something like it was a shout out to like a a Irish unification group that.

Destiny: OK.

Null: Had a violent passion.

Destiny: Yeah. Yeah, yeah, I've.

Destiny: Know more than I care about these people and have a bad kid. Yeah, the, the, the, the scary part, the implication because I just wanna be clear because a lot of people will say or we'll counter will say well, no, there were actual like threats posted on the website. There was that one, which is true, but the scary part is that like, should a site that hosts a threat like that for less than 15 minutes? Like what is the action? Time before you're black hold from the Internet, right? Could I theoretically walk into any form in any chat room and type in? I wanna kill this person and then go and report you immediately. And now your site is Internet black hole. There's gotta be like a moderation terminal, but like this is what you said before, where it's like, OK, where's your user agreements? Like what is the moderation requirement? Like what kind of threat can stay up like how like do you really lose all of your cloud for protection of a threat like that is posted in within two minutes and it's not action. That's like it's a really ridiculous standard that I guess some people try to pretend existed for a minute, but I mean. Nobody really cared at the end of the day, it was just whatever they could to get the the. Site like taken down right?

Null: And it's not even like the AP is always for any reason or no reason at all. So they can always just point to the any reason or no reason at all clause for disconnecting service and that's protected by Section 2. Which I am a strong proponent of, but there's section 230, I think paragraph 2C or C2B, and that paragraph is the one that says that you can disconnect something, remove something, delete something from any service as a provider, and be immunized from consequences. And that is different from keeping something up, which is the first paragraph. So if I basically what that means is. If someone posts something on the Kiwi farms that causes civil harm, you have to sue the poster, not me. The contrast of this is that if I delete something that somehow causes civil damages, you can't sue me for it. That person cannot sue me for it. Actually, nobody can sue me for that. I minimized from any damages. So if Facebook, you know this, this is what protects YouTube. YouTube can ban and the monetize anyone they want. Twitch can do the same. Facebook can do the same without for any. Reason or no reason at all. And because of the section second paragraph of section 2:30, they are completely and totally immunized from media. Images and supplies. To Google results and Facebook ads and whatever.

Tom: I actually had a question for like that pertains to both of you that I wrote down here prior. So Destiny, if I recall correctly, you actually wrote the first guide for streamers on D dosing after it impacted your own streams in income. And this is probably years ago. Umm do you guys think there's anything that can be done to kind of create more standardized mitigation against it? Like has there. First of all, has there any ever been any legal repercussion for such an attack as far as dosing? And secondly, what would the like funds be needed to create some kind of infrastructure so that you don't have to rely on cloud flare? One of these companies that maybe are at the whim of someone like devils?

Destiny: On the first thing I saw a couple of people in my thread saying that like maybe you can help null because of your Didi. When you're a consumer DDoS protection for you is keeping your IP address hidden. It's fundamentally different when you're hosting a website because you want people to have your IP address or like your DNS, like people have to connect to your website. So any method that like I developed to protect me or other people, a lot of these are data because people don't. Use Skype anymore of these other programs. Any method that I develop isn't going to be applicable to a website because I don't want people to find me. But you want a website to be found so.

Tom: Do you do you know what the Josh, you know what the kind of money needed would be to create your own kind of DDoS protection? Service like is it is it in like the 100.

Null: 10s of thousands. Of dollars a month. OK. Cause I mean I'll put it like this. There are multiple layers to the stack and you can go to protectthestack.org which is ran by the EFF and explains why these service providers should not make political decisions because it harms the health of the Internet. But the stack includes layers 1 which is physical to layer 7, which is the application layers 3 and 4 result. Are about the network infrastructure, So what can happen is they can either just send. Sophisticated packets that cause the application itself to lock up, or they can send so much traffic that it simply floods the pipes. The bandwidth tubes of the Internet and prevents any legitimate traffic from reaching out. So one GB per second of dedicated bandwidth is, I think, like \$150.00. And then if you. Bulk up to A10 Gigabit per second connection. You'll be paying about 7:50 a month, depending on where we're at. So if you go up to 100 gigabytes per second, that's going to be, you know, between 5:00 and \$10,000 depending on. Here a very strong DDoS attack can exceed a TB per second, so you're talking tons and tons of money just for the bandwidth. And that's not even including the other layer, which is going to be the packet filtering, cause you need sophisticated routers that are able to. Not only you have to buy special computers that can even receive 100 gigabits per SEC. And, but then you're talking about filtering through billions of packets per second as well, and somehow legit figuring out what's legitimate traffic, the amount of money that you need to make a company like that requires you to have significant investment capital and a customer base, which number one, the customer base can be attacked and they can be scared off from doing business with you by people like Liz Fong Jones and capsules and drop. Firms et cetera. But they can also go after your payment networks as well. And the financial censorship is something that I desperately want to touch on as well because I don't think people fully appreciate how much soft censorship is. Coming from financial control.

Tom: How expensive is it now? On the other end to DDoS someone.

Null: It is like \$100 a month.

Tom: \$100 a month. Is it illegal to deal with someone?

Null: It is a federal crime. It's against the computer protection and anti fraud.

Tom: Act has there ever been any legal repercussions for D dosing? I mean, as far as you're concerned?

Null: Not my side.

Tom: Didn't you tell me that Zwang Jones openly has talked about she like having a botnet? That did I just say.

Null: They they list Fung Jones published a GoPro. Basically, we have an in House deals mitigator now that's written by Thomas Lynch for Fat Chan. And we borrowed this and we've run it for protecting Tor. But Liz Fong Jones has published a GO program that is a way around this cause the DS Mitigator is not intelligent, especially not the one for Tor, cause there's limited information.

Tom: Right.

Null: It simply uses a proof of work, kind of like cryptography, but very quick so that you can load the page your browser. And then in five seconds, you're connected to a site, and Liz Fong Jones write wrote something to try and get around this. I've never seen it employed, though.

Tom: Well, kind of in that vein, I guess, you know, find it like you said yourself you want to talk about financial institutions. I guess that's needs to be a question for you. I'd rather pass off to you to get your take first. What would you say the payment processors should step in to stop some kind of, you know, content or some kind of or to interfere with someones activity when they're you know using? Chase Bank or TD banks?

Destiny: Ideologically, when it comes to backbone infrastructure, I don't think they should ever step in absent a court order, and even that is iffy. Like even when we're talking about payment processing for child ****, for bestiality, for animal torture, for snuff, whatever the **** you're talking about, all of that enforcement should happen. On a level that doesn't require like public pressure to financial institutions. Because I think that we get into these weird areas where you wanna take somebody down or if you wanna do something. There's like different standards for enforcement at like every different type of level. Like let's say I had a website and I go. To the government. I say take it down like, well, they're doing legal. It's like, OK, well, **** you. I'm gonna go to the ISP, take them down. And it's like, well, you know, we looked at it, we don't things like ****, OK what about the people that do their their money, you know, PayPal and all this. If it was like, OK, yeah, I guess, yeah. We got them. I don't like that there's like 17 different attack vectors to try to take down a website. If you don't like the material that they host because it just. Leaves the whole Internet in such a weird *****. Place where like in the future, right? the doomsday scenario is you're in this hyper fragmented reality where it's like, OK, I wanna be able to go to 4 Chan so I can't use Cox Communications or AT&T but if I have another ISP like I gotta start picking and choosing like which credit cards I use, which ISPs I have maybe in the future what hardware I have like depending on how crazy it gets, right. I don't think that should ever be a case.

Tom: We were talking about this sort of down the line of net neutrality being repealed, right?

Destiny: I mean it, it's net neutrality, but like it applies to all of this kind of like backbone infrastructure like my understanding is a lot of the anti **** stuff on the Internet. I think that was fought almost purely on the payment processor side and I yeah, I just like I don't, I don't necessarily oppose people fighting these things. Like if you wanna take down Kiwi farms, you're.

Destiny: Gonna take down?

Destiny: If you do that, that's fine. But it shouldn't be through like processing payments, it shouldn't be pressuring like those types of vectors. Just feel like it's super inappropriate.

Null: Yeah, but it's such. It's not just even websites. the soft censorship that exists by removing somebody's ability to monetize what they do is it is a cancer. It's like an actual cancer that is sitting on our organs. It's constricting our lungs. It's slowly killing us and it's just not fast enough for people to notice and take action. The fact and the thing just to lay this out, here's how this financial censorship works. There are four companies that basically dominate global finance. They are MasterCard, visa, discover and Amex, MasterCard and visa card. Between them control about 90% of all financial transactions that. Happen on the. On on the line, which is the dominant market. Now Amex and discover control another you know 5% age. So if you are a payment processor like Stripe, you have to stay good with all of these companies. If you lose any of them, you're out of business. People will move to a different payment processor that accepts all the networks. So any rule that any of them pass apply to everybody who uses everything. So if discover says something, then stripe implements it for all their customers, not just for the ones that choose to process discover payments. And these these rules are trade secret and this is the real kicker. They don't outline. This is specifically what you can and cannot do what you can and cannot allow who you can and cannot allow when your platforms, it is a pure secret that they kind of tip their hat at and say like this is what we're looking. For with high risk stuff. But it's at their discretions at the discretion of every single one of these companies that you stay online, you have to stay good with stripe. You have to stay good with MasterCard, visa, card discover and Amex. Otherwise you're gone and you do. Make money and this happened to the Kiwi firms very early on. In fact, I use PayPal to collect donations. PayPal not only ban the site if I try to book an Uber, I have to use specific cards because they know what cards I had on my PayPal account and I cannot use them on Uber because they use PayPal to process transactions and it's like. That kind of **** where you like once you're banned, you can't even appeal it. There's no appeals process with any.

Destiny: Yeah, because it's not even a formal ban process.

Null: Any of them.

Destiny: It just happens. And you're like, OK, I guess it's done with this.

Null: It just happens.

Destiny: Yeah, yeah, there's nothing.

Null: And like you can't appeal it, you don't get to know who made the decision. You're very lucky if you even figured out which part of this this nation was responsible for it. There's no appeals process within that company and then there's no government appeals process and you can't even sue them to figure out what the **** is happening because it's a trade secret and they're not obligated by any kind of contract. The laws to tell you what the what, the. Thought process is. And this is this is the heart of our economy now, and it's just this completely opaque black box that sits on the ground and things go in and things come out and nobody knows how it ***** works. And I think that's the most terrifying thing at all. the number one way that you could open up like true competition in the market is to make it so that. Anybody legally allowed to do business in the US can do business until they have broken the law, and then that there's suspicion of breaking the law. There has to be timelines for appealing it. Disclosing what the concern was and giving a route on how to get back onto the payment networks and. Then, as a last resort. There has to be a government solution to fixing the problem.

Destiny: As well, yeah.

Null: Just right now.

Destiny: The only problem, OK.

Null: I'm just gonna say that the **** is completely ***** broken. It's literally a small cabal cabal of bankers that decide. Who gets to make a living right now?

Destiny: Yeah, the only problem is, the reason why I don't think this will ever change is because it only affects content on the very. Edge, like I'll look at like my Twitter ban on my Twitch ban, and I'll be like back like this is unfair. Like we need to change the system, blah blah blah. But like if I truly, really look at things like how many people get banned from Twitter, it's probably less than, like a .1% of the user base. How many people get banned from Twitter? Probably. Listen Point, 1% of the user base. How many? People are getting like a payment processor black hole. It's probably actually. There's probably only a handful of sets in the Internet has ever happened to. I don't know if anybody has actually taken a site offline as hard as Kiwi firms before, that was that wasn't explicitly by court order, like child **** or. And when things exist so much at the fringe, it's so easy for everyone else to just look at it and be like, well, you know, this is probably never gonna happen to me. So I don't give a. ****, and most of them are probably right, so it's hard to get anybody to care.

Null: And if you really think about it when someone is like removed from a platform, how many people notice like? How many people you have? About 600,000 subscribers. If you got banned from YouTube, like how long would it take and how many people? How long would it take for like your subscriber Steven knows there would be like a ***** audience like 20,000 those people to notice immediately. But even like half of them wouldn't even know. They just wouldn't. They would just stop seeing suggestions and think, well, I guess you stopped making videos. Yeah, a lot of a lot of people think. So we're it's it's, it's very scary, but it does impact a lot of people and that's why

I think it's good to get ahead of it and for people who know that what they say is as you're like you both you and Turkey Tom do a thing where you and I have like websites for all the content that we put out and like letting people know that this. Is the thing. This is like an imminent? Ohh it's like a sort of dynamically. It's just constantly swinging overhead that could happen at any moment and.

Destiny: I was gonna ask you earlier like it's hard for me to balance out complaining about this because everything that you just said, you're like confirming that like, these are actually really effective attack vectors like you should go after my Uber.

Destiny: You should go after.

Destiny: My PayPal you should contact call those CEOs because people. Know it works. It's always hard to complain about **** that people do that's effective, cuz it's like, well, if you guys want to really **** with me like here's what's happening, here's what works. So go for it.

Null: Yeah, yeah, yeah. And that that was the thing that I did for a long time. Because I had one guy. In particular, who's **** psycho? He he's like full on, like, swatting members of my family, putting people into **** like, and like, spreading his first. And like, it's hard to talk about things and confirming that this is. But this is what's happening. This is what annoys me. This is what's causing problems. But I'm becoming more vocal about it, cause it's like at this point it's there was there was a point where I was like I sent a couple of emails out to a bunch of different companies that had I had spoken to before I said I'm I'm about to give up. I'm I'm I'm pretty **** done. I don't know how I can get around this and then by. You know, like a literally a saving grace. Is that someone replied and had some contacts and I got our current setup and that's pretty rigid, but it got there. So now I'm just. I'm just gonna spend the time that I have left with any kind of audience screaming at the top of my lungs that the issue is, is that section 230 protects the platforming. The banks are allowed to. Remove people from the financial system whenever possible. Net neutrality is a must. and this this should concern everybody. So that's kind of why I wanted to talk.

Tom: But how do you get the average person even invested in this? I mean, you know, talking solutions like 1-1, you know, way to get a decent solution out there at least have a conversation about it would be to get the average person just involved. But like you said, the average person just doesn't really. Hair like I'm imagining, trying to explain to like literally any of my, you know, IRL zoom were friends about this. They just be like, well, that sucks, and then they carry on their day because it's hard to get people invested in 1% of the population. Is there any way that you can get people to care about freedom of speech? I feel like even a few years ago, freedom speech was a bigger deal, you know, online and even, you know, in real life. Around the Trump presidency, but since then, people have just stopped caring as much, and it seems to be getting worse and worse. You know, with every passing year, people just don't give a ****.

Destiny: I think the biggest deal is people don't. This is kind of a hard one and I just might be cynical here. People don't really care about the principle of anything. You don't really care about the principle of freedom of speech. What they care about is when stuff that they like is getting taken down. So when you look at defending places like when you look defending the principle of freedom of speech, if you're case studies are places like. It's kind of you're kind of like beyond any normal person at that point. Like guys like there's websites are being taken off the Internet like for. Bad reasons like really what kind of sites? OK, well it's a site called Kiwi Farms. Like what do they do there? Well, you know, it's we it's like a bunch of people that like, obsess over lol cows on like what's the laws like? OK, well, like if I explain this, it's gonna be really weird. It's like, OK, I don't know if I even care about this. It sounds weird, you know, like that's the issue. Is that like all of the things are being? Affected around it. Are kind of things that the fringe even for my stuff like I'm a big lefty and I got banned from Twitter and it's not fair. Like, really damn. Like what? Kind of stuff. Do you tweet? Well, you know, I told a woman get raped by a shovel once, but like, I'm not like a person all the time, you know? And it's like the when you exist at the fringes, people don't care about the principle. They care about the stuff that they like disappearing. That's why conservatives. Who were traditionally. Like, you know, big business does whatever they want, the government, blah. That's why they're all clamoring about Section 230 now. They never cared about freedom of speech or any of this ****. It's just when their content is getting the hosted. Now they're in favor of government stepping in and helping, but until it's something that people like that the principle of it is. is irrelevant to most people.

Null: Yeah. Yeah and. That's why I try to avoid like. Ascribing to any kind of partisan or label is because I really don't like a lot of people on the right. They do not give a **** about freedom of speech. They give a **** about themselves and that's that goes both ways and it's very it's really hopeless when you see people like Nick. And as you. Know would you know, would let you get the. Platform in a second they they only. Care about their their own thing. As far as getting people to care you, you can't. It took, you know, Ron Paul went about the Federal Reserve and the debt ceiling and so on and so forth for literally decades. And nobody gave a ****. He gave these huge proclamations about imminent doom and nobody cared. And now just kind of recently, there's like this sudden surge in interest in in silver. And alternative payment methods that aren't. Backed by the US. So it may be decades before people care, but I feel it's important to just kind of reiterate it as much as possible, because when the time comes that people do start to care, when you can look back and articulate what the issue is and have a fix it it, it can get done. You might be the Canarian like. I imagine there will come a time where I just can't keep the site up anymore and I just have to move on because of the way things are and nobody's gonna come to my rescue. But hopefully by that point I've spread the seeds of discontent far enough that. There will there will be a positive outcome later in the future and. Kind of two different related themes to this. First, if you've never heard of this speech, I would

actually encourage you to go look especially Destiny. People who are interested in like intellectual content. There's a Christopher Hitchens speech called in Defense of hate speech which explains very articulately why people need to defend speech. They don't necessarily agree with. And he asked the crowd at the theater he's speaking to. Who among you would you elect as your censor? Many people would agree that there is a line of what is free or permissible speech and not permissible speech. But who would you actually elect to make those determinations for you? You have a clear idea in your head what? You do and do not want to see. Propagated. But who do you actually trust enough to make those decisions and action them into law? And it's most people don't have an answer for this. So when you see people like Kefauver's championing championing. Like massive corporations into ***** with people and taking their income, it's like, do you, are you really trying to make Susan Wojcicki your your sensor? Are you really trying to elect these people into a position of power over you and what you can and cannot say? Are you sure that's a great idea? Because I don't think that it is. Sorry, I forgot my second point. I bisected my idea in half now I.

Tom: Lost some? No worries. Yeah, I mean, it's definitely kind of a scary time right now for me personally as someone who, I mean I'm I'm you know for viewers at home, I'm only 20. So just as I kind of became aware of the concept of freedom of speech and could even start to believe in it when I was, you know, 1314, that's all that stuff started being ripped away. With like the apocalypse and stuff like. That listen, you saw YouTube clamping down. So my kind of concept of a free Internet is like 2016, but I'm sure to you guys 2016 is like way far down. The line of a free Internet.

Destiny: Yeah. Yeah. Oh, my God. Yeah, things have changed so much in the past, like, 25 years of, like, yeah. Yeah.

Tom: Well, the thing, well, The thing is what I'm saying, like people my age, I don't think they even have a grasp on it. And I'm I'm trying to even someone who's younger and is trying to get, you know, some concept of it. But for me it's kind of hard to, you know, imagine like early 2000s, like when he bombs world was around or whatever or ITM and when you had a lot of these. Sites I guess one question I would have for you guys is apart from the obvious, which is just OK, they're, you know, freedom of speech is good and whatever else is, what do you guys miss about that early era of the Internet, early 2000s, when sites had a more libertarian kind of view of things? Everything. Well, do you want to explain what everything is?

Null: I wish I could turn back time to the good old. Days. I mean, I don't think there was a time in the mid 2000s where. The people my age had just sort of taken the reins of the Internet and there was a period where, like the government didn't know what the **** the Internet was and anything went. It was just like it was a literal wild. West and anything went and. You know that that would it had problems, but it also it was like it was just so free. It was so free. Any literally anyone could just boot up a ***** website and become a millionaire like it. It was so competitive. It was so rich and ideas and genuine diversity. And we'll never have that again. There will never be a time period where, because put this in the perspective. In 2008. This is my

one of my favorite little allegories or metaphors or whatever the ****, but in 2008 the top 50% of websites, so the websites that competed for 50% of all web traffic was like 1000, like multiple thousands of websites, thousands of websites competed for half of Internet traffic by 2012, which is when the Internet really started to go to. But this was like a couple 100 websites, so it already shrank massively. Now the top.

Destiny: I bet it's like probably what less than.

Destiny: 10 it's like.

Null: 12 websites from four different companies are like half of all Internet traffic.

Destiny: OK.

Null: It's sickening how small the Internet it's so hard to explain that it used to be like this vibrant metropolis with thousands of small businesses, and now we're it's like Walmart and then target and then. McDonald's and that's the Internet, it's. Like take your. Pick you ***** idiot. Welcome to the Internet.

Destiny: Yeah, I think that there's like. I always complain about this. I wish that we could, like, get good things without, like giving up everything because like, I think there's a lot of advantages to the new Internet in that. Like 1, the audience size is obviously massively grown. Two like it's cringe as it is having a bigger diversity of people online is nice. You get a lot more cultures coming together, you get like. Just bigger audiences, you get like women, you get all these other people that traditionally weren't as involved in the older Internet who are now on. So then in turn, if you are like working in content creation, there's a reason why you can make so much ***** money on ad. Revenue, which is something probably have money in a long time. Now imagine you get. ***** blacklisted from. Everything but for like the people that are like making content like YouTube or Twitch or other things like there's so much more money to be made today, which makes a lot of forms of content so much more viable because there's money out there to be made, which so these are like really, really positive things. But there was like a beauty to like the old. Anarchy of the Internet, where like just the craziest like random people making content like a lot of the early, like, YouTube **** was just like random ***** kids, like making YouTube videos with no idea. Like there wasn't like a formula for thumbnails and content and all that ****. And yeah, the people were. You see, I think another thing that was nice about the older Internet and I don't know if this is true or if I'm just, I might just be like nostalgia out and maybe I'm delusional, but it felt like back then there's this concept I guess I can in in maybe in program or whatever. It's like we had smart users in front of dumb terminals and then it became dumb users in front of smart terminals. I think back then there was this idea. Of like, I'll call it like trolling, a lot of people on. The Internet used. To act stupid in the Internet. But it was ***** hilarious. You would like trick people to think you actually believed a lot of the dump **** you said, and that was just hilarious. But that whole concept has changed and now the Internet is so much more. Serious to where? Like you know, back in 2000, like, it was funny to, like, tell a guy like all the different ways you were gonna kill his family. Just and like all the ***** ** **** you saying cause it was just. It was funny **** and it was just fucked

up and. But nowadays people do it. You know people are gonna actually go out and start ***** killing people. And I again. I don't know if I don't remember certain events or whatever, but it just wasn't a thing back then. The idea that somebody would actually leave the Internet going to the real world and do some of the crazy **** we. Talked about, didn't happen, and now that people are doing it, everything is just so much more different.

Tom: But that must be just cause there's more access now that you know if you have so many people. I mean 1,000,000 millions of people using Internet like one or two of them are gonna, you know, do you know they're gonna go on Twitter, be like I'm gonna kill you and then go cut that person's head off. Right. But that's just a limited pool of people.

Destiny: But I mean like. It just be like if you got like a form like those people, you just laugh at especially. Is so mad. They're like, talk about go ***** shoot up a school or bangs like, bro. You just make fun of these. It was funny, but like yeah, but now, like, **** like, you're, like, watching the news seeing of this dude from, like, your thread is gonna show up. Like on ***** CNN, it's an actual serial killer. Yeah, I don't know.

Tom: What do you think about that now?

Null: I mean there are, there are more serious the main thing is that the Internet is such a powerhouse for everything that it was basically destined to be conquered and controlled. The Internet is 40 years old. It was supposedly started. It was officially born in January 1st, 1983, so it has just turned 40 years old and. It's really starting to show its age. There, they realized at some certain point, probably right before the Trump election, like how important. It is to have. Mass media control via the Internet and. that's really the impetus now, like deciding who can see what they're going to put in front of you, what they're not going to show you like these are, these are the levers of control now for the powerful. And it is. I mean, it's a shame that it's no longer just a toy. It's no longer just like, a an enrichment to the human life. It is is. Is a significant portion of the entire human experience at this. Point and that. Was not the case when I was your age. When I was your age, the. That was a much. Smaller piece of a bigger picture, right?

Destiny: But back then, even like 5 or even like five years ago, we'd be like this is a Twitter problem. Like, who cares? But now it's like this is a Twitter problem. The entire world cares. The president cares. Everybody cares because these are like, yeah, like, nobody was winning or losing elections before, like, ***** Barack Obama and even Barack Obama. The first gotta like really start to utilize and stuff wasn't even doing it that much, but now like there are whole campaigns and like political movements that are born and die like that are born from the Internet and then like, come to the real world like all the Q and on stuff, a lot of the BLM stuff, like a lot of the stuff is born and bred online. And that's where it develops. So the stakes are so much higher. And yeah, the. Real world impact is so much realer.

Null: Right. Fun fact about qanon there is a picture of me standing next to Ron Watkins and Frederick in in I think the Japan or the Philippines. I think in in, in the Philippines and somebody in my family, distant family saw this queen on the documentary. And there's this picture of me and I got like a random message of nowhere. Like are you is. This you are you. Standing next to this guy that's supposed to be queuing. On I'm like, yeah, let's. Which is pretty ***** surreal.

Tom: You got owned. You got ***** owned. Was it in, like, a big documentary?

Null: Yeah, it was. It was really big. It was like. It was by one of the major media.

Tom: OK, well, that's definitely interesting. I mean, so would you say we'll never go back to that era the Internet. Just because the powers at you know that be are too big and they profit too much to allow that kind of like dissemination of a, you know, individual websites and people owning their own businesses and stuff like that. Like, it just wouldn't be convenient for them. They make less money or what? What is the deal there? Is it about control primarily?

Null: Well, nobody is. The thing is that the Internet is very comfortable. It's never they're never. People are never gonna want to go back to the time where we didn't have instantaneous communication and access to all information in the. Entire world. Yeah. And then a lot of ***** that's just made-up. So The thing is that it's going to be around forever, no matter what. I think that. I mean, unironically, I think that you're going to see a resurgence of, like. Where you're gonna see a growth in Amish communities and Mennonite communities where people just say **** this and I think that's already happening. But for most people who choose not to embrace Kaczynskiism, you're going to have to deal with the Internet being around. And as long as it is around, it's going to be widely manipulated.

Tom: Is there no way to go back? I mean, you do see some of these all tech platforms like Odyssey getting a little bit of traction or rumble stuff like that. I mean, you see individual creators that have had problems with YouTube in the past, like Sam Hyde. He goes to gum road and then he gets, you know, 10s of thousands a month through his pay wall. There does seem to be some like. It's not totally impossible to kind of do your own thing. Even Kiwi farms is still. I mean, despite everything, despite, you know, whatever happened with levels. I thought this was gonna go down and it did, but now it's up and everyone can use it right now and it, you know, loads pretty perfectly, so it doesn't seem like all hope is lost, right? It's not over.

Destiny: One thing that Joshua brings up, something that's a really good point. I wish more people would realize this is like people will argue for. Like ohh like we need. Privacy and ohh and blah blah. Blah blah blah, nobody actually cares. That nobody cares about privacy. Nobody cares about rights or any of the. Ship what people? Like is the convenience of everything right? If you wanted privacy, nobody's forcing you to use all of the Google ****, but people. Did they buy it? They want the Android. They want all of the synchronized shift, they want their e-mail to buzz their ***** watch to vibrate their ***** Wi-Fi pillow. That ***** jerks them off. Like all of this **** has to be connected. And people love the convenience from the convenience

of having a cell phone that is all of the world's information, your fingertips and the conveniences of e-mail and text. Well, that and the idea that people would give all of that up for some world where it's like, Oh well, they can't spy on me or, you know, sell this information anymore. We we're never, ever going back to that. So when people talk about like the world that they want for tomorrow, you have to find a way to incorporate that idea that people have all these conveniences, that they're never going to give up. You have to incorporate that into whatever model you have going forward. Because pretending that people gonna walk. Away from it, it's just absolute delusion.

Null: Well, I mean that's like the major issue with any kind of YouTube competitor like right now. You know, there's a lot of times where I'm not at the computer. So I wanna listen to music or I wanna do something in the easiest way to do that is like open up YouTube. And I tried to specifically find a TV that didn't have any kind of smart ***** attached to it, but I can take out. My phone and find a song I want to play and then press a button to screencast it. And that's really that's a convenience level that's so significant that it's impossible to replace right now with things like rumble that they're trying their. Yes, but and this actually kind of segues into an interesting thing about doxing is that just to kind of preemptively jump this criticism about, like allowing docs on the site, is that a lot of people point blame at the forum for allowing this information to be published, but it almost always comes from two sources, public voting records and things like Spokeo, Instant, Checkmate and White Pages. And those websites get their information from public voting records and also from marketing data aggregates, which are illegal in the European Union. Not illegal in the United States and I find it frustrating that people are very vocally against doxing, but they don't realize that this is information that's already public out there that is a product that is sold. And I feel like more people should be concerned about that and trying to stop the commoditization of, like, personal data.

Destiny: Why actually wait? I have a question I'm. Kind of curious. So how do you decide what information to allow versus what not to allow on QB farms? Because I think like don't you, don't you have a ban you. Can't post like Social Security numbers.

Null: No, I don't have a rule against that.

Destiny: You don't have....

Null: Social security numbers are OK.

Destiny: Oh, so anybody can post. Oh, OK, well, gotcha.

Null: the rules are kind of they're enforced in a very human way. It depends a lot on what I perceive as the intent of the post. If it's just like, hey, look at this. He didn't crop this out or whatever or this e-mail links to this is like, OK, whatever that's already out there. I found this one whitepages.com. OK, that's already. But if someone joins the site specifically and then dumps like a bunch of nudes and says **** this ***** like I'm, I'm nuking that **** right away. I'm not even playing that game because obviously this is malicious and the site's not a a weapon. It's not a cudgel, it's a, it's a discussion forum. So if someone's trying to use my website to cause. Arm like I can usually identify. That pretty quickly and I'll delete that.

Destiny: How do you separate that out in your mind? Cause like realistically, if there are a lot of people that if they want to cause harm to somebody, they go to Cuba farms, they know all the information is there. If I really want to **** with somebody, I'm gonna see. If they've got a thread, because then all their information is there and I just like, yeah, do that. How do you, in your mind like like, how is one who care not the other, I guess, or how do you? Navigate that it is.

Null: It is very human. It's very case by case, but like for most things the information is like a natural byproduct of someone being overly open online and not being careful. It's specifically when someone is just trying to obviously cause some damage and it's especially sensitive when it's ***** because. I'm not a fan of revenge *****. I think that will be before docs is criminalized or anything. I think that revenge ***** will be criminalized and give given warrant to take down from the Internet before like docs. And stuff is. So it's mostly intent if I if I think someone's trying to. If if someone's trying to do line crossing harassment trying to. Intimidate somebody or calls for you. That's more likely to be deleted than like if someone who like I don't want to name names but someone has like a thread that has several 100 pages over years and they have like a new leak. Well, that's there's literally no no point deleting. That because that's out.

Tom: There one of the first things you said when you got in the call Destiny was that you don't want to defend the Kiwi farms, but you basically just want to defend its right to exist. Would that be correct?

Destiny: To be fair. Well, yeah fuck Kiwi Farms. Yeah, of course.

Tom: Well, what would be your main criticisms of the site in general? I'm curious to hear what you have to say.

Destiny: Well, I mean, I think that like the idea of, like, obsessing over other people's lives and then, like, obsessively digging up and posting personally tells, running these huge compendiums, like compiling all the personal information of somebody, like, just for other people to sit **** *** over. It's like incredibly, mentally unhealthy but.

Tom: I mean, I guess you know in my eyes that's the that's the one thing that I would defend from the site because in my. Is it's like there's a whole. I mean, maybe I'm showing my hand a little here. There's a whole industry that I obviously make money off of, which is documenting online people and like their stupid shenanigans. And it's generally a, you know, a a very accepted form of content. I mean, from the beginning of time, I mean with like Jerry Springer show, stuff like that, you had these weird people coming on Doctor Phil, you know, bad baby or whoever else you had these strange figures coming on. And now Kiwi farms. Kind of fills that void, but these are, you know, for the most obsessed people, obviously. And I'm not going to defend every user of Kiwi farms, but I would say that it's probably not the worst thing in the world just to, you know, pick apart these odd figures. I mean, we've been doing documentaries about weird people forever. I guess I see that as like the least bad or or not bad.

Destiny: At all part of the farms, I think the problem is that it's very hard to keep everything self-contained like even like stuff always jumps off site. Other people will go to the site for details to harass people, and even regardless of what anybody on Q from said, I'm sure know would acknowledge there's probably uses on Kiwi farms. That engage in harassment themselves, even if the user base discourages it, just find numbers. Game there's gonna. Be some people that do it. So yeah, I mean, I don't.

Tom: Obviously I don't. I guess my follow up to that would be like doesn't that happen on kind of every website, I mean even from Twitter you know are you? Familiar with the dream? Yeah, this the Minecraft. So he got like, big, big docs on Twitter and got a bunch of harassment as a result of it. But nobody seems to have a a problem.

Destiny: With Twitter right now? Well, because on Twitter, I'm pretty sure you can report that stuff and it'll get taken down.

Tom: Yeah, I guess. But I mean that post was up for days and days and I?

Destiny: Guess I guess the difference for days and days cause nobody reported it. Or was it up for days and days cause Twitter cause? I'm pretty sure if you post personal formation on Twitter, it's actionable like, though I'm sure at least someone reported it.

Tom: I guess the thing I'm saying is that people only seem to care about the aesthetics of it when it's written in writing, and the rules versus when it actually happens. Like you didn't see anyone causing like, moral stink about dream getting
*****.

Null: With with Dream it was just like people found the picture of his coach and him and he was just like this fat ginger. And people posted on on Twitter and said this his dream and he hadn't had posted his. Faced by himself at that point, and that was, I mean, there was no way Twitter couldn't. It was like thousands of people just posting a picture and there's nothing to be done about it. It was the correct picture. He denied it at first, but I think the real thing was that he was, you know, he had encountered success and he was using that to better himself and he. Wanted to post a picture of himself after losing I guess I guess in my eyes.

Tom: Harassment occurs everywhere on the Internet like. You it's not really something you can like. Stop like to have a problem with the culture of the site a little bit I.

Destiny: Well, no, you you. Absolutely can have control over like how much harassment is coming from. Is that something you absolutely can have control over? There are different moderations like I said I use for my community that is going to change the amount harassment comes. My community will harass people depending what you consider harassment, but like if I have like rules in place saying you can't directly link to somebody's social media, even though some people will harass like that. One rule in and of itself is gonna dramatically turn down the amount of harassment, or if I have rules saying that you're never allowed to mention a person's name, then or whatever. Like I don't have these, but if. I did like the well, I have some of these roles, so some

of these things will reduce harassment. One effect you never get rid of all harassment, but that's not the same as saying you can't.

Null: Get rid of any harassment. The one thing that we do that is like a counter harassment measure is that if you. If you decide to like contact like either the person themselves, their family, their work. Or law enforcement about them. If you do anything. Like that that crosses the. Or your if you post about it, it will be deleted. You will be warned or or banned for it. And since that, I consider that's a strong deterrent because it's it deprives that person of any attention that they would receive for that behavior. And the issue then comes in when. There are communities like cars. I'm not gonna name names, but anyone listening to this on my on my side knows what. I'm talking about. There's like a community that's sort of like ours, but for a specific demographic of people from, like, one radio show. You know, and they. Are ***** insane. They're like, 40 plus years old on average. I am pretty sure that they do swatting and stuff, and then they try to blame it on us and they're extremely difficult to deal with. And it's like, I can't even ban them from my site because then they just have an auxiliary site and they make new accounts and stuff and the stuff gets cross posted anyways, since it's a nightmare to deal with and I. Really do not appreciate it. Right now the threads locked. I'm deciding what to do about it.

Tom: I guess I guess, I guess my major question for you, Destiny was like obviously with your Community, you have a policy to mitigate harassment because that's your personal prerogative. But with a site like like, you know, Twitter or Kiwi Farms or any site where you can, you know post user generated content, you're gonna have some level of harassment. Is it anyone's responsibility, do you think to necessarily stop that? Do you think it's like a moral obligation they have? Or do you think that you know Null's position which is basically he'll, you know he'll stop some stuff on the site, but for the most part unless someones directly posting like OK, I'm gonna ***** get this guy swatted right now. He's not gonna intervene. Would do you see an issue with that policy of, like, only taking down content that's illegal?

Destiny: That's a hard one. I don't like harassment, so I don't support it on my side and I'll do what I can to stop it. Do I think somebody is a moral obligation to never host harassment? I don't know if I would ever go as far as to say that. I don't know. I feel that way about that. OK. I don't like it on my stuff. It's kind of like gambling. Like, I don't really support gambling. I don't really like gambling. I'm not gonna do like gambling. Or whatever, but I'm gonna say, is it immoral to ever support gambling? I don't know if I go as far as to say that it's just so I don't like on my side. The only thing I reject, the only thing I'll fight back on is that Sammy was like, oh, well, people are gonna get harassed anyway. There's nothing can do, like you can absolutely mitigate it if you want to, but I don't know if. I would say that like you have to that it's immoral to host harassment of people on the Internet, right? Well, this would be kind of a strange question to ask you.

Tom: But I'll ask it for contents sake. So if you were in the position of running a website similar to Kiwi Farms, how would you try to counteract things like swatting

harassment? How would you try to mitigate stuff like that that you see is like big problems, while still encouraging the culture of documentation and things like that? Would it be a total removal of docs? Would that be it?

Destiny: I it this it's gonna get like it would it would require an artistic level of moderation but I guess like for me like when it comes to personal information I would say that like the only information that's allowed to be posted has to be like directly relevant to like whatever they're a local for. So if you wanna make fun of like DSP owning. Like a particular condo or whatever. And like it's funny that he has it, like at a really high-priced area and blah blah blah. Then like maybe that's like relevant. But if it's just like, but there are a lot of posts, sometimes they'll go up and I've seen this happen on threads. Gonna spin off mine or somebody just like, oh, I found this guy's full information. I was able to look out the window. I see that he lives here. Here's his house. Here's his blah. Here's he went to school and I was like, wow, this is really relevant to the reason why not. Is really relevant. Wearing like, like the only like, none of this is even that enriching in terms of understanding.

Tom: So you'd probably. Say there's no good reason to have someones personal info on the site.

Destiny: Yeah, the only reason pose is cause now it makes for a really easy like attack vector like.

Tom: Right. And that's and that would be my one contention with you. Farmers have voice to know no, what would you say to that criticism that like what what what good reason is there to have someone's SSN. You know there at all?

Destiny: Now I can. Like, harass the ***** person. So I go like, yeah.

Null: I mean it's sort of a testament to be people being able to find it, it's. It's hard to. Say and the fact is I don't try to justify it, I do it. I if there is no. I don't want to put myself into the position of being able to decide for people what they can and cannot say I do prohibit. People from contacting people to the best of my ability, and that that's effectively all I can do.

Tom: Right. Because it because it would require an insane level of moderation, right?

Null: I am, I'm. Curious what your.

Tom: Like it would just be so much like there's no way you can police every post on the site.

Null: There is no when I write my rules, there is a an approach that I take where the rules have to be binary. You take the rule, you hold it up to a. A a post and you should be able to determine very accurately if that post violates any of those rules. I would not even know how to begin wording a a rule about doxing and like what Destiny said, it has to be specifically related to what they're known for. It's like, how do you how do you enforce that equitably? I don't think that there is a is.

Tom: To do that right. So your position would be just don't enforce it. If it's illegal, take it down, and if not, then it's not your responsibility.

Null: Because I yeah. And I would I would actually I would be more open to it. But like I said, nobody has ever cited docs as a reason why the site can't stay up. I have never. I have literally never once been told by any service provider that that is the reason why they cannot host the Kiwi farms.

Destiny: Well, docs is. Probably the reason though, right? Like it's not the reason I'm.

Null: No, I don't believe so at all. I believe that it's 100% the complaint.

Destiny: Yes, but it's because of the docs that's the issue I think like no, if Kiwi farms was a site where people just like **** on people and harass people and whatever then like it would just be another site where people **** on people arrest or whatever but.

Null: No, it doesn't exist.

Destiny: I think that the. Fact that the fact that personal information gets posted there is why it draws so much higher from other people. That's why, like if you talk to like any normies. I say normies, but like Internet normal people and they talk about like being afraid of like a Kiwi farms throwing up, showing up on them. It's always because they're really scared of all of their dogs being collected in one place. And then people. Like using that the director asked Man, I think that's always think people scared of. it's not dark.

Null: it is, it is the *****. People like kettles in particular do not want their, you know, their findom fart **** to be next to their information about the HRT directory, to be next to the information about their career as a trans Twitch streamer icon for teenagers. That's the issue. it's almost never the docs. The docs is what they point at and say like. If they posted my address, this is trying to make me fear for my life. That's what they say. The real reason is never that the real reason is that they are. They they do not want that information to be on. The Internet I.

Destiny: Mean, but all that other information can be archived and like Reddit threads and ****, and you can't report it and take it. Yeah, it can't be.

Null: It's taking down all the time.

Destiny: OK, I did. I don't think so. No, you can you can write a bunch of fucked up **** about people on Reddit, and so they do. And those threads will stab and there's, like all Reddit admins, unless there's like actual like docs or some information let's you eat dirt kick rocks. I gotta make it. I mean I.

Null: I've I've seen Google Docs it taken down, I've seen Reddit threads get taken down with without any of this information. It it, it really depends on what kind of pull this person has, but I really strongly disagree that it would just go on some other website. The reason why the Kiwi farms is up and the reason why it has the audience size that it does, is specifically because you cannot just do what we do.

Destiny: Anywhere else or. Yeah, but what? But that's because of the Daxing aspect. That's what you can't do anywhere else.

Null: I think I disagree. I think that like having a thread specifically about a person that can that can, you know, just say whatever that whatever you want to and kind

of outline. And someone's highlights in a negative way. I've discovered in hosting the forum that. Money is not the strongest form of capital, it's personal reputation and people take that very seriously. And when someone's personal reputation is on the line, it impacts their ability like I think you didn't complain about this, like how people like once you get like a stigma, it's really hard to shake that that dumb ship like you said that you regret saying like 10 years ago and. Like it impacts all future contact with you and how people form like an initial opinion of you. And that is really that's really powerful. It's worth a lot of money. So people are very seriously invested in taking down the site, not not even because of the docs. I again, I strongly disagree with that. It's because they want to have control over their personal reputation, which is understandable, but at the same time, to give them that is, to enable them to like to, to censor what other people can say.

Tom: Hmm, I would agree about you going. I don't know exactly about Kiwi farms, but I have noticed a strong anti sort of like drama or documentation sentiment with a lot of sites like YouTube for example. They've been hitting a lot of commentary channels lately and they say like if you post someone's personal information like I had a video taken down. Under their cyber bullying and harassment guidelines because I posted info that the guy himself had made public about his like his like he you know who this is? Josh, this dude with a a fart diaper fetish, who would message random eat girls pictures of himself in a diaper and he posted his own personal info. He messaged his he posted his own birth certificate online. I didn't put any of that. In the video I just mentioned that it existed that he. I didn't say his full name. I just said his first name and he managed to get that video taken down for harassment and cyber bullying. And I have. A strike in my channel. I've had it for like a year. I can't believe you fell for that.

Null: I can't believe you fell. We have a thread. On this guy he has sent me pictures of himself and he.

Tom: OK. but I the point I'm making is not that I'm retired from making the video. The point I'm making is that.

Null: He dabbled on you super hard, he.

Tom: Fell for it the point. The point I'm making is that YouTube and their guidelines actually has changed to not allow that and not even. Now, like they have a guideline now that says intrinsic attributes. You can't make fun of someone's intrinsic attributes, meaning the way they look. And four years ago, you know, leafy was one of the biggest channels on the platform and he was, you know, calling people fat, calling them *****. And I I'm not gonna necessarily defend all of his actions. Say that's a good thing, but that was like a, you know, that was a an acceptable thing on. Sites just a few years ago, at a time when you know.

Destiny: Is he still? Is he banned from?

Tom: YouTube right now he's banned from YouTube. Yeah, he's banned.

Destiny: You got me. OK, I got.

Tom: and he's he's tried making other accounts and they get banned. They're they're very watchful of him and even just the other day, another big commentary channel called Benji, who I believe hadn't even posted in a while. YouTube got him for cyber bullying and harassment because a while ago he made fun of Jacob Sartorius and called him like stupid or something. And this is the thing that that you see people cracking down a lot. So I will say and even on even on subreddits and stuff like you see a lot more like policing and stuff, Sam and Tolki was like the Boogie documentation subreddit. That sub was taken down. There's a lot of there. There's a lot of stuff like that that just gets taken. Down now and slowly, the.

Null: There were a. Bunch of subreddits dedicated to, like Trisha Paytas and stuff that got taken down. They I mean, I'm telling you, they cracked down hard on stuff that hurts personal reputation, especially people who have pool. Yeah, I mean, I'm sure the docs doesn't help. I'm not gonna say that that probably it's like that gives people a thing to point out and say, look, they're posting my address and this is to make me scared for my life, even if that's not the case, it definitely doesn't help. It doesn't do any any favors for the site, but I the main reason is the complaint volume and the complaint. Volume stays high because. As the site lives on. More and more people hate. The ***** site cause they're on it and they want to take it down. It would it's like. Someone like when it goes down, when it went down briefly. I remember all these tweets about how like I have a thread and it feels like a a burden has been lifted off my back like. I'm free for the. First time and it's like. That's a bit ***** **, but.

Tom: And the thing about the thing about this that I that I kind. Of want to talk? About is I feel like there's a sort of disproportionate of fear of Kiwi farms versus the actual material harm it does because I mean the Kiwi farmers threat about capitalists is still up to this day. Right, yet Keppel still has an audience. She still has a fan base. She's still up posting content. Nobody even seems to believe. A lot of the, you know, grander accusations about HRT directory or Catboy ranch or stuff like that. And as far as I know, her personal info is also there. Nothing's happened. And so in my eyes, it's like, actually, I don't know if I have a Kiwi farms there, but I think if I had one. Even if it had like, you know, a picture of my face and picture of my family, that would suck, I would definitely not be cool with that. I would be supportive of it, but in my opinion the best way to deal with the drama of any kind is to just ***** ignore it for a few days and it will go away. And if you just never acknowledge the existence of that thread, you don't. You don't feel that fire, but it seems like nobody.

Null: Yeah, but you. Don't make \$100,000 doing that.

Tom: You don't make \$100,000 ignoring it.

Null: Yeah, you make \$100,000 making a go fund me and transfer of you.

Tom: Well, OK, I honestly didn't pick up on that reference for a second, but the, the thing I wanted to talk about and kind of transition into which we talked about a little bit, I think you were critical of Destiny. You know, for this decision was Destiny.

You were planning, at least in some form, to gear up for a lawsuit against capitals. Right? You sent a cease and desist.

Destiny: So basically what happened was was of all the statements she made about me, I took. What I considered to be the four. Easiest ones to prove defamation. Like you said this you know they're false one. She even publicly stated, I think, she said later on the no one she was like, oh, I was just trying to bait him. I don't know if. She was true or not, but she probably tweeted it. But there were four statements. Made that she. Knows her fault. She's never heard me say that before. I've never called her a *****. I've never, like, been friends with Noel. I've never directed harassment like any of these should use transphobic comments, and I sent out cease and desist and the. I after sending that sentences, she emailed my lawyer back and she said, oh, I'm gonna talk to my lawyer and see what happened or I'm sorry. See what I should do? And she was on another streamers show later, I think like a month later Dylan Burns and topics that involved me or were peripheral to me, came up quite a bit, and she seemed to not want to. Venture into that territory. So initially when I send her that ctis, my goal was a retraction because it would be nice to have that to point mainstream media sites towards like, hey, you've published this about me. But this person rejected the statement. She didn't post the retraction publicly, but she hasn't said anything. So basically the next step is I have to decide if I wanna like, basically, reinvigorate her whole Internet career, to attempt to go to court. Against her, which presents a couple of unique challenges. Or if I just want to like, let her cause, I think that right now her trajectory is kind of like to fade into irrelevance cuz she's very boring. She was doing her content and if she's not? Like actively fighting. With larger figures, nobody cares about her. So right now I'm just kind of like sitting in the like, maybe I could just let her fade away. I don't know if it would be smart to do the full litigation route, right?

Null: Yeah, that's fair. And I think Kefla's is done with it. I don't know what specifically happened like they were all about that HRT directory and Bob posting and ****. And then at some point, Bob posting allegedly gave up on the HRT directory and vanish, and then Keflex said that I'm done with not sponsoring this anymore and I'm done with Kiwi farms, and that's been it, and they've pretty much been silent on it. The problems have persisted. For instance, Google has effectively delisted the site if you try to Google Kiwi Farms, you will. Not find it. Google Kiwi farms castles. You will not find their thread because that's also been the index, but the site itself is not completely de indexed, just the index page and a couple threads. So I'm I'm not, I'm not. Particularly irate couples anymore. Though, I mean I have. I have more of a legitimate torch with interference. Case with Liz Fong Jones. The amount of crazy **** that they've tried to do is just insane. One of them is that Liz Fong Jones tried to get at Nick. And just to sum this up as briefly as possible, you get IP addresses from what's called a regional Internet registry. There are five RIR's in the world at Nick is in Australia and IT services Asia Pacific. If Apnic were to make their decision to revoke an IP address allocation, which is where I have my IP's from, that would mean that China the service provider for China now has a set precedence. They will revoke

IP addresses and that is just devastating that they would that they would do that. So if listen, Jones had really gotten their way, they. The Internet would be properly ***** torn apart. You would you would start, start saying what I predict will be a a fracturing of the Internet into small what I call lowercase I Internet, which is like Russia will probably the DPRK and China basically have their own lower case I intern. As it is, but you'll probably start seeing the EU Internet, the American Internet, the Russian Internet. Maybe like in Africa or African net and South American network, probably in South America.

Destiny: And like when I joked about earlier, where I was like, you're gonna have to choose. Like if you wanna browse certain websites, there's only certain ice peas you can. Have because everything gonna be so fragmented based on, yeah.

Null: Yeah, it would. It would be. It would complete like you know, and I think a lot of the reason why things have been so peaceful in the last couple of decades is that, you know, you had all these people coming online and you're you're talking to a whole world of people and you're listening to their music and you know, you're playing games with them and stuff and you're having conversations with them and we're we're going to revert back to this extreme like. Territorial, like bordered world of not being able to talk to, to people anymore, and it's going to be real ***** sad when it happen, then it probably will happen because especially for things like copyright, if there's ever going to be something that breaks apart the Internet into smaller little fief, thumbs up occupied by you know, like a government, it's going to be copyright ship. Because of piracy and how easily it is to propagate, you know movies and stuff from countries like Ukraine that don't have copyright laws.

Tom: And Josh, you said you think what Liz Huang did constitutes torturous interference if you considered legal action in any way, would that. Be worth it.

Null: It's \$75,000 to take something to trial and. I it's I like the amount of money that I've had to spend to actually deal with this is really, really pushing my \$0.00 budget. It's.

Tom: Do you think that if you did it, there would be sort of a risk that you don't win or do you think that you'd? You'd absolutely have. A good case I think I would have.

Null: A pretty strong case. I would have a lawyer.

Destiny: You can have a strong case of the problem. There's always a risk you don't win and that's the issue, right? Like that was. That's one of the things I worried about for couples too. Like, I think I'm like, I'm very clearly in the right and my evidence is pretty clear. But like when you're dealing with certain issues with certain people, depending on what pops up in the media depending on like who's presiding on your case. If it's like a. I mean, who's like if? It's almost worse than not testing it. So you'd rather like go through other means, unless you literally truly have the biggest slam dunk in the world, which is very, very hard. In complicated cases, you know.

Null: Like there were a ton of people who were convinced that Vick Manana would win his torturous interference case in Texas, and that didn't. That literally did not

even pass the **** test. That didn't go through the. The anti slap, which is the first Barb entry for any kind of defamation or related case. So I mean, after saying that I'm, I'm not hopeful for any kind of TI case at all, but it would, it would have been a really it would be really nice, a huge win if something like that was proven in court. Like if you go after people's infrastructure, you go after their money, go after their business they're hosting. That is an inner. You know that that's a civil tort.

Tom: Right. But it seems that no one is willing to go through with that, because I mean, like you guys said, I mean it would be even if even if even if you win, I mean, you know, for years you're gonna be fighting in court. Just gonna be, you know, spending 10s of thousands of dollars, potentially a month for lawyers and legal fee. Just it just should be a complete pain in the *** and you know, let's say even if you if if you do win, it's a huge, it's a huge reward obviously. I mean, not just for you, but for the greater Internet. Like, what do you think, Klein. Right. He won his lawsuit. I guess the guy Matt, Hoss and that. Was obviously a. Good precedent for fair use. That was great. Yeah, his shift.

Null: Ends up in law textbooks now about fair use but.

Tom: As far as people are willing to go through with that or you know with Ethan, he had the backing of his audience who gave him like \$250,000 to help. It's really hard to get that. I mean, you know, Destiny, your audience is pretty big, but I don't think it's quite as big as Ethan's was even. In the day, you'd probably be going through your own your own funds. If not, you might get like you know, 30-40 fifty grand raise. But it would be difficult to justify spending that much time, and even at that it's like it feels like a weight on your life. It's halting all your other progress, so it would just be difficult. So yeah, yeah, I guess I don't really blame you for dropping that lawsuit as as much as I would have loved to see it happen.

Destiny: Yeah, of course.

Null: Like if I had them, if I. Won the lottery today. I would probably carpet bomb people with lawsuits, yeah. Just to be as vindictive as.

Tom: Possible. Yeah. Yeah. Fair enough. Well, is there anything you guys wanna you guys want to talk about? I mean, that's the end of my. Questions in particular, but you know you guys are obviously good friends. You play StarCraft back in the day, so.

Null: Actually I have a I wrote this down. It says on the piece of paper I literally took notes. The these are my grading scale for my expectations for this conversation I would give myself an F for getting angry for any reason I would give myself a dad if I made a. Serious like blunder in my conversation, I may give myself AC if I managed to escape. And molested AB for exposing audience, new ideas and a. Getting Destiny to fund the Kiwi farms Destiny. What would it take for you to?

Destiny: The fun Kiwi farms. **** you, you. Guys are all set up now.

Null: What I mean, I still have. Should I need to do? I'm not completely back. Like I said, I got legal legal services to find and replace.

Destiny: You should just implement things like one thing, a really common thing that a lot of private torrent sites do is your account gets deleted for inactivity. If you don't use it for 30 days unless you do like a one time crypto donation or some ****, you should do so. Whatever is fine.

Tom: Now, that's whatever reservations you have about funding the Kiwi farms. What number would you need for it to be? What? What could? There be a return on investment. Could he get his money? Back and then some. Ohh.

Destiny: God, are you only for that fence? Are you looking for **** donations?

Null: Both, I mean like what I'm considering right now is like some kind of open. I would like to create open source. For instance, we've it's in Fargo has banned us, so we can't renew our license with them anymore, which means the software is just gonna be continually getting out of date as time goes. On and I have to.

Destiny: Is this your your definition?

Null: No, this is just the actual forum software. Xenforo is a premium license, so the forum itself I cannot update the software and that means that if I have to keep my eye open for security things and patch them manually, I actually do a lot of manual patching to them for it. And it's a pain in the **. So I would like to. I would like. To write an open source forum software that can compete with them for first and foremost, I would also like to. Make a either open source or just launch like a small time competitor to cloud flare that can help risk your sites with the proof of work details protection that that I was talking about before because the thing with cloud flare is that they have to like do real time protection against tons of new threats that come out all the time. Because they're so big, they're like half the Internet, but with a smaller company. the interest in attacking it is much smaller so. it won't.

Null: Create so many problems. But I'm thinking about that Andrew Anglin actually said that he is looking for developers because I think he's also banned and having issues getting Sephora updated. I'm thinking like if he has money, you should. Give me funding.

Tom: Andrew Anglin is Daily Stormer, right? OK.

Null: But I think he hates me because I don't like Nick Fuentes or whatever the ****.

Tom: Ohh I see. OK. Yeah, you guys. You guys both seem to have some some issues with Nick Fuentes. You seem to be critical of. Them maybe for different reasons I assume.

Null: I thought Andrew Anglin likes Nick Fuentes.

Tom: No, no, no. You, you and Destiny, I mean.

Null: I thought I thought you guys hang out.

Destiny: Yeah, you know what we were best friends. And then he back. Stomach who took down our. He took down one of your favorite content creators, Mr.

Null: I thought you hated Mr.

Destiny: Now, yeah, I do. But there was. It was the principle of it a long time ago. There were people in cozy that were **** spam reporting Mr. Channel, like,

take him down. And I was like, Nick, if we're chatting, I can't have other people on your platform spam reporting him, but I didn't also know that I was stepping into this whole bag of **** where Fuentes and his whole community had already been fighting about the flat D platforming people because they fought with Ralph, Ethan, Ralph, and they all, like spammer, put it. He should, too. So apparently that community is a whole back story of like, how they feel about spam. Supporting everybody and taking people down in check.

Null: Dude, I am pretty sure. And I don't have evidence this is simply a feeling that I get. So don't pull out any surveys to cross correct on this. I am pretty sure that Nick Flint has like a group of people who are responsible for all the spottings like the Marjorie Taylor, Green ship, Marjorie Killer. Green had no presence on the forum. Keppel's docs was not on the forum, and they got swatted and we got blamed for. It I'm pretty and Nick for one, has people hate us. So I am. Pretty convinced that it's Nick Fuentes's people.

Destiny: Hmm, yeah, it might be. I think for the attitudes and their community are very much like the world has **** us. So we're gonna burn the world, and I can't really blame. Them I guess cause who fuentes is getting kicked out of banks and ship then yeah. Why would you adhere it to any principles about deep platforming but yeah.

Tom: Do you have any evidence for that? Josh is stuff you want. To talk about.

Null: No, I clarified. That statement by saying that it's intuition only.

Tom: OK. Well, it would be interesting to see if there's any, any, anything comes out about that. That'd be the biggest drama ever. But I guess you probably won't hear that on the subject of you brought a Mr. My question for you, Destiny, maybe this is a played out question, but the thing the two things I hear about Mr. Girl when I hear him brought up are a people like Vito and whatever we like. He's the funniest guy ever. He's being the best content in the world. He's he's based and the B answer is he's a pedophile. What is the deal with that? Is he a pedophile?

Destiny: No, I don't think he is. But I mean like he's obviously, like, very **** edgy and for a lot of people, there's no difference being a pedophile versus making pedophilic jokes like all of it is indicative. Sucked up **** for my ship. I just like, really, like, interesting people and a lot of the people that intersect with tend to be **** insane, but they're interesting. So that's all I know.

Tom: The thing people point to is the cuties review is that is that satire or is that his stance?

Destiny: I mean like. **** don't wrote me into this whole ship like there are worlds where you can have like these analysis of like media and all this blah blah blah ****. I'm not gonna. I'm not gonna be the next cutie guys. OK.

Tom: I'm not trying to get you to defend cuties or anything like that. I'm just curious. I'm a listen, Destiny. I'm a Destiny fan, OK? I'm a Destiny super fan.

Destiny: The Yeah, the broad, the broad. Stroke that he was trying to get across. To get it the broad message he was trying to get across was that the 9 year old girls

and the cuties review were hot and the whole point of the movie was to make them hot and that's the problem is that we're sexualizing minors and so the movies trying to get across and it does it well. That's like his like Steel Man version. Of his argument, but obviously there are people that say if you ever find like 9 year girls hot, then you're a pedophile.

Tom: That would be sneaky's point as well.

Null: It's so ***** creepy. Right.

Null: Just the way he's, like salivating over it makes my ***** skin crawl. And what I've learned this is again this is. Like notes I took the whole libertarian stance on like lolicon and I had like a rehabilitative. I believe in reformative justice. And I had like a rehabilitative opinion on pedophiles. Like we should be doing things like help these people. And I can I can understand that people into lolicon probably can separate it in their head from like real kids because obviously. Drawings and real kids are really different. What I've learned over the years dealing with the people that I do and trying to moderate image boards and host image boards is that the people who talk about being pedophiles as a joke end up becoming pedophiles or coming out or being identified as a pedophile. And the people who post lolicon also post child *****. So my opinion from, you know, a very libertine stance on on this kind of stuff has really completely 182. Like I think that these people are an active threat to other people and they should be taken out of society as quickly as possible when identified.

Tom: Right. An example of someone who. Used to joke about it and then started defending it and then ended up being an actual pedophile. Would be amazing, right? Who you talked to Destiny.

Destiny: Who is now in jail, I believe. OK, because I'm a CEO. He wasn't like, like lolicon is OK. He was always like you should be able to find a one year old child and it's OK. So he was always out and he's like a ***** insane dude. It's not like he was ever, like mask on that guy was ***** wild.

Tom: I think for a little bit it was mask on though, because at first he like right when he got big, that's when he started saying that ****. But it wasn't right away.

Destiny: Oh, maybe not. I just know that when I debated him, he was saying that you should be able to have sex as long as you don't like open, like, tear them up. You should have sex like a ***** two-month old child and that was when I debated him. So he was always way the **** out there in pedophile lead.

Tom: Right. Yeah, fair enough.

Destiny: Yeah, that's a lot different. Than like some guys like she's got 1000 year old spirit, my lolly con. Whatever *****. Like. Yeah, that guy was, yeah, he was always.

Null: Nick Bate was the one who who said he was joking about being a pedophile, and he got convicted molesting his sister.

Tom: I remember having that. Do you have a take on lolicon Destiny? Are you a pro or anti lolicon? How do you? Feel about lolicon.

Destiny: Don't feel about I. I just don't care that much. I don't know. I don't. People wanna **** to ***** cartoon drawings.

Tom: I don't care, guys, Destiny official member of the Digi. Bro gang, shout out. Did you bro gang shout out? Rev says to sue. OK, he's on. Your side, I'm more of a furry con guy.

Destiny: Myself, you know, so OK.

Null: Oh my God. Are you joining Team Adam? Gonna dress up as. A horse. Ohh yeah.

Tom: How do you feel about furies, dude? That's not good.

Destiny: I just don't care. Listen, everybody can knock themselves out to their own ****.

Null: Furies are retroactively like decent at this point, like the Internet is so ***** now that it's like whatever. For I don't care.

Destiny: Yeah, compared to the grand scheme of things, it's like I'm a furry. It's like, OK, there's, like, way more **** that. You could be involved in so yeah. UM, I'm kind of curious is how how much this is a full time job for you. Is a Kiwi farm ship, right?

Null: Yeah, it occupies a lot of my time. I try to get like side projects out and stuff, but I'm I'm I'm pretty busy.

Destiny: What is like the and I don't because these are all things I've heard. I don't know if I'm not trying to trigger you or I don't know if this is like **** that you hate or whatever. So just and things have random things I've heard you started with a guy a long time ago called Cog Step right when it was like when you like the cookie forms or. I know the **** you pronounce it. Why did you like rebrand? Did come from what all that?

Null: You just went like the origin story in general.

Destiny: Yeah, I guess, yeah. I'm kind of curious how the actual cause I read. Some of different things. I never know what the **** is true.

Null: Yeah, there are. There are a lot of like and journalists take, I don't know what the **** it is with the media. Journalists do not give a **** about getting things. I thought for most of my life they wanted they actually made like a an effort to understand things before they write about them. They do not give a **** about what they're putting out there. Do not care the origin of the.

Destiny: Nothing black tells you more on some like media, especially writing about alternative stuff they don't care about more than when they start writing about you, like read some **** about me. That's like, bro, are you serious? You could you can find.

Null: The answers with sources on Wikipedia, what the **** are you doing? How can you possibly be so? Wrong, but yeah, OK. There once was a man named Christian Weston Chandler. He decided in infinite wisdom that it would be a great idea to take Pikachu, the Pokémon and Sonic the Hedgehog the Hedgehog and make them into one. The electric Hedgehog Pokémon Sonnet show. He further decided that it would be a

great idea to make an online web comic called. Manage you about his creation. He also decided that this online web comic would then be a suitable place for him to talk about his adventures and trying to find a boyfriend, free girl. And of course, because this was on the Internet in the mid 2000s. It became a a topic of discussion on something awful and then later for. V and then they made an entire wiki dedicated to Christian listen. Chandler called the Quickie, which is CWC, eki pronounced quickie. The discussion about Chris sprawled into the talk pages, and this was mostly like hypotheticals and Q&A type stuff that really didn't belong in the talk pages of wiki cuz you wouldn't have this in like discussion page on Wikipedia. So COGS Dev who was the admin of the quickie. Who now hates me because I think COGS is trans, decided that we needed a containment website for these so-called spurges. And so the quickie forums was burnt, born and it was administrated by a man named Champ. Them who had Richard Nixon from Futurama as an avatar. This site had problems staying up because people who got banned from the site. Had complained to hosts and so on, and then after about two. On February 3rd, 2013, they accepted my offer to make me their permanent host, and so I was the admin of the cookie forums. A little over just under about. 10 days to 10 years ago, I became the administrator of the site and then in 2014 I want to say the topic of discussion kind of branched out past just CWC. I end up becoming like the lead admin. All the other admins kind of dropped off. And I sort of inherited. For him and the Kiwi farms was the pronunciation of the sites name quickie forms. Because it's spelled awkwardly. Buy a couple different people who had threads, so we just sort of retroactively adopted that as like a backronym for the site and we just went from there.

Destiny: Where did you? UM, when did it become like a full time? OK.

Destiny: Job for you like. How long ago?

Null: So when I first started hosting the site, the reason why I picked it up is because I was actually a PHP developer for a payroll company in Australia. And I worked remotely. I was with that company. That was my first real programming job. I had that for about 3 1/2 years. I want to say. I got really bored of my job because I was dealing with the quickie forums and I was dealing with all these interesting security threats and novel problems and I just got more and more interested in what I was doing and eventually I just told the company like because that my productivity was dropping off. And they're like, is there like an issue or do you like still want to work for us? And I was like, no. I kind of want to go out and do. My own thing. And from there I went I because I was unemployed at the time, I still had, like, a lot of savings. So I wasn't like. Institute I actually had met Frederick Brennan from the thread on the think, then quickly forums about Wizard Chan, which is the website for in cells. That he that he founded and I pitched him because he also founded 8 Chan in the interim. I said we should probably rewrite 8 Chan and because the form soft the software that they use, right. And was ****. And that's when I moved to the Philippines from Australia to work with Frederick as his neighbor. Basically on the replacement HN software.

Tom: Damn, how long has the site been up?

Null: In total, February 3rd will be 10 years under my administration. I don't know how long it's been around in total.

Tom: Alright, well one last thing I want to talk about as far as things I wrote down that I forgot to talk about was last time we were on stream. You talked about how you believed that the inception of the cancel culture sort of online that exists was Gamergate. 10 years ago and I was kind of curious what your thoughts were on that Destiny as someone who's dealt with a lot of that kind of interference with your business.

Destiny: I thought the Gamergate shift was cringe spark. the problem is that like. This is where my SJW ship will come out. I guess is. That like there are. Legitimately, a lot of people on the Internet that just ***** hate women, especially in the gamer communities. Like, there's not a lot of women here. When you think of women, you just think people are policing language or people that won't **** your real life. And I feel like movements like that ended up getting Co opted by so many. ***** horrible, hateful people that like the whole movement. Just gets like kind. Of ***** and I feel like that kind of happened again. Like I think there were legitimate criticisms. I'm pretty sure early on relating to the Clinton all that stuff in the Gamergate shift. But like when the leaders of your movement, the faces, are people like Sargon of a cotton shift, or like all of these, like pretty like. Right leaning very. Like anti people like everything just gets so political. So quickly that it evolved into some. Crazy, stupid ****.

Tom: Very fast, right? Even among the stupidity you had genuine, like derangement. I would say from some people who would go to websites like Polygon or whatever else and try to get their sponsors cut and that was I think the point that Noel was making was that. I mean, you can explain yourself as well, but that was sort of the inception of this whole like contact their sponsors.

Null: OK, but what they did is that they they had there are these company, OK, just real quick, I mean this is if you're you're trying to make your ***** video, this is how you lay it out.

Tom: They're taken down.

Null: There was the Zoe Quinn ship. They complained about it because Zoe Quinn, her terrible ***** indie game, was rated best game, best indie game by 5 different publications, 5 that had editors on the on the staff that were men that. She was ***** people complained about this, and so the media, the that at the time, you know, this was 2014. So people really trusted the media, put out all these articles saying that gamers are horrible misogynist and racist and ***** and gamers are dead. This upset a ton of people, and in response those people started going to polygons. Kotaku's advertisers and their advertiser networks and complaining to try and get them to. Go bankrupt and I think with Kotaku, they succeeded. So as far as I'm I as I can remember, this was like the first time that a mob of people would complain to like providers and to beneficiaries and so on and so forth to try and financially destroy someone basically for just saying something they didn't like. Right.

Tom: But typically, cancer culture is sort of associated with the left, but that was sort of a more, you know, moderately right wing kind of anti SJW anti leftist movement, yeah.

Null: Yeah, but I mean nowadays it's like it's both ways and I mean I guess it kind of makes like when Disney put in mass mandates for their parks, people boycotted that, then they keep putting out like stuff that's considered woke. So people cancelled Disney plus. And yeah, like it, it goes back and forth. it's an issue with the country and basically the. You know the West as a whole being split down the middle. Between like conservatism and this far left stuff, where it like with Destiny, Destiny diverges from, you know, majority consensus on like woke **** and literally one way it's like I think he said transgender athletes have an innate advantage competitively and that's like. Whoa. About a year. You're. A horrible bigot. Now you don't deserve to be able to feed yourself. I hope you go. And so and then, of course, people on the right can't accept him because he's like, polyamorous and whatever the ****. And so it's a very strange like hyper polar polarity between these two sides. That's kind of ruining everything very, very rapidly.

Destiny: Yeah, I think like I said earlier, the way you have to view it is. Nobody really has any principal position. It's just when. Their ship gets. That's the only thing that people really care about. And if people have the ability to like use a tool hammer against somebody else like they'll do it. Whether it's doxing, deep platforming, spam reporting, whatever the **** else, like, nobody actually cares, they'll do whatever they can to take somebody out.

Null: Yeah, and this is I've referenced this twice now, Schmidt, in his opinion that there is no such thing as apolitical anymore or this well. This is like in 1800s, but everything is political and choosing to be apolitical is itself political. And that's just how everyone says, like everything is fair and love and worry, we're. Just going to, we're going to like. Actively ruin absolutely everything to try and have our way, so that's why that's why it's like free speech. Free speech is just not something anyone cares about anymore in general. And it's really sad.

Tom: Yeah, yeah, I agree. Good to see you guys are best friends now. Are gonna be playing a lot of video games together.

Destiny: I hope in the future if I if I am on fire and rolling around on the floor, you'll at least spit on me.

Tom: You know, of course I'll.

Null: I'll put you out my dude.

Tom: I'll do the solid. Thankful I did OK. Alright, thank you're coming on Destiny.

Destiny: Thanks for having me on.

Livestream (June 13th, 2023)

Source

June 13, 2023

6,243 views

7,346 followers

Where'd you find this?

Do you think you? Should play Runescape again. Oh, unfortunately it's now dead and gay like everything else, even old school Runescape has the ***** pride **** and. I think they the last time I checked they made it so that you can gay marry on that island where you have to like royal marry somebody to inherit the island. They made it so that you can. You can even have like, an asexual option where you don't have to marry anyone because you know some people might get #triggered by being forced into a marriage even for the sake of a role-playing game. And herden island. So yeah, they got rid of that. They also renamed the. This is the thing that made me cancel my subscription runescape for good, even though I didn't play it that often to begin with, and I renamed all the before for like 20 years in Runescape. All the there was a desert part of the map and all the NPC's there, including the camel, was named Ali. So it was Ali, the kebab guy, Ali, the armorer, Ali, the weapon Smith Ali the car. Prince Ali, the leader of the area. They're only the ally. That was the joke and they they changed that cause that's too offensive to all the ***** Muslims. I guess even though. When Muslims start migrating to a country like Germany, the name Mohammed becomes like the top boys name like almost immediately. Like wow, they they. They sure don't live up to that stereotype, naming their children all the same ***** thing all the time. That sure is a misconception about Arab people that is not based in reality whatsoever. Hello everybody I was almost late. I was not late despite what people in shower. OK First off before.

Thank you, Golden Black back, Jack, for the prime.

I changed it for this week. I felt inspired, so I changed the \$100 super chat to something special for this week. Ohh thank you. So before we do anything, let's talk about this thing there is in the bottom right of my screen a heart and it is spewing bile and disgust. I don't know why the **** there are like party emojis and laughing emojis and heart emojis. I don't know where the **** that is coming from. I don't know where I if I turn off my foreground. It goes away, so it must be like a part of the YouTube chat. I don't know where the **** it's. Coming from though, is it like a reaction to? Ohh emojis in the ohh is that what it is? Anytime anyone uses an emoji it translates it to like one of three different kinds of reactions. I really don't. What the **** it is. it's ***** vomitous in horrific, though, and extremely distracting. I don't want it on my screen. Can I turn it? Off see the foreground YouTube chat interact. OK, click it. Ohh, what the ****? Oh oh geez, I broke it. Can I refresh it? Ohh, this is awkward. There it is. OK, I fixed it. You do just keep getting better and better all the ***** time. I love it so much. it's not at all a giant pain in ** **** to. Constantly

have to deal with YouTube. OK, so let's just ignore the OK, next next stream before next stream. I'm gonna go into the CSS. I'm gonna rip that ***** thing out. I'm gonna throw it to the ground. I'm gonna stomp on it. I'm never gonna look at it again, cause that is awful. Anyways, let's see. Let's move on to the new segment. Everybody's favorite lower thirds. We're in news mode. It's time to make fun of the English. Once more yet again, as I say. What part of England am I making fun of today? That's a country, as I say in. The United States. This is not. OK, it doesn't say what part of the UK, so maybe somebody can explain to me what part of the UK a doctor was pull, there was an emergency meeting that was called in the in in his hospital. They press the emergency meeting button and then all the little doctors and the doctor lab coats ran over to the emergency meeting room and they just sent it to discuss the events and the UK because their their medical system is like socialized. So I imagine that the people running the meeting are government employees and they work directly for the government and the medical system there. The NHS and they call him in and they say, Doc, you gotta start using proper pronouns A and other. Doc said no, that's sassy, Baka. I don't want to do that. And so they said, OK. You don't have to use the proper pronouns, but you will be fired instead, and so he was fired and this 26 year veteran who worked at the hospital for peanuts because the UK doesn't pay their doctors much compared to the US, he could have moved to the US at any time and made, you know, hundreds of \$1000 for the amount that. He was getting paid in the. UK and he's just he's just he's forced to quit. He has filed an appeal with their system, saying that it's a religious grounds, that he's not going to recognize someones preferred pronouns in a medical situation and says that especially in the medical environment. Being aware of someones sexual characteristics is necessary. However, that will. Probably be denied because the UK is a sinking pit of filth and disgust and degeneracy and no good things happen in the UK. So such is life. Just small brick brick bong update mostly what I want to talk about in the news today. Are four wait 1234. Very kind of coinciding updates in regards to. So first of all. I did not know this, but apparently discord. Last month rolled out. Or talk to started talking about rolling out user names and I find this extremely weird. I don't know what the purpose of this. Is one of the nicest things about discord was that you could. Fix odyssey Odyssey's not working, I cannot. Fix it, sorry. Yeah, I don't know what to tell you. That's honestly's fault. It seems maybe you click reset stream but it's working exactly as it has been before. So I don't know what the purpose of the. Of this is. Because one of the nice things that about this word is that you can just make your name Josh and then he would be Josh number, you know 46,000 and you wouldn't have to be forced to come up with a different name. Like if you're trying to make a character on. Path of exile. Your name has to be something like Josh ***** solo self found league name or something cause they in the forest unique names. Across all characters. So you just add up like a ton of ***** gibberish at the end of the username. Try and make it. It's always been nice that you could just have the name that you wanted on on discord and not have to fight over usernames. They got rid of that and it's sort of a mystery why, however, I believe. That they

probably. Intend to monopolize this market. Soon after releasing this. This is a player up. There's also swapped in a couple of other different platforms that sell usernames on different social media sites, so if you want to have the username ****, you can pay the nice price of \$50,000 and you can be the only catch. One discord today, however, there's a couple more interesting ones. I'm honestly tempted, even though I don't even use discord to buy a ***** for \$15,000. Depression, also a smooth \$10,000. However, femboy sex is film boy sex. Is available for \$10,000 and I think out of all these different names, the one most likely to sell. 1st is femboy sex. I think that has the right market and set the right price for that market. Thankfully, I'll never figure out how much Sneed cost on discord cause. If I did, I might have. To fight it. There's somebody suck. Jack and Ben sold. Who knows about Josh, though. So I think this is something that. Twitter does Twitter made it so that you can buy if you like. If you're like a major brand, you can buy your name. I'm aware that for the country of Israel, there was someone who actually had their first name, Israel, and they registered the name Israel and they've been using it fairly because they are. That's their name. They didn't squat it, but they managed to sanction like a. An auction with the State of Israel for like over \$1,000,000 for the Twitter handle. Israel and Twitter took a cut, so I think that. That's probably what they're going to do to make some more money is just sell like the, you know, the simple usernames that people are squatting or whatever the ****. But that's just discord. The other, more interesting thing that people have been talking about is the Reddit ****. If you are fortunate enough to not have any ***** idea what's happening on Reddit right now. Twitter last couple months ago rolled out changes to their API. This was one of the first things that Elon Musk did. There are a huge ecosystem of third party apps that use Twitter in its API to function. Elon Musk has made it so that you have to pay a lot of money to use it. You have to pay like \$0.10 per query, which used to be free. There were like some caps on how often you. Could use the API. But there were like, thousands of requests a day as opposed to paying per per call. It's extremely expensive, a lot of third party apps on Twitter have shut down. However, Elon Musk has cited something interesting. He said that the Twitter API has basically been misused by other gigantic tech companies to pull all sorts of data off. And use that to build machine learning and otherwise like compile in intrusive profiles on users and **** that that use Twitter. So his rationale, I guess is solid, even though it sucked up a lot of people. However, Reddit's motives are probably even less genuine than than Twitter's. If you don't know if you ever try to access Reddit on mobile and mobile, users are probably, I think, 60% or more of the market. You know, like almost the majority of. People use a mobile device to browse the Internet. Majority of I'll rephrase that cause people a lot of people use both, but there is an increasing number of people who don't have a computer who just. Use mobile apps and 60% or more of all web traffic is done over mobile, so it's a huge audience. And UM. When you install an application, you give it permission to read things about your device and give it more personal information. It's just a nice boon to have when you have access to that much data and. It helps with circumventing bans if if a a device can tell you its unique ID

through you know special API's on the phone so it helps with dealing with alt accounts and **** and it basically just gives Reddit information about your marketing profile that is useful to its. Advertisers, which is the most important thing that it has when it gets on your phone. So if you ever tried to browse Reddit. On your phone, you will be prompted to download the app and if you try to browse any words which is Merck not safe for work, which includes a lot of boards which are not pornographic but are just considered not safe for work for whatever reason, either due to theme or some other contrived ***** you'll be you'll be forced to download the app. And log in to access that content. This is not the case on the desktop version of the site. So one way to get around using the atrocious Reddit app is to and intrusive Reddit app is these one of the eight million different Reddit third party software applications which just use the API's to use the site and that allows you to bypass the Reddit app officially. You know very easily. Reddit is killing its API. Effectively, they are making the API so expensive that it would be impossible for any third party application to do what it does currently for free. And it's actually so expensive that it would be pretty much impossible for any third party application to do what it does for a price. Meanwhile, the Reddit app will be free for everybody except. Free in the sense that you're giving them your information in exchange for using the website. So it is. It is basically impossible for any of those applications to continue to exist. However, even more insidious than that, which is on its face, pretty ***** nasty. It will break all moderation tools because automated systems that have been policing Reddit for free on behalf of the community without any involvement of the administration, use the API to make moderation decisions. So any sort of API based work that would. The moderation tolls will be broken because they can't afford it, and what's also particularly interesting is that even with the fee, you will not be allowed to use Reddit at all. You will not be able to use the API at all for not safe for work boards, so this is what I believe. Is the is the actual intention behind this is that Reddit has admitted in its investor meetings and its advertiser like pamphlets, that ***** is the. Predominant use of Reddit it is like more I wanna say more than 50% of their traffic is specifically for pornographic areas of the of the site. Not even you know just not safe for work but ***** especially so even with API you will not be allowed to visit the pornographic areas of Reddit even if you're paying for it. And I and what they say about this. Is that it is. For the protection of women and content, sorry, content creators, not women. They don't block women. And that might have something to do with revenge ***** laws, because in 2022 they, as part of the omnibus spending bill, updated the violence against Women's Act, which included a non consensual ***** clause, which comes down pretty hard on revenge ***** . So I think. That on their face, they're saying that this change is to make it so that nobody can scrape the not safer work boards and archive those. And I'm not sure what the point is cause like the men who browse that can still save those images. It's not like it goes away. I guess it just can't be automated. I guess like some people are just in this state of mind that they can put things up on the Internet and then take it back down later when they regret it and that you know it, it will

actually be permanently deleted. I mean, it could be copyright. I mean copyright is on his face one thing but. Yeah, there's there's other concerns like they've been operating for, you know, 10 ***** years with its previous rules. Why is it copyright suddenly their concern. It's more about squeezing money out of people. And Louis or I don't know if his name is Louis or Louis, but I must say, Louis Louis Rossman, who have been watching a couple of videos of recently, probably my favorite person of melanated distinction at this point in time, pointing at that probably what they're trying to do is just to get people to stop using the API. It's a service that they begrudgingly offer, and they're just going to make the price such that. Nobody bothers to pay for it and they just use the Reddit app. And that's probably true. So the subreddits they have had a blackout, which is the typical Reddit Jenny protest when whatever, they're **** about, they start to lock their Subs and leave a little ***** little message saying we're locking our Subs cause we're very angry about what it right now. However, they plan to make it a 2 day protest which is not going to do anything. Because they know that those suburbs are gonna come back in two days, and so does everybody else. So it's like, you know, you don't have to do anything. Just wait two days and they'll be fine. And however though. That has not stopped Reddit from launching Coultas against the non compliance of the largest Subs on the site that are currently in revolt. In particular our advice animals has had its top mods permissions removed by Reddit admins. Their decision to join the blackout was reversed and now the sub has reopened to the public. Wholesome Mod team has protested this actually, and so the rule that in an inactive top moderator may not make the unilateral decision to close down a large active subreddit against the wishes of the active Mod team as years old and 1st applied in 2018 against. Occur in action. And then there's a link there. So they are. They are filling the ranks with spez loyalists and then claiming that the decision is against the wishes of the Mod team and replacing the disloyal janies with the loyal Janies who are willing to do what. They do for free. With allegiance to. With allegiance to **** in the status quo. Which is pretty funny. So in summary, I believe that they are disadvantaging their users for the sake of squeezing more money out of ***** addicted people who make up the majority of their user base because they can sell more advertisements and get people off of 3rd party applications, which may be removing their ads or replacing them with their own ads. And everything else. Is just a. It's just a casualty of that. Then third, on my big platform update, YouTube is going after invidious which is a way of viewing YouTube videos outside of the YouTube ecosystem. YouTube has becoming increasingly a pain in the ***. Their advertisers are off the wall. I I'm just gonna. I'm just going to break Reddit to your YouTube TOS. The stream I'm going to delete it afterwards. Like, I'm not gonna restrain myself when I say I keep get seeing in archives, people asking why is why is this archive channel running ads? I can't believe that they're gonna monetize Joshua's. Channel I do not run ads. None of those archive channels run ads and you should be using ad blocker and that's against YouTube TOS to say you always browse YouTube with an ad blocker and I think that even with your TV and phone. You can get ad blocker with something

called pie hole. I think that pie hole used to block the Huey Farms. But with the pie hole DNS now I think that you can get around that. But you should basically always be running ad blocker and you should instead support people that you actually want to support directly. You know, with their Patreon or whatever the **** they run, or by buying merch advertising as a industry needs to ***** collapse. Advertising is one of the most disgusting things on this planet. It fills me with rage and YouTube is going out of their way now to try and ban ad blockers, ban viewing videos outside of their ecosystem, shake off any kind of third party application that's doing things that they don't want to, and they're running advertisements for 3rd party content creators. Like if I run 30 seconds of a pop song on this here. Watch this what hold up any pop song then the video gets ads are all the are all the archives are monetized and you see ads and the money goes to the ***** rights management companies even go to the singer it gets monetized by like BIM or the other one. The two huge content creator or intellectual? Music industry rights holder organizations. It goes to them and then they take their cut and then the singer gets, like, a a pittance from that. So always UMG. Always, always, always, always. BMI and ASCAP. No, no, that's the right one. But yeah, always run eye blocker constantly. And hopefully, NVIDIA says they're not gonna bail out and they're gonna hand the code off to whoever they're gonna want to do, and they're gonna send their money. To if, if they're developers are gone after they'll send their money to other developers and they'll continue their project and they'll move to get tea. If they have to from NVIDIA dot IO and they'll fight it tooth and nail because **** them, which is pretty based. However, YouTube has also been made big moves in like the. Last couple of weeks. Against the daily wire. So despite how little Ben Shapiro's hat is, they're still going after the anti trans people and they're not work. The infringements that were cited against Michael Knowles, Candace Owens and Matt Walsh were not using. Pronouns and Matt Walsh as a whole has been demonetized, which he says is going to cost him over \$100,000 a month in revenue at the idea of how much money he was making. So despite how optimistic things seem for the anti trans **** at the moment because of how loud people are being. Against them now. This seems to be the Pride month that broke the camel's back. I am not seeing nearly as many rainbow avatars as I used to. I'm really like the amount of pride **** this month seems to be way, way lower than last year. By like orders of magnitude, I think people are really ***** done with it. But Despite that, YouTube is still holding the line and hurting people where hurts the most, which is by going after their pocketbooks. And until the credit card companies MasterCard, Visa, card, discover, Amex are completely and totally destroyed and alternative avenues of sending and receiving money or set up, they will continue to do that because we have bottlenecked our entire economy behind four of the most. Evil companies that have ever existed in the history of mankind. But the fight is not over. That's my point. This is also my got from Lewis Rossman. I was corrected. He is black so his name is not pronounced in the French way I suppose. I will read this real quick and the gist is that his Amazon Smart home revolted against him. The sequence of events that led to this digital exile began innocuously enough.

A package was delivered to my house on Wednesday and everything seemed fine. The following day, however, I found out that my Amazon Echo Show had signed out and I was unable to interact with my smart home devices. My initial assumption was that someone might have attempted to access my account repeatedly, triggering a lockout. I use a fairly old e-mail address for my Amazon account, and it's plausible that my old password might have been exposed in the past data breach. However, I currently use the strong auto generated passwords via Apple and employ 2 factor authentication with an authenticator app to authorize unauthorized accessing unlikely. I checked my other accounts to ensure I hadn't been compromised. All seem normal with no flood of notifications from Microsoft authenticate that would indicate an attempted breach. Puzzled, I followed the advice of the numbers on that and dialed the customer service number provided. That's when things began to take a surreal turn. The representative told me I should have received an e-mail, which I indeed found in my inbox. It was from an executive at Amazon. As I dialed the number provided in the e-mail, I half wondered if Amazon was experiencing some issue and I was unwittingly following into a scam. When I connected with the executive, they asked if I knew why my account had been locked. When I answered that I was unsure, their tone turned somewhat accusatory. I was told that the driver who had delivered my package reported receiving were racist remarks from my ring doorbell. It's actually a youth fee, but. I'll let that slide. Here's where things got even more baffling. First, I have multiple cameras recording everything that happens on my property. If the driver's claims were accurate, I could easily identify them with video footage. Second, most delivery drivers in my area share the same race as me and my family. It seemed highly unlikely that we would make such. Finally, when I asked what time the alleged incident occurred, I realized it was practically impossible for anyone in my house to have made those comments, as nobody was home around that time at 6:00 PM. I reviewed the footage and confirmed that no comments had been made and said the Ufi Doorbell had issued the automated response. Can I help you? The driver who was walking away and wearing headphones must have misinterpreted the message. Nevertheless, by the following day, my account was locked. And all my echo devices were logged out. I have to say, and I mean this sincerely, if you have these smart devices in your ***** home, you are the apex of cattle. You ***** disgust me. I actually literally hate you. I hate you. I don't want you listening to my streams. I hope you jump off a ***** Cliff. And when if you want to. Fix your house. I want you to. Take them and I want you to burn them. Do not take your Amazon Echo and throw it away. Write it off on taxes and. Give it to. A a, a goodwill or some ***** because these things should not exist. You should physically destroy it in your backyard using either fire or percussive instrument such as a hammer, so that they cannot function anymore. By the way, he uses everything in his home. Was shut down because an because a man of melanated distinction misheard his automated doorbell chime, and that's all it takes. You don't have due process with mega corporations, so take it and ***** break it. Do not accept gifts from your families. Your family says, hey, I know that you're like, computer stuff. I bought you

an echo. Don't accept it and explain to them that this device is *****. Cancer and they just tried to give you a bomb that was set to go off in your house and spy on you and shut off all your applications and ****. Don't even be. Don't even be nice about it and accept it and smile. And say thank. You give it back to them and. Say return this. It is ***** awful. You just put in my lap metaphysical evil that I do not want anywhere around me or anyone I care about. And that you feel **** that he uses, by the way, is also clouds. I was looking at security ****. All the dupee stuff is cloud, and supposedly the last generation that what's his face? Linus Tech Tips was promoting. It was supposed to be completely. Completely like offline, but then they were still sending images off to the Amazon Web Services in China. I think to process images and put them on your phone so that you can get notifications. And then when Linus Tech tips called them out for the fact that they were not completely offline and they were using a WS to process images because they were using that. For phone notifications, instead of saying oh, we'll fix that and we'll just. Make it so. That those phone notifications are optional, their next generation of equipment is 100% online and it doesn't work at all if you're disconnected from the Internet. So what the **** is even the point? Of a a surveillance system for your home that doesn't work if your Internet doesn't work, you know what you do. If you wanna rob a house that has this **** for home security, apparently you just cut the Ethernet cable or you take one of those. Signal jammers and you put it in your backpack and then everything is offline cause it uses Wi-Fi like what a what? I'm honestly curious if there is a surveillance system that has. That's completely offline. Like are there any? Are there any that don't require the Internet to function at this point in time? If there is, let me know. Because I'm really curious. Linus Tech Tips was using something else by the way he was using. He switched over to think I have a bookmark somewhere. But that's you, fee. I'm not sure what he switched over, or maybe it's ubiquity that he switched over to, I don't know but, but I'm really curious if there's one that's actually completely unified. I'm not sure I'll look into it. I've been looking into it. Closed circuit television maybe. That's a pain in the *** though it.

Would be nice to.

Have like facial recognition stuff. That's like on the firmware so that. You can record faces and stuff on your own computer. It's not that it's impossible for these technologies to be made practical in consumer goods, it's just that they don't want to. They want your ship to be plugged into the cloud and always fitting in information. A ***** 10 year old GPU can do machine learning fast enough to recognize. Bases with open source technology that's out there right now, it's completely possible to make home surveillance systems that don't upload to the cloud. They just choose not to. It's really it's really disgusting. So I am curious if there's a company out there that actually does cameras that have convenience features baked into the firmware that do not need Internet access and can run on like. Its own network. So I don't know. Send me your your, your Linus tech tips. I'm curious, but definitely don't use Amazon for the love of God, don't even live near people who use Amazon. That's the news.

Next up, chat.

I got some content, I think some Troon content. Dylan Mulvaney has been spotted in public.

Here he is.

He wow was in a pink mini dress and cropped tweed jacket at Paris Hilton's concert. After shrugging off bud like controversy. Look at that. That is a man who has spent. Thousands of dollars of Anheuser-Busch money to try and look more feminine and to no avail.

Look at those legs. Such a woman.

Look at this picture. He looks like honestly, he looks like Joe Biden in this, I don't know. I think that maybe Joe Biden has had facial feminization surgery cause they they look like. Brothers, you know what I mean. A Cryptid. A slender man? Yeah, it's true. It's true. He does look like a crypton. Maybe Joe Biden's a crypto look. OK, it's funny that you mentioned cryptids, by the way, chap. It's really funny that you do that because. I after last week I took a little bit of a dive into into the deep end of something called SCP and I would like to read you 2 SCP's that I found that you may find interesting. This one just for the memes. This is S I'm gonna do this? Creepypasta Crypted hour chat. CP5962SCP-5962 is an obese humanoid resembling the McDonald's fast food mascot known as Ronald McDonald. It weighs approximately 5 tons and is 4 meters in height. The specimen is naked except wearing only yellow gloves. And red shoes. Its head is notably large, having a diameter of 1.3 meters. A layer of frying oil covers its skin, which is constantly secreted through its pores. Despite its humanoid appearance, SCP-5962 is genetically identical to cows, and it clarifies Baz Taurus over here. So you know the Latin name for a cow. It lacks numerous internal organs and instead has 27 interconnected stomachs of varying sizes that serve no biological function. SCP-5962 does not respond to any stimuli. and as a result it is not considered sapient, it is dormant for the majority of its time. However, once a day. It will be active. SCP-5962 will unhinge its jaw before producing packaged items from the McDonald's menu from out of its mouth. The items appear ordinary, but upon closer inspection they comprise entirely of human biological matter. Class D personnel report no difference in taste. Compared to regularly produced food from McDonald's, they experience no adverse medical effects. The entity produces around 10,000 kilograms worth of menu items per day. It is not currently known how SCP-5962 produces such large amounts of food. Genetic analysis of the food are matched with multiple living individuals that report no unusual activity. SCP-5962 was discovered in Beijing, China on March 23rd, 2005. It was kept within a packaging facility owned by McDonald's Corporation Food and Frying Oil, produced by the entity were being collected and then distributed across McDonald's restaurants within the country. It's very racist, actually, if you think about it. So so all the Chinese people are eating. McDonald's made of cartilage and ligaments, hair, skin and nails. Liquefied fecal matter. And to be honest with you, the coffee from McDonald's is better than Starbucks. I wanna see the SCP that's making the Starbucks food because I think it's gotta be. A real piece.

If the McDonald's monster is making better food than that.

How about another one shot? Uh oh, SCP 1004 is adult content only. From what I understand, there were lots of adult, like sexual SCP's that were not like age gated at all. So when all the little kids were finding out about SCP through Roblox and ****, they just had, they just stumbled upon this on accident and there was no warning. SCP-100 Four is a computer program, found either on a CD or a 3 1/2 inch diskette, either of which will be hand labeled with the words factory ****. Contained on these disks is a single executable file labeled thefactory.exe A1 KB program, so Mac **** and Linux faggs need not apply. The program runs perfectly on all platforms. I want to know how that's possible because that's an executable file that does not work on Unix based systems. OK. I don't know. It's an SAP.

Ask no question it.

Running the program results in a window operating on the computer within which the factory logo is displayed. The logo fades to black and was replaced by the words. What would you like to see at this point the user may input any selection of words from the ambiguous to the precise. Once a request has been input, the program will set up several dozen images of pornographic content. Each of which leads to a full video on the subject. Many of these videos appear to have never been made in real life. Watching videos on SCP-100, four has a cumulative effect. The more **** a user views, the more disturbing their sexual desires become and the harder sexual gratification becomes. After approximately 100 straight hours of viewing **** on SCP. 1004 even the most normal of viewers will display an interest and scatological play. The torture and murder of living people, bestiality, pedophilia. And combinations of the previous. The deadening of reactivity to sexual gratification will encourage them to seek out such things with other people, or to mutilate themselves and their genitalia. How the sensors did not know there was a reference to transgending and their enormous library. I'm sure this will be changed. All that made fun of it, but that's what I was getting at, by the way. I looked this up. Someone or someone pointed this out rather on the forum. If you got a history. And you look at the history of this and you go back to Page 3, which I, Think is the earliest. You'll see that the original author of this. Is Edmund bright? And I just so happen to know, ladies and gentlemen of the chat that admin bright is currently banned from the SCP wiki because he was grooming underage users that were using the wiki and he may or may not be a truant. I don't know, but it does seem. Like maybe this SCP was based on true events.

Although I do.

Have to admit, it's pretty interesting that he predicted machine learning.

But I think.

It's a little bit telling that he decided to write this. Very suss, very suss indeed. Ship and the most suss thing being that an X in EXE file is going to run on on Linux. Rule #42,069 Doctor Bright is not to be allowed around children unsupervised. They his name comes from Doctor Bright and they were. They're renamed it because he's a. He's a dirty Chester and they don't want that to be one of their most famous stories to

be associated with him anymore. This is this is a bit of an uplifting story. Now we're gonna be uplifting the chat. We're gonna be lifting the mood, elevating the mood. Call of Duty removes Nick Merck's skin from shop following anti LGBT plus comment. When I heard about this and it was one of those I heard about this. Actually I was listening to wings of redemption. For whatever reason that was watching one of his streams. From people in chat asking his opinion on it and I'm thinking, OK, what I wonder what this is. So I end up looking it up and I had no idea who this guy is or. Whatever and all the reports are like on big platforms. Apparently this guy is like a really, really popular streamer who plays one of the most normal games. And he has a massive normal audience.

You know, saying.

Call of Duty, Call of Duty bands Nick Merks and removes original content from store following hideous LGBT comment. And I'm like. What the **** did he say? They weren't listening. It Eurogamer was the first article I read that actually linked to what he said. Guess what he said? Boys and girls. In response to. Apparently there was a fight outside of the school in California over the school recognizing Pride Month. Officially between parents, there was like an actual fist fight that police had to break up in. Puckett replies, saying this happened four blocks away from my Overwatch League apartment. Americans are in a sad place right now. Let people love who they love. And live your own life now face is like a friend with this guy, cause he actually apologized for bringing so much attention to him for this tweet. But he replied and said they should leave little children alone. That's the real issue. That's all he said. And he's he's banned from or like, disassociated with Call of Duty by Activision Blizzard. That's it, that's all he said. And then there's replies to this. One of them was funny. And this one. Said this is incredibly harmful and wrong to say. The gays are hurting your kids as the hired as clean that folks with feeble minds have been saying for decades and decades now, it's not new. Reminder that the average age of first sexual encounter for a young a gay man is 13. They reproduce by molestation. Sad to see some with this bigger platform as you so uneducated about this, nick. Those wide guys in the matching white T-shirts aren't Glendale parents, and no one is targeting kids except the alt right propaganda campaign designed to make LGBTQ people seem like an enemy. And so on and so. So what was his? The pendulum swings. It's on him now, Ken. He saved his career. It's time chat to apologize. It's time to Buck break Nick merks, bring him to his knees, pucker her up and apologize.

Simply feel that I want to be the one and my wife. Wants to be the one. To speak with our child about stuff like. And that was that was that was the tweet, that was the tweet. You can take the tweet if you want and you can spin it, flip it, flop it, quote tweet it. You can put 10 paragraphs on top of it. You can do whatever you want to it to make you feel better, if that's what you want to do. But that was the tweet. OK, so if you came here to hear that, I hope, I hope you feel a little better about it. I didn't mean to upset anybody. I know that I did. I'm not apologizing about the tweaks. I don't feel like I'm. I don't feel like it's wrong. I'm going to stand by what? I said I'm not

going to delete the tweet. You know, I just want to make sure everybody understands exactly the point I was trying to make. By tweeting by tweeting my response, you know and. I do, I do. Want to apologize to Puckett though, I I. I feel like. I kind of I might have brought a little bit of **** his way, man. I didn't mean to do that, but.

Base what is it? Call it call of. Duty streamers where they. At now, I don't know. Maybe he's just a fluke. Maybe Call of Duty streamers are not the base normally chatted that we that we may assume that they are just from this one example. However, Nick Morris has a friend apparently named him the Hat Man. Who says Nick Merks has been my friend for years, who went to getting our Call of Duty operators together. It feels wrong for me to have mine and him to no longer have his and support of my friend. Please remove the Tim the Tatman bundle. So this man, after getting financially penalized by Activision Blizzard and removed from their operator store, is a customizable character that people could buy to support him. Tim the Tatman has also decided that his part in Activision Blizzard is unjustifiable. Considering their stances against this right and has voluntarily tanked his own relationship with that division, which they tell them go **** themselves. So good on them. Isn't that amazing that there's camaraderie in the ranks of our armed forces on the Internet, the real armed forces, the armed forces that I respect the most, the boys keeping us safe from. I you can't even call them terrorists anymore. And all the modern Call of Duty games, it's like mercenaries. They can't say Russians. They can't say Muslims. They can't say Nazis. I guess they try to say Nazis every so. Often they bring. Back World War Two or World War One. But nowadays it's just like it's just like the black beards versus Corporation IX, and they're fighting and Durka Durka istan or not Durka Durka istan but. The divisional batch or a fictitious place somewhere in the former Soviet Union. So anywhere between Berlin and Vladivostok there is this fictitious town full of unrecognizable people from all races and genders around the world, and they're fighting for generic corporate greed interest because they can't. They can't attach any faces or names anything. Earl, Stan dirka. Yeah, that's tarkov tarkov. I don't know. I can't get into. Tarkov he's a little bit gay, to be honest with.

You nothing gay about?

These Bros being Bros, though, good to good to see some some, some fighting spirit. Only when the redemption was falling in Call of Duty, he could also **** *** gay people. Alright, I have. A little bit of. Locale stuff burning through this suspiciously fast. I guess I can stick to my my intentions of keeping the stream shorter under 2 hours again. I want to give a huge shout out and I wanna play all of this, but I will play a little bit of it just to kind of tease. People a user named kill albedos, he has a farm account, but he's also just sort. Of been like a. Nameless, faceless identity within the like a log sphere for many years. Occasionally he put out a couple of videos that were like rehashing Jim quotes. Did zombify medic? However, he seems to have moved on past that and is putting his talents to better use. This video is 75 minutes long. It is demonstrably, obviously, just watching it, a lot of work put into it. It is a very succinct explanation of America. First, it's pretty funny and it involves, like all the different

characters in it. I will play. Like I've been there or two of it so you can see what? I'm talking about in terms of like the amount of effort.

OK, welcome to America first.

We got a great show for you tonight.

Good evening everybody. We're watching America. First my name is Nicholas J Fuentes. We have a great show for. You tonight I'm. Here with my Kanye. And we have a lot to talk about tonight. Lots to get into. It's been a pretty crazy week. And I'm actually not going. To be covering the news tonight because. Honestly, I am the news this week. I do have a big announcement. I know what some of you people. Are thinking OK and no, it's not that I'm gay. Everybody already knows that. But what I really want to talk about. Is the plan. For years, for years I have been telling you.

Trust the plan.

America first is unstoppable. The things to come. Is so good. It's a long plan. So you just gotta trust, gotta trust. It's unfortunate, but I hear you, you know. Some people are. Thinking what's the plan? What are we doing? Well, look, here's what's up, you know.

I'll leave it.

There, as you can see, he has rotoscoped Nick Fuentes into a live action puppet that he can make say whatever he wants, and it's pretty amazing. OK, so let's I don't wanna play too much of that cause it is. It is a proper 75 minutes. Long it's pretty great. Next thing, OK, so it's already been spoiled by twinkle turd cause he donated \$100 before I got to this video. During fish tank, which I was not able to keep up with because of issues with the site that occupied my time and literally I didn't watch any of this still. There was at some point a woman introduced named Betty who was supposed to be a doppelganger for Letty, and then she was quickly kicked out. Apparently she got into a fight with Sam Hyde or something. And now all now that fish tank is over, all those people have become streamers. And UM, Betty. Streams like 250 people now and after closing her stream, she decided to raid I dubs, who was closing up on his own stream. And as a result. I does have a a sort of an unusual reaction which I'll. Now play for you.

I dubs sending. All right, let's go.

If you don't know, or just to clarify, they're on Twitch when you raid somebody on Twitch, it kind of sounds hostile, but all you're doing is you're you're closing your own stream, and maybe you have a friend who's still streaming for another hour or two. So you just say, OK, I'm gonna raid him, and then you send all your your viewers. Over to that other person. And that's a way of like. Supporting them by giving them your viewers and it it's beneficial to your viewers, cause now they have like similar content that you endorse to watch when you're offline.

And then UM.

Is this how we do it? All right, let's go.

A little warm.

Posy wild session, who are like this pet?

Beat him up, beat him up. Beat him up. I got cruise control.

What is that?

I got bumped.

And this thing is loud.

What are you doing? What are you doing?

They're now spamming fish in the.

Oh, ***** rape.

Chat, by the way.

Whoa, you got raided.

Or they do one second.

He was only streaming to 250 people on his own and then when they show up, they start saying fish and **** and chat to announce their presence. And you can just see on items of space, like look at them. Look at how angry he is. OK, I'm just. Going to let this play?

Don't let the raid fool you. The YouTube video.

He, he says basically nothing, and the only time that I'll show you the wave form actually cause I was clipping this for the sound bite for the donation alert thing. And as I was clipping it you can see. the peaks, that's. All Anisa, but you can see for seven minutes. He's basically stunned in silence and anger, trying to figure out what the **** to. Do with what's just happened this this raid and I guess he wasn't expecting.

Alberta is still Canada still on fire. I don't. Yeah, I don't know what Ian's doing. He's like in maximum concentration mode.

She's, like, making fun of her. I didn't even pick up a much. She doesn't even know that. He's like seething he. She's like bullying him as he's doing that.

So he basically just stays silent for the entire time. Betty apologizes actually, cause again, she's not on good terms with Sam Hyde. And says just to be clear, bothering I dubs and these are the greasy with the raid had nothing to do with Sam Hyde or his whole nothing burger of a personal issue with I dubs, as many of you have noted, Sam and I don't particularly get along. The only real grievance I have towards I dubs is surrounding Chris. Other than that, I don't give a ****. I have my own life. I don't give a. **** if Sam Hyde is mad at me. Apparently she did that and it ***** **. He's probably filing a complaint of Form 56B with Sam Hyde for violation of his agreement. Not to cyberbully him anymore after cutting out in the YouTube video and begging for the Merciless. Bullying to stop. And so that's the Sam I probably sent her a message in in response said don't ***** bother. I don't for making me look like a an ***** or something. So that's what happened with that I do. Have a time.

Stamp for this though.

Sam, where is the? He breaks his silence 4 minutes and 38 seconds in. So about 4 1/2 minutes after. After she reads them.

Little bit delirious, so I don't. I made it when I was a little bit delirious, so I don't exactly know in what order I should be doing. Things. Well it.

Maybe a little bit before this.

Sorry guys, I got to queue up this 1000 sub special. I made it when I was a little bit delirious, so I don't exactly know in what order I should be doing things.

Oh, I forgot to point out, if you look on the right hand side, you'll see the room is now in subscriber only mode and then he accidentally makes it emote only mode. So you can only reply with E modes and then he. Ends that emote only mode is. Like the hardest level of cocking your chat so that you. Can regain control over it. Because you can only reply with it be like if I only made it so you could only reply with the pooner or finger. Fingernail painting emoji. That's basically what it does. So he went through and then that 4 minutes and a half minutes. I think that was banning every single person that was responsible for the rate. And actually, you know what, now that I think about it, he was probably filing a report with Twitch right on the spot saying that this person is associated with the evil neo-Nazi Sam Hyde and was trying to cyber bully him and his feelings got hurt. And it's I think it's coincidental and it's not like deliberate that she managed to do that right at the 1000 subscriber goal. But that's what happened. 1000 subscribers are pretty good, though I think that. It's \$4.00 or \$5 per sub usually, unless they get like a higher tier. And then you. Keep half of that as the streamer, so that's \$2500 a month that level for. Watching him play World of Warcraft and be humiliated by an ease of life. On Earth you can just see how much he's enjoying his life at this exact moment.

OK.

So yeah, that is that. I think I had a little extra note about this. No, I did not. Now to torture you with more video content tantau. Has just been. In fact, I will show you this. She has been doing literally nothing but binge eating on camera day after day for weeks at this point, she's no longer even trying to do the whole I'm on a diet thing. Ohh, did she delete this? Ohh this *****. If she deleted this video and went to play, we're gonna find out. Ohh no, it's is it unlisted. Why does it not show up on her video list? It's a private video. No way is it gone.

You ***** *****. Ohh I'm mad. I am mad. OK, hold up. No, no, no. No, no, no, no. Come on now. Not doing this to me.

Give me a second. Hopefully chat the goals have archived this video. I see that chantel's thread is getting some replies. Let's check it. This isn't happening. We will not let this stand. You are going to see. It is one of the rules, but I didn't assume that she would delete this cause I have been up for a couple of days of the plant. She's even made a community post saying that she was making a Part 2 on this. I'll show you that cause I remember seeing that. Hi I'm gonna do a lot a Part 2 of the miserable girl world and meditation. Soon I will do a compilation this time and. Make it a longer video. I'm not sure all the people who grow old now. So what do you want me to imitate next? Video she's asking for information. I don't know why? She just ***** deleted the other one. OK, let's see. Page 2 scamming through it right now. Hopefully there's an archive of it. They do, they archive every video she posts, so there's no way that.

It's not there. Iranian food mukbang. OK, here it is. Yeah, the Chantelle thread is like the most thoroughly archived in the entire site. OK, I'm downloading it now that I'm doing it. Now let's pigger robs. 18 seconds chat 13 seconds 987654. 4321. This is this is worth it. This is worth all the effort you're going to think it's hilarious and you're gonna think. Wow, Josh, I'm so glad I waited for, like, 3 minutes for you to find this video.

Video Clip: Crack it, cook it, crack it, cook it, crack it, cocaine cracking cocaine, alright. Three days I have not reviewed this *****. This dumb *****. I'm not going to talk about that. I just won't do it. She got married to provoke guests and she moved to Kuwait to provoke us. And now the ***** got the cat. To provoke us. Anyway, I don't know who wants to watch this crap anymore, but the proof is. In the numbers. I don't know I. I can't really react to this ***** anymore.

Null: I'm laughing at the guy in chat too, screaming at me to get help.

Video Clip: Anyway, let's watch this bitch and her nasty, horrible man. I hate him. I can't stand him in his.

Null: You know what's funny? That this is actually, a really good impression of French Fried Girl is like. A an amazing midweight and she has this army of people who only watch her to like stream snipe chantel. So every single time Chantelle goes live, doesn't matter what time it is, doesn't matter what time because she's in Kuwait, which is in European like Ukraine hours. And like UTC +3 and so she's hours and hours ahead of. French girl doesn't matter what time of the day French girl will boot up a stream, insert stream sniping. Cause that's how she makes her super chat money. And she's just, like, extremely crass and vulgar. She just watches it, like, doesn't matter if it's three. Hours and just says it's ***** pitch. Just lying, *****. Like super angry. It's like, chill the ***** out. Everything is the biggest deal ever and it's really great and annoying to watch. But I laughed. I thought this was funny cause it's a. Really great impression. Lofar Ringo has repeatedly said in chat. Hi, Gersh, and I will now answer that. Hello lafar igno. I hope you're doing well, my friend. I hope you feel gratified. I look forward to Part 2 and chat I. Will play it on stream. OK, this is also. And when I say great, I mean absolutely atrocious and impossible to listen to. I haven't talked about James Stefani Sterling in a long time because his videos suck. There was a little while where he made like 2 videos where he was doing OK. The videos were kind of longer than they needed to be, but they were like kind of returned to form. They were just a little bit *****. But he very quickly gave up on that unironically, or without exaggeration, rather not on ironically. But with that exaggeration, every single video that he does now has at least five direct references to him taking to estrogen and his penis, and that he ***** ***** basically every single video and every single joke he used to have all these. The bits where he was. He would have like all sorts of little comedy bits and reoccurring gags that he would put back into. His videos and. Those have all been replaced with just the punch line being I'm a man *****. I take estrogen. I have saggy ***** ***** that are really big. My penis doesn't work anymore. My balls are soft, he says. that's a joke haha. This one is about Bobby Kotick and it's. It's an

old drum that he likes to beat and it's worth beating because Bobby Kotick should be basically thrown into a pit of burning tires at this point in time. However, there's a particular point that I have. Time stamped already that I will play for you because I found it.

Video Clip: Did he accept? Maybe the man himself and his. Family, but even that's. Denies that Bobby Kottick is a monstrous little man whose abusive nurse nasty. Stiness heartlessness and greed has earned him the ire of the masses. There's been a not insignificant pushback to that ire manifesting in the particular expression of photoshopped horns. This is on account of Codex's Jewishness and the historically anti-Semitic implications of portraying Jewish people as devils. Which, you know, it's fair enough to find that link more than a little uncomfortable. The gym position stopped at dawn and Kotick's visage with Demonica kutra month for this very reason, as despite the clear fact it specifically about Bobby Boys, an individual some viewers were nonetheless uncomfortable, and I really don't need the aid of infernal embellishments to make the point that Robert A Kotick is a despicable. *****. He's also started calling those Photoshops anti-Semitic himself. Like he's worked out that play. So don't give him the ammo. That said, whether. We do this with horns or via some other method we absolutely, positively need to ensure that Bobby colic, stating life remains hilariously fraught with the ever present threat of women finding out how much of A ***** he is.

Null: So I did not know that Bobby Kotick was Jewish until Jim Stefani Sterling did a base in red Pill early life search on him and pulled up that he was Jewish for the sake of making sure not to portray him in anti. I don't know how the ***** devil horns are anti-Semitic. You put devil horns in anyone that you don't like. I don't know how that became an anti Jewish trope, but OK, I guess. I guess portraying Jews as demonic entity is anti-Semitic and uniquely offensive to them. We really want to go that way. We can do that I guess. There are other time stands for this. Two more be warned, this is really gross. If you are a Serbian man who finds a fence in disgusting *****. You may turn around now. You know, I'll show you that too. This is an example of the jokes he makes.

Video Clip: Every union you come across just hand wave the reason away. Oh, yeah, it didn't play by the rules. It's about as informative as me saying I don't suck every consenting ***** I'm offered, just the ones that make me want to really *****. I was in the middle of something before I started recording. Oh, my God, Keegan. You've been stood there the whole time. I'm so sorry. Ohh, there we go. Sorry ***** ADHD. I swear. Next time I'll finish you off before I check my emails and then get distracted and do an entire script. OK? You're a pal. See you next week. Kicks Bobby Connie's idea of playing by the rules.

Null: But ohh my. Phone, but he likes to complain that YouTube keeps the monetizing him for sexual content. He did an entire video. Literally his entire last video. Was about how unfairly his video was marked as adult content because and how that penalized him in the search algorithm. How YouTube said to the Michelangelo he said

that the Michelangelo was considered sexual contents and now he just does ***** sucking like bits in this video and he's gonna complain more when that's marked as not safe for work, I guess. And one more thing, this one's not gross. It's just offensive, I suppose.

Video Clip: Women's champion bunder. Break while I was off doing wrestle fighting. Thank you so much, darling. And OW still PCW women's champion, by the way. Commander Stephanie Sterling. Yeah, and pride of the ring, too. I did successfully defend this try soul before we go just a little bit of promotion for my.

Null: Ohh I was unironically needed for once, so that's like his favorite thing to do now is that he's like 6 foot six £300 and he loves to just beat the ***** out of women and then make fun of them and hold his wrestling trophy. And he just says, like, he's the best. And that's like his new hobby. He literally, I think he even says that he moved. Twice, he moved from Louisiana up to Chicago to be closer to the indie wrestling circuit, and then he moved back to the United Kingdom, where there are like these inclusive wrestling circuits. So he moved twice. He moved to back to his home country of the United Kingdom, did to get away from bigotry, and to be closer to wrestling. So that he can beat the ***** out of those, those British, those angeloids angeloid femoid, and declare himself champion. And that's just his hobby, which is pretty funny.

So, next I will only touch on this for the sake of including 'cause I feel some people will be remiss if. I don't include it. Dream did a video saying that he regrets doing a face reveal and he's going to be taking his face off the Internet and a lot of people have taken that to be like a Streisand effect thing where he's just gonna go around DMCA. Every website has a copy of his face. However, I don't think. That that is the case. He's just deleting his all of that. You mentioned this down here is that he? He just he's just going to. Delete those videos from his social media and try to reclaim his privacy. He doesn't say he's not. He's gonna go around DM saying people and *****. So I don't know, I think it's probably just like a joke or like an intention seeking bed, which is why I'm not too interested in in talking about it. OK, now this. I don't know this was the. Last thing I was putting together for the stream before I went live. I was trying to understand what the ***** has happened with this and I'll try to talk about it as. Informed as I can. But keep in mind this is the last thing that I was adding to the shrink cause it just happened. And I don't fully understand. There is something in the smoldering ruins of IP2 has come forth, a sort of autistic little brother of IP2, and it's called the commentary community. It's super paused. It's super ***** gay, and it includes some of the least interesting humans that have ever existed. It has, like tipster. All G RFC tipster is tipster. The guy that I think runs the Buffalo Wild Wings, who is the guy? That is The Who is the Little League? Coach that goes to Buffalo. Wild Wings and has a throne there. The tea chasers Turkey. I guess the nick, the Oreo, I think he's also considered commentary. So there's like all these people that you're vaguely familiar of because they were associated with keemstar and would sometimes show up on the kill stream when it wasn't complete. And they're just like. Nobody's

apparently Auggie or Auggie likes me, and that's nice. But he was, like, a A A keflex's **** ***** for a long time, and he's finally, apparently broken ranks with the Truman Chasers.

Ohh I remember. OK, So what happened is that. Tipster who is a avowed ***** **** lover, was outed having a? Alt account on Twitter. Name something like. Let me find it. I had it. Written down somewhere? I do not have it written down somewhere. His alternate was something like big swinging horse **** or. Something and he made a tweet. That says it was Bill blacks. OK, it was. It was blow. Blacks had a Twitter account where? Sorry if I completely forget that blow blacks. That's like a different. A different guy. There's like 8 million of these ***** people, so blow blacks is like he has an alt account called. Big swinging horse thick and he keeps talking about how big his penis is. But one of the tweets that he made was. Something directed at Keppel saying like. Trans women aren't women, but I would still **** the **** out of them. Don't take out of context, so blow, Black said this and started like a huge debate bro thing and all the debate blows. And blow blacks were talking to each other about about this tweet, and if it was offensive, and then our all GRFC. There was no context. He just said that. Hey, Turkey, Tom. Turkey, Thomas, come back to defend her prostate. With a grand reentry, he heard it. He heard his name mentioned, has come to defend her honor. I'm pretty sure that's a joke. OK, so I will let play these clips actually, let me let me read this, OK. Punish Neko says. I can't believe. What was I saying? That's pronouncing that differently? I always thought it was blow blowbacks or blow blacks or something. I don't know. He has the dumbest. ***** name on the Internet. I can't believe that Bill blacks was getting canceled like Cat falls for racism due to old song lyrics, digital blackface. I know Keflex requires drama as the victim says it's irrelevant, blah blah. I'll just have to do A to defang Keflex's entire argument early on by openly admitting to being. Transfer like just to throw kettles off his game cafes and immediately shows that they shouldn't do live stream debates by struggling to say anything of substance. Aji rips kettles on this fact. Now the question is chat. Ooh, I should try to preload these. Know if I'll be able to. Hi mate I was struggling to get this saved all ***** day I may not. Be able to play the clips as a result of it. Only my sight wasn't dead and gay. Yeah, I might be *****. I have a feeling, actually, you. Know what it is. I'm gonna shift the blame on this. I remember trying to download them and these these clips were each. 30 like 5 megabytes long, so if we just take, I'm gonna just pull out a calculator here real quick. You take 60 seconds and divide that by. Or is it 35 by 60? .58. So that's like what? 6000 kilobits per second. That's a lot. It should not be that big. That's a lot of *****. That's a lot of bandwidth. I'm just saying. Can you like? I'm not even e-mail him. I'm saying, like, fix. Your ***** thing so that you're not. Wasting so much hard drive space with your ***** *****. OK, hold up. Maybe I can. I can salvage this real quick. No. Ohh actually this first one is 62 megabytes long. For whatever reason, that is ridiculous. Dude, what's I? I'm legit leaving this guy a ***** nasty profile message real quick. Like all you have to do. Go to kadenlive.org. And then clip their **** and then save it at a resolution. That's

not, you know, *****. 2160. Bro, just clip videos using this **** and export as MP4. Works every browser and you. Won't have six or six in the night. 62nd clips. ***** mongo wood. Thank you heart. I try to educate people and I never work ****. I suffer every day. No wonder why it's not going to ****. OK, here, let's try. Let's see how far along it gets.

Keffals: How did I come to that conclusion? Because you said you're transphobic today and you. Just said you believed the same things today that.

Augie: You're not answering the question, you're.

Keffals: You did yesterday, and you're transphobic.

Augie: You're refusing to answer the question.

Null: 10 seconds in OK so. Due to the. Due to punished Necco specifically and his immense failure in at Reencoding, these videos in the format that anyone could possibly ever possibly ***** hope to download off *** **** tour. As if this is the. Appropriate time to be uploading videos in 4K at the highest bit rate imaginable you may be. You may be unable to listen to some of the most annoying ***** people on this planet. Look at this ****. Look at this fat **** on the top right. Look at this. You see this? This is that SCP I was talking about. The person that's made of cow flesh and vomits up food made out of feces. And he has insightful commentary about transgender penis and what it tastes like. And unfortunately, due to Necco and his inability to clip, you will be denied that quality content. I'll let you steal on that for a second. I'll let you let that sink in. Oh, my God. Two minutes. 2 minutes I'm downloading a I'm downloading a 66 megabyte file, a ***** tour. It's gonna take two months.

Keffals: Actually, don't even know how to make an argument. It's so funny. For somebody that pretends to be a Vader of transitions online, you can't. Even prove how I would transform me before this.

Null: OK. Should we wait? Maybe I'll you know what I'll do. I figured it out, chap. Let these load right. And then I will come back to them after I've talked about other stuff I have done with this is what we're gonna do. I'm gonna try this is something I've never done before. I do have now, of course I. Remembered to download. The Ralph clip. This is something I would not forget. Actually this is less about Ralph than it is everybody then. Then somebody else in this video that I want to dab. On for a second. Let's play it.

Video Clip: I will tell you that a million times, it's the most abhorrent ***** thing you can do with a child and somebody who deeply cares about children. I do not want pedophilia to be a thing that is normalized or engaged.

Video Clip: Hey, you know what? I don't give a **** about children, except the two that. I have. I don't. Care like what?

Null: Take care of your own ***** kids like. OK, that's the clip. That's basically him just parroting with **** said. Like I don't care about other people's children. If other people's children is getting raped, then what impact does that have on me? Doesn't bother me. It's not my kids and I don't have kids, so therefore all forms of pe-

dophilia are completely and totally. The rehearsed statement by Vida Lupito that that I've heard like 3 or 4 different times, every single time he gets in a conversation with more than one person, someone says wait, aren't you that guy that's like a pedophile? That's like an open pedophile on Twitter talking about how you're a pedophile and he goes after 10. This a million ***** times. They'll vote in here, you know, it's most horrible thing. Love kids, but out in that way, no *****, no chomo. And it's like live on his knees now, but constantly repenting and begging for forget this. But he's not even doing that, really, because. You don't remember his original claim when Twitter was that someone was saying, like, virtuous pedophiles know that we should look but not touch or something to that effect, which is the virtuous pedophile thing is the thing that they briefly tried to push on. Like Salon, this idea that we can add pedophiles to the LGBT, since we're already doing ***** when. And pedophiles outright, and it didn't work. People were really disgusted by that. And they said it was a bad idea. So they aborted that scheme and but there was for a brief period of time, a virtuous pedophile movement where it. Was basically like. They're I'm pedophile. But I know it's a bad thing to do. So even though I'm attracted to kids, I said no. I know not to touch them because it's bad for their development and I love kids so much I don't wanna hurt them. Oh, I'm virtual with and this was something they were literally trying to add in to LGBT. Very brief amount of time before they realized that it would probably result in everybody involved in the LGBT movement being set on fire. They aborted, but that movement didn't disappear. And Vito ended up repeating it on Twitter. And when someone asked. So when you say we, what do you refer to? And he clarified that by we he meant including himself. And since then? He's had to constantly apologize for that and try to backtrack it, and it never works. But even when he says this, I'll repeat exactly what he says. So you can hear what I hear it again.

Video Clip: I will tell you that a million times it's. The most abhorrent *****. Thing you can do with a child and somebody who deeply cares about children. I do not want pedophilia to be a thing that is normalized or engaged.

Video Clip: Hey, you know what?

Null: He doesn't deny it. Maybe I cut it. It's clipped in such a way that the words I am not a pedophile are, like, clipped out of what he's saying. But he's still just repeating the virtuous pedophile thing. He says that it's a. A bad thing to do. he loves kids, but he knows that it should never happen to a child and it just sounds exactly the same way. You know, it's like it's just he's repeating in such a way that it makes it sound like he's saying that he's done a pedophile without literally denying being a pedophile. Because if you're not, if you're not English, you have a part of your brain that makes it so that it's difficult. So a lot of what a lot of some if someones caught in the lie and they're trying to. To get around, get out of it. What they'll do is they'll say something that sounds like a denial without actually saying anything. That is a lie, and this is like a a tell. Like if you're a Jim can't swim person, you watch crime interrogations, there's they'll point it out. Sometimes that they'll say things which are technically true as sort of a denial. To sort of get out of the question that they don't

like without having to actually deny it and lie. Though the British people don't have this part of the brain, British people are also psychopaths and they can all lie flawless, sly and they don't feel any shame. And then they believe their own. That's why they are are terrible and they're not white and I don't want anything to do with them. JC essence. Right, exactly. OK. Ohh, but I was gonna say in regards to Vito. Like it's really gratifying to see this ***** sick ***** ** ***** have to cry and *** constantly about how nobody likes him because he's a ***** freak. And I told *****, by the way. Before, before he hooked up with Vito. Even when he was just talking to. Did you, bro? Did you bro who was in open pedophile via lolicon. He said that he wasn't into real kids, but he loved jerking off to. Little girls being raped. I said you can't walk this back. You know, ***** that I said when I was 15 gets brought up constantly. You can never, ever, never. Doesn't matter what you do, what you say. How how you behave, how you live your life, who you know how, how, how much you clarify or apologize or whatever the ***** nobody will ever let you live that down. For the rest of. Your life and I told him this and he could have just avoided the issue. But then even after this, he did the whole ***** cuties thing and. He doubled down on on the cutie shift was OK and it was the best thing ever and he didn't give it about other people's kids and public schools are worse than Hollywood, cause more kids get raped in public schools. And then he met Vito while doing this. I think it was around this time that Vito started getting really involved in the streams. And now he's like a permanent fixture. I don't think a lot of people even know this, but *****, basically a lot of people remember the biggest problem in the universe with Maddox, but he's tried to revive the biggest problem in the universe with Vito. And it's like nobody ever talks about that. The only time I've ever mentioned this new reiteration of the biggest problem in the universe. Was when Vito was crying about how thankful he was that he managed to crowdfund like \$40,000. For his ***** comic book. And what's really funny about that is someone left me a ***** comment once saying I can't believe Josh is taking the side of the black guy. That veto is feuding with Bro. I don't even know anything about this. I just know that Vito should be curb stomped. American history X. Like, I don't know anything about who he's feuding with, who the black guy is. The merits of their comics. I don't give a ***** about any of that. I just like seeing Beetle cry. I don't need to. I don't need to take a side. So ***** you. It was talk about some guy named like July or something. His name was. Like July Childs or some *****. Some weird it was like Julia Childs, but like black defied or something. I really don't know Eric July. That sounds correct. Yeah, I definitely was not taking the side of him. I just AM. I mean, honestly, \$40,000 is too much for Vito. Leader should not be getting money for anything. That he does. Alright. Yeah. Eric, Juliet. OK, I now have a couple of the Algy clips so we can try to try to listen through them. Despite Nekos best efforts, I had managed to download this aught in 4K high quality. Footage. How do they?

Keffals: Come to that conclusion. Because you said you're transphobic today and you just. Said you believe the same things today that.

Augie: You're not answering the question, you're...

Keffals: You did yesterday, and you're transphobic.

Augie: You're refusing to answer the. Question you actually. Don't even know how to make an argument. It's so funny. For somebody pretends to be an invader of transitions on. Like you can't.

Keffals: Always got an argument.

Augie: Even prove how I would transform like before this poll today I just told you I transformed. You're saying there you. Is goes right but you. And improve it until I said it to you. Yes, because they ask.

Keffals: You, if you believe the same things. You believed today, yesterday. If you believe the same things, you. Believed today yesterday. That means that you had transposed yesterday.

Augie: So why did you call me transphobic and tensor? Why did you call me transphobic? And how did you come to that conclusion? What led you to that conclusion.

Null: Augie sounds like. He is trying. If if he. Is a machine learning model. That has digested. 16,000 hours of Destiny taking Adderall and trying to epically own people. I really thought this was Destiny at 1st, and then I clarified that that it was Algy. It is Algy that's talking right? It sounds just like Destiny. I don't know what the **** is going on, but it really does sound like a machine learning program trying to imitate destination. I don't mean that and like ohh he's definitely trying to imitate Destiny. He needs to stop like a like a Jim Walker or whatever the ****. It's just like I don't know if that's intentional, but. it sounds like that.

Augie: Are you crying?

Keffals: I don't think. That neither of us are going to be able to come to. A reasonable conclusion when you're.

Augie: Are you crying?

Keffals: No, I'm not crying.

Augie: You sound like you're trying.

Keffals: But this isn't funny. No, this is just something that you do because we want to a predominance of the. Like you're unable. To come at this from a logical perspective, you need to get emotional heated person.

Augie: You haven't been able to make a single argument.

Keffals: It's called or. Your argument is dead. You are bad. OK well do you.

Augie: Have anything to substantiate that or you just gonna?

Keffals: I never called you about earthquakes.

Augie: Or just gonna paint labels and pretend like that's an argument.

Keffals: I never called you a bad person.

Augie: You just call me transphobic.

Keffals: That's just something.

Video Clip: That you're talking.

Augie: You think that's a bad person? So explain to me why you thought that.

Keffals: Why? I thought what?

Augie: Why did you think I was transporting a picture stream?

Keffals: Why did I think you're transphobic? Because you are, I know. This you've admitted to it.

Augie: That's not an answer. You're not answering.

Keffals: Why do I act?

Augie: The question you can't make an argument wait, you actually. Can't make an argument there is a million things you could say to make.

Keffals: Probably admitted that to her transfer.

Augie: An argument you can't think of anything. Right now, are you high on coke?

Null: He sounds a lot like you know what he it sounds like he sounds like. Destiny, like blended together. I took a picture of something real quick. Let me find them. Take it here. Dude, this guy is fat as ****. Why does he? Why turn that camera off? How does this benefit you to put your fat ***** face out there? Really. Like for real? I don't even look. I don't know anything about tipster except like who? Like ones friends with with game star. I think he's like a training chaser, but damn what a fat piece. There's actually shocking that people watch this guy. Have you watched someone so ***** fat? Inspires me to lose more weight. You gotta you gotta stay on top of ****, otherwise you might look like tipster one day. Be ***** dead. OK, this is Part 2. Let me see what the stupid cat. Person posted about this. 10 minutes later, Audrey makes fun of Keflex's labels, but no substance. Acts of keflex's acts like I'm black. Acts of Keflex is going to the platform him. Keflex decides to Huff his own farts. What do you stand for? Those so much fundamentally greater than what I stand for. OK, let's hear Part 2 of the debate. I'm I'm curious where this leads to. I will ban the cat if all these clips suck.

Augie: Pick up new points because you're brought up anything. You have got. I can do that.

Keffals: I've brought up enough.

Augie: You haven't thought of anything.

Keffals: The problem is that you don't get.

Augie: You have labels. You have no substance. You have no substance.

Keffals: At this point I didn't bother.

Augie: You actually have you, actually. Have less substance in this call than the call, unless it's being between. Blacks and tips. It's actually hilarious. That's such a stupid ***** name. Who the ***** name themselves. Blow blacks, *****.

Augie: OK.

Keffals: No, I'm fine. It's just funny, ma'am. Is it funny are?

Augie: You having a good time?

Keffals: Yeah, I know it. It definitely really confirms a. Lot to me.

Augie: So what are you gonna do now? You gonna, like, depart from me or? What's the move here? I mean, all you've got is just labels. So like, what do you do beyond that? Just like ***** get me off the Internet. Kick me off. It's like I'm the next Nick Fuentes.

Keffals: What do you have?

Augie: I mean, I have a lot of arguments.

Keffals: Like, what do you what do you have?

Augie: You you're bothering.

Keffals: What do you stand? What do you stand for with so much? Fundamentally greater than what I stand for.

Augie: Well, I'm saying I'm a ***** YouTube.

Keffals: I don't understand. That will purchase commentary people.

Augie: Commentary ***** ** ****. I just talk about stuff online and. Have fun, however.

Null: OK, let's him. I mean, what do you do? You need to stand for something on the Internet. I guess when you're like a washed up like ***** icon that is now in disgrace cause you're like a drug addict who keeps spending \$100,000 of charity money, supposedly to fight the police on a. After nearly 20 minutes of being absolutely embarrassed, one view when keffel's leaves and to call mid sentence and comes back in with tipster as back up. So the fat man himself will make. An appearance like hold up. Take it out. I'm gonna do some real quick I'm doing. Another thing, check give me a second. OK, I take this and then I need a brush. I'm I'm currently. I'm currently in the midst of trying to use the new Linux for the purposes of a meme. Will will this be a huge embarrassment? Will this work ohh. Ohh **** yeah, this is working now hold up. It's a little bit finicky, but I'm. Doing it OK.

Speaker 10: Take the square.

Null: Now put that in like that, OK. We're coming in. I my meme. And who's coming in hot. OK, imagine imagine the music is playing. Imagine an alarm is blaring, the music is loud. Oh my God. Something's happening on the screen here. In a second, a challenger has appeared. He's a he's a big chungus. Who could it possibly be? Who is the challenger approaching? We don't know. I did not spoil it already. OK, OG clip 3.

Keffals: But I also don't really, I don't really trust.

Augie: Yeah, but in the well in the.

Keffals: You be good. Faith in the conversation considering in previous.

Augie: Then why'd you call?

Keffals: Because I wanted to see something. Because I was really.

Speaker 7: You wanted to.

Augie: What the **** does that mean?

Keffals: Yeah, I'm really curious. Oh, I wanted to. I wanted to figure out like. What your opinion was of the situation with leafy.

Augie: Amazing. They left the call. Oh, that's called me with tipster. Chad joined the call, tipster.

Keffals: Hello. Hello, big tipster tipster. Let's step start.

Null: So much yelling. I want to hear the fat man.

Augie: So Catholics has now fled a call from me and called tipster. For backup, this is some.

Null: Look at the people in this chat. She's so cowardly. There's a couple of people who are based. I'm speaking through the either I'm piercing the veil. Draft rule is based. This she ran. You're ***** gay. Shame on you, Muldoon. He's my boy in the southern chef.

Augie: Really cool stuff right here.

Tipster: What's going on?

Null: Well, that's it. That's all I get of my tips for content. OK, the cat continues. Algy later decides to add Oreo to the call to make it a 2V2. Not that it was really needed and Keppel immediately kicks him from the call and ask Audrey to invite someone else kicks him again before following, allowing him in. OK, here we come. Our boy, our boy, I think I might be reading the messages in the wrong order.

Oreo: I don't know, like everybody's acting like I backed that blacks and that's not what ***** happy.

Null: Don't, don't don't backstab blow blacks.

Augie: I mean, you were letting Caples just completely smear his image online.

Null: I don't know the **** that is, says tipster cheats on his wife. Don't forget that I can't imagine. Imagine audacity of this man to think I'm too big from one way I'm in. I need to. I need me a harem of women to satisfy.

Augie: Even though you. Defended box in the past when similar people made similar arguments, you know. Capitals, by the way, just kick your out of. The call Caples is a *****.

Null: Yeah, I don't wanna hear those words in the same sentence that makes me that literally makes me kind of nauseous.

Augie: Damn, so you add tips to the club but. When I add other. You won't let them in.

Keffals: Bring in someone. Else bring in bro. Are you mad?

Keffals: Bring in sober. Are you mad? Are you mad?

Augie: Add Nick to the call again. Yo, what's up, Nick? What? The hell man.

Null: OK. This is the last one. Kefalas complains about the chat spamming, total training death and has laughed at for knowing what it means to TD rather and for know what means. I don't know what that means. Only you do sounds like you read more Kiwi farms than I do. Proceeds to them so they don't know how to find Kiwi farms. Now that it's on the chair now, right? You know, then kicks Oreo when Oreo recurrency comes with the banger response. You can find meth in the dark, but you can't. Find Q forms.

Keffals: In response to are you bringing up me?

Speaker 5: Have I been?

Keffals: People are spamming in chat, TTD, which stands for total true death like just.

Augie: That's not what it stands.

Keffals: For cancels, I remember the sucker is what is.

Speaker 7: That means only.

Augie: You 2, that's not what else. It stands for.

Speaker 7: All that says.

Keffals: Read more Kiwi forms.

Speaker 7: Than I do.

Augie: It stands for.

Keffals: I don't actually even know how.

Null: To get on it. Oh, no, look. the chat Luna Lizzy is deleting the base TT deers in the in the GRC fact. I have a RGRG. I'm making a report right now. Give me a second. I'm I'm I'm filing my report. OK, listen. This right here. I'm going to identify. For destruction and reaching through the veil yet again, where is it? I have identified this. This Luna, Lizzy. I hate to break it to you, is a Troon. They must be destroyed. They must be eliminated and they must be gotten rid of. It's no good. It's bad news. You see them in the chat conspiring against your own users. Poor, innocent stream guist. Boxing has been betrayed by Luna, Lizzie, and you know why? You know where. Their true allegiance aligns.

Keffals: Now that it's not on the clear net.

Null: Oh, I'll rewind it.

Keffals: Now that it's not on the.

Speaker 7: Clarinet, but I do.

Augie: It stands for.

Keffals: I don't actually even know how to get on it now that it's not on the clear net. Nothing, to be honest.

Augie: It stands for total tips or domination.

Keffals: We thought if your dog whistles whistling.

Augie: It stands for total tips or domination, but that's actually pro tips right now. I don't know if you knew this, but my chats actually been really against me since I've started. The tips to arc. So they're actually cheering.

Video Clip: OK. Then it's just so such like tipster, isn't it sad?

Keffals: Of a ***** he is he.

Augie: You literally just sits and Nick out 20 times in a row while you just added new. When you added tipster.

Keffals: And you gotta love the one.

Augie: Ohh are your *****?

Keffals: You gotta you gotta. Love the *****? Ohh no.

Speaker 10: You gotta love the way they over exaggerate. Like the way that Nick said. I'm responding to every comment and my promise that didn't happen, but OK. What's up, nick? Welcome.

Keffals: Back how can you?

Speaker 7: Find mess on the dark web, but you can't find Kiwi farms.

Null: Oriol that said that. I must rescind my bullying of Nick Diorio. I don't know if someone gave him that line, but that's really funny. Nick Diorio is no longer a minor League Baseball coach at Buffalo Wild Wings, waiting for a plate of hot and spicy

tendies for. He is instead the coach of a Major League Baseball game that goes to Longhorns and gets a nice 44 ounce steak we have. We have elevated the man to a higher echelon of debate rooms where he belongs, for coming up with a good one liner. No, that's where you. That's the pits. That's where you send people. I feel like I'm an egg. I'm being dumped into the boiling water or whatever. The **** this **** is. Or kettles is still relevant and people line up to make fun of them except for except for this guy. Fat schlub, who would suck a **** *? Isn't it shocking knowing what they look like, what the chasers look like in real life when you see those people say, actually trans women are women? This is the face that's typing that message. The actually, if I were to date a tramp woman, that wouldn't make me gay. Cause trans women are women. That's the face. That's what it looks like. There is actually one more thing I don't know this clip from elsewhere. I can find it. I think this is the part Augie RFC.

Augie: It's not enough, so **** it. I don't care anymore about **** pronouns. Or any of this. ****, I don't. And I'm sick and tired of pretending like I have to. It's meaningless. It's nothing. It's never enough. And you can. Sit there and. Say oh, whoa, there, there he goes. Off or whatever, it doesn't change. They've been calling me transphobic my entire **** career, so **** it. Mask off if that's what it looks like to you. Ohh yes, when mask off, yes.

Null: OK, that's pretty. That's pretty nice. It's nice to see that the, the, the slow horses, the donkey race that's been going on in the keemstar adjacent community is finally. Like, yeah, these method dicted **** and they're fat. **** chasers are really just up to no good, and they'll never accept anything short of total submission as as good enough. Sure is sure is shocking that they're like this. If only we had had any way of knowing about this at. Any point in the? Last six **** years. At least things are at least nature is healing. However, I have to. I have found the content lacking and as such I will be putting neko whatever the **** his name is into the bag and throwing him off the bridge. Very, very unfortunate things have to be this way. But like I can't. I just can't leave it down. OK, I do have. Ohh wait, hold up. I have been given something at the last second. One of my inner circle has provided to me content. Which I will now attempt to watch. This is from tiktok.com at just so Tippy. Check it out.

Video Clip: As I'm sure a lot of you guys are aware right now, there are a lot of people who are big mad on the Internet because the makers of. This beer Anheuser Busch decided to use a trans influencer to promote their products. Never mind the fact that they, as part of this marketing campaign, hired a ton of different influencers from various different backgrounds to promote their products. But because they hired this one trans influencer, suddenly that's enough to boycott the company now, quite frankly, as somebody who's a regular drinker. I don't give a **** who promotes my beer. They can choose whoever they want to promote the product. I just drink beer because I like drinking beer, but I think it's really silly that there's so many people who are mad about this whole ordeal because they can't accept that. Yes, trans people

drink beer too, and I don't have a problem with that because I prefer to treat all people like people.

Null: I just realize. Look at this. Look at that. I didn't notice that in the big chunk is thing cause it's so dark, but look at all those ***** toys and **** in the background. So this man is on TikTok uploading videos of himself drinking beer. and simping for ***** in a room of filth and garbage. Look, look at this. Look ohh dude dude, he has a he has a box of the figure. That's the person from that, that ***** video game that. Anime video game that. That's the person that Ralph hates. he has a Haru okinami figurine from the anime game. Oh wait, that's Catherine. I thought that. I thought that was Haru. Ohh I was not excited anymore. I don't give a. I thought that was how I thought. That was funny, but that's not funny anymore. If it's some other gay ****, they all look the ***** same. Jeff really think that all white people look the same, huh? This is embarrassing. Look, he gets like 100 views on his videos, too. Is this guy? Like completely irrelevant. Why is this guy? I'm really not the. Type to be like. Oh my God, he doesn't have any. Viewers. So his. Points aren't relevant. Tipster Twitter, I think I looked. This up before on. And but and I laughed at it. I'm I'm remembering this now. He has 5000 followers and then TikTok where he drinks beer to epically own the transphobes. In his room full of child vital product. Get like 400 users. This is pathetic, bro. You gotta kill yourself. I'm already at TOS this episode, so I'm just gonna say it. You're ***** sad. You should find a. I can't say that. That's not if he does it. Might be in trouble. I'm just saying, if I was you here, I'll frame it like this. If I was you, I would have no impetus to live anymore. And I would find a rope. Thick enough to hang my fat ***, and I would jump off a ***** chair. What a sad existence. Only if that was me, of course. you do you. I'm not implying you. Should do anything. But if it was me, I would have trouble getting out of bed. I mean, I'm sure you have trouble getting out of bed. I would have. Enormous, not just for physical restraints, but the mental agony of waking up each day. It would hurt me. Alright, let's continue on before I get strike five special special content the Reddit moment I have endeavored. I have endeavored to find some extra bonus Reddit content. Because everyone liked the last one. So I have something special. This one is not as funny, but it's really sad. Well, this one, this one's just funny. This guy is just a trend that plays a bunch of video games. But he says, and this this I'm looking at an archive because the original was. The original was. Locked or blacked out? The Destiny Fashion subreddit is in protest right now with the Reddit ****, so I had to find the archive. But he says. My journey of discovering myself as trans has led me to cut ties with my male Titan who have had since season of arrivals, a female one is now in his place, absolutely dreading regrinding behemoth and berserker, though. And then he shows off his Destiny fashion. As you can see, Mr. God of War, Seven might have to change his name to missus. Out of war seven at some point. But he's got the trans icon and the trans icons holding like it's like a trans thing. So I guess if you're, I guess if you're the kind of person who, you know has Funko pops lining the back of your house and you and you cheat on your wife. With ***** , you and you're playing Destiny,

and as you're playing with other people, you just see trans ****. Well, even notice the trans thing holding the icon, the BLM ***** fist that's holding the lightning bolt like Zeus. You just get to see that. While you're playing and you have no opt out, you are just forced to see that constantly. I mean, at least in dead by daylight, when I'm the killer, I can tunnel the truing flags extra hard and make them suffer for their choices. And Destiny, you have to like Co-op with these people so you don't even. Have the choice to like block them and get and make them upset. Such as life. So this other guy. This is his first post that's available on on Reddit. From two years ago. Says how do I get this indoctrination out of my head and our ex Catholic, he says. Sometimes I feel like the only way I can possibly be happy is by forcing myself back into the church. I could just allow its rigid structure reject being transgender and live a conventional life where I don't feel constantly out of place. I feel incomplete without the church and nothing has been able to replace it. I get so caught up in the I'm going to hell for XYZ and feel like ****. It feels like I'm going to hell and I can't do anything about it for so long. I thought my problem was that I lost faith, but then I'm realizing the problem was having faith to begin with. I was tricked into joining a cult and my now my life has felt empty since I lost that cult 7 years ago. I've tried filling that hollow. Space left by Catholicism with sex, *****, alcohol, romantic entanglement, self harm, politics, philosophy. None of them work, and I feel incomplete. Being a trans woman just makes it all the worse, since I feel like I'll never pass as a woman making me feel like I should stop transitioning and run back to the church. The church was the only place I where I felt a sense of community. It felt like someone loved me and was looking out for me, but I realized that if God did exist, much like my dad, he was physically present but totally disengaged, cold and spiteful. I just want the indoctrination to go away. I want to forget about how good it felt going to mass every week, how good it felt at to alter, serve how good it felt to be loved and. Cared for in my life. How do I make all these thoughts stop? How do I figure out who I am without Catholicism defining me? Wow, if I really wanted to like go like. To fully unpack this, I could unpack a lot about this. However I wanna. I wanna laugh at this part in particular. If God did exist. Much like my dad, he was physically present but totally disengaged, cold and spiteful. There's an old common filth quote from the Tumblr resas where he said that a lot of this **** is just **** you mom and Dad. And this is like a a perfect quote for like, a Tumblr Reese's episode, but **** you mom and Dad so much. Like this is. Just anger at at your at your. Parents manifesting into like how you treat other people in other communities and organizations in your life. This is a sad story, but it's like it's really it's so crazy that it's that it's real cause this feels like something a troll would set up. And there's more. I have more post, but it feels like something a troll would be. Doing but I've read through the profile. And I'm totally convinced that it's not a troll in this post. It's in true off my chest. He's a very frequent poster in childhood PTSD. The DSD, but in this one it's about my brother abused me. My parents didn't care. So from the ages of 6 to 13, he was physically and sexually abused by his brother. And apparently when he told his parents, they didn't. Do anything to stop it. And then

it continues. This post and are adult survivors. I'm worried I'm trans just because of rape. Long story short, I transitioned male to female over two years ago. I realized I was trans because I felt uncomfortable with my genitals, and I felt like I wasn't a real man. I wouldn't say I regret it, but there's a lot of times I wish I could have just been a normal guy. I wish I could have been admirable and looked up to and said of a freak. I still feel like I'm just a failed man. I don't know whether I still just haven't let go of all my masculine. Programming I was fed growing up, or if I was really a man, but I don't feel like I deserve to be because of what happened. I guess I'd appreciate some guidance if anyone has it. January 30th and this one about the Catholic Church was November 13th, 2021. This was January 2022. And then this post is I think. So two months after that post he posted this. In Rd. trans. I have permanently *****
</verbatim>*</verbatim> my life. I'll never have fully functioning genitals again. I can never have blood children. I am the antithesis of impulsive, but the one time I do act too quickly, I end up ***** my life up. I am an outcast. I am unlovable. What was done to me as a child isn't to blame for my choice to transition, and neither is anyone or anything else. The blame is on me because I walked into that clinic and made my decision and I made a horrible ***** decision. How can I trust myself ever again? How can I be certain about anything if I feel so certain about that? But I'm a ***** nut case. What am I living for? I just have drifted through my life so far. The only place I belong is a jail cell because it feels like it's a matter of time before I hurt somebody. I'm so damn angry at everything and I want revenge against the whole ***** world. I think two months after this. In May 10th. So yeah, two months after this in. Our **** addiction. 228 clean for 228 days. Threw it away. 228 days. I've come so ***** far and I ***** it all up for something so fleeting and unrewarding that just makes me feel like **** at the end of the day and then my brain has the audacity to want to go back and watch it again and again. Even though I've established that nothing good comes from this, I seriously wish I didn't have a sex drive. I ***** all. So this guy. Is starts realizing literally, realizes that he misses the church. And that a lot of his problems are psychological. Quits ***** starts to detransition. About 100 days free of ***** Breaks that and then after that by the way. He stops posting. This is on May 10th, he says. What helped you break your cycle of eating disorders? He says that he increased his Med dosage to kill appetite. And then he says that he moved in with his partner last week and. As a depressed addict, because I had fallen into a pretty bad depression and said it's the worst it's been in the while, my stuff is all over the place and I made their home into a giant ***** mess. I'm looking for a job since I just graduated from college. He's like, really young, like 20-4 years old. But I always dismiss any job opportunity I find because I'm afraid to fail. To top it off, I relapsed some **** addiction today because I don't have anything else to make. Me feel good. Besides that, they'll come home from work soon. I'll have to explain why my apartment doesn't look any better than this morning. Why I didn't? Do the dishes. I just relapsed. I'll have to tell them how I'm depressed. Now that we finally get to live together again. Sometimes I wish they'd just hit me or yell at me, or assault me again.

Again, just so I can feel something. Besides all this depression, it's a matter of time before they kick me out and I'll have to move in with my parents or go to a residential facility somewhere. I wish I wasn't such a ***** parasite. And then that's his Last Post 11 months ago. Pretty pretty. It's just it's. Just he has, like, everything. Like he, he is so. So archetypal of the people that we imagine ***** to be just like summed up. He, by the way. He also posted a depression or a. A subreddit for alcohol addiction and **** too. So he's, like, got all. Devices he has an eating disorder. He has an alcohol addiction. He's seriously he's addicted to ***** and he knows that that led him to. The transition and then when he stopped looking at *****, he detransition he blames us all on sexual abuse. He tries to that he says that it's not that it's his fault, but that's the source of it. It's really sad.

Ted Kaczynski

That's kind of my lead in to talking about Ted Kaczynski, I guess. Ted Kaczynski's dead and I wanted to write him at some point, but I decided against it because I felt like anybody who writes Ted Kaczynski is going to get put on a list. And I feel bad. I want to. Write him after. His diagnosis of her cancer came in. I felt like I say I want a list. I know I'm already on a list, but I just didn't wanna invite problems into my life and he. Couldn't I sat down and I was thinking about what to write him. And I couldn't think of anything. I wanted to kind of outline to him. How terrible everything is and how he's really not even missing anything. Being in the outside because it's just like a a ***** nightmare. They decided against that cause it's like I don't know. I didn't want to be too depressing and write a man in prison and say, like, Nah, really. It's better in there because it's like it sucks. He mentioned in his book that he had gender issues he wanted. He was seriously considering transitioning, and this was back in like the 60s. So he goes into one of the first gender clinics in the world that's in Colorado, and he visits the doctor there. He sits in the waiting room and around him. Are transvestites some of the first adopters of the transvestite lifestyle? It's now just called being transgender, and he was literally so disgusted. That he likes had a psychological break. He quit his job. He moved to Montana and he started sending pipe bombs in the mail to academics because he was so angry at them for the agenda they had pushed. He was so prescient in everything that he said the. Thing the most. Important things about what he wrote about in industrial society and its future. What he called the over socialized male. And it's true that is the issue. That people are are being LED down this road where the most important thing in their life is how others perceive them, and it lets people. It lets people. People become completely obedient to having people think a certain way about them, and it overrides everything else in their life. It overrides their interest in. Their performance and their self fulfillment and starting families and being authentic to themselves, being male. We're being female even and it's. Industrial society and its consequences have been a disaster for the human race. And so I. I do encourage people to read his book. And

ironically, cause it is interesting. Not everything is very agreeable and he is a he is, I think, most controversially, a direct proponent to violence. He explains how the system adores violence and how even when proponents of the system and engage in violence such as the police, like with the George Floyd shift, the system will come down very hard on them. Because it does not want violence. It doesn't even want violence from the system. The system prefers not to use violence whenever possible. If it can coax people into conformity and obedience without violence, it will always prefer to do that, and it will never directly try to use violence to quell things, because violence begets violence and the system is terribly afraid of violence. It's extremely interesting, very, very thought provoking. Because of its age and what it says about transgender **** in particular and over socialization. You say except. Blacks but the prison system is full of blacks. The prison system is mostly blacks. I think it's the despite being 13% of the population, there are more than half of the like what, 3 million people currently in prison, right? Now it's mostly blacks because the system will try not to tolerate violence from blacks. If it can, it's just that black areas are so violent and the police are so understaffed that they can't really enforce the system as well as they can in the black areas. Yeah, it's, it's. Something they tolerate. They really don't. Leftists might tolerate black violence as being rebellion, but the system itself unanimously comes down hard on violence because of, and I do agree with that.

I have read the systems need this trick. The systems need this trick. Is this other writing? It's very good. It explains again it goes into detail about how the system like you it perpetuates itself accidentally. It's sort of like an Organism as he explains that has coincidentally kind of through. Sort of coincidence. it's like evolution. Evolution is happenstance, but at the same time, it's inevitable. It's inevitable that under certain circumstances, life will evolve to have certain features to overcome those circumstances. In the same way, the system is brilliant in its design, and it doesn't require design because. This happenstance, but at the same time the set of circumstances that that exist in industrial society force it to exist. It is inevitable that that these that this system will develop itself, and the system perpetuates, and it encourages obedience and so on and so forth, almost accidentally. And it's not it, doesn't it? It's brilliant and that it explains how there is both a conspiracy and also there is no conspiracy in some ways that so many, so many facets of the system plug into the system and operate the system. But you don't have to demonstrate direct conspiracy between those components. Because the system just encourages it and it is self replicate. Creating an ingenious and it doesn't require a direct meaning of the mind, it just has a way of existing and encouraging compliance and encouraging people and corporations to do what it wants to do without necessarily needing to come and say do this. it's really brilliant. And yes, Yarvin is also a lot like that when he talks about the cathedral, he's basically talking about what? But Kazansky would call the system and it is true. that's the that's the difficult thing to understand is that when you say there's like a. Piracy of certain people to perpetuate the system then, people will say, well, there's no conspiracy because you know nobody has to reach out to Anheuser-Busch and say,

run this gay **** on your bud light, because that's what we want. It's just that the system encourages it indirectly and people try because they're over socialized and for various financial interests, they try to. Be a part of the winning side, the, the right side of history and participating in the system without actually having to be forced to do so. And that is the systems in this trick.

I'll leave it there. I don't wanna go on too long and talk philosophy cause I know. That's **** gay. And nobody wants that, however. I am considering. Doing a reading of one of Kaczynski's books for the Gummer people cause I've been neglecting the Gumroad people. I'll look at that and see. I know I'm not the most talented elocutionist. I'm not the best reader of stuff, but it would be funny. It would be a nice meme, so I may do it just for just for funsies. And then you can then all those people who said, well, I might read it one day, they could just listen to me instead and not actually not actually have to.

Outro

OK. And with that, I think I have. Ohh, I was gonna do the ultrasound. No, I have. Donation alert? Yeah. I will now go into show mode. I will read those. So thank you for listening, not interested in the Super chat ****. You can tune out. You wanna stick around? I, of course. OK, let's see. Sign in via YouTube. And recently I probably should done this while I was talking, but I was so into it that I couldn't. Saturday, let me get. Let me get swing of water chat. I'm feeling dehydrated. Been doing too much talking, you know. How it is? OK.

OK, anonymous for \$4.86 says; "hey, Josh. Sad to see the passing uncle Ted. May I ask you to do an audio book of his manifesto? It would be Kino." Wow, what a coincidence. Maybe I feel. I mean, I feel a little bit inspired to do that. It might take a while to. I suppose it would be worth it depends on how long it is. I look at his writings and see which is like the shortest or most possible to read. Journey Journey Journey for \$101.00 says hi what an amazing super chat. Probably the best super chat I've ever received. Thank you Gurney. I appreciate it very much. You gay for 10, says catbox file. And then it's a move file which I can't play. 6 Gigabit OK, hold up. I'll open this real quick. Let me mute my sound and I'll watch this and. See what it is. I will play this. It's a I of the white. Guys, let let me sit on your face white guys thing. OK, hold up. I will accept this even though I should not.

Video Clip: I'm in love with Joshua Connor Moon's farts. I'm in love with Joshua Connor Moon's farts. I want to smell Joshua Connor moons farts. I want to smell Kiwi Farms users, farts sit on my face, Josh for \$100.

Null: Chris, thank you. Total cyclist distraction for 10 says YouTube like Ohh Boy, we're off to a great start. This is gonna be a four hour long stream. OK, there's a guy driving. He's got a rear view dashboard Cam and a front facing dashboard Cam that appears to be in New York. Based on the Orange license plates. The cyclists cut in. He falls down on his bike path. And the driver has left. He's doing the Joker lot.

I didn't even know that I saw him. I saw him. Oh yeah, he hits the concrete barrier. Why is that there? What is the point of that barrier to stop cars from coming in? It's like a different color and everything that's just a hazard to the cyclist. What a stupid thing to put. Pope Urban pretends. Are you concerned that letting chat bait you into trashing your data might strain relationship a bit too much? Don't let chat make you trash your friendship. Nick's best episodes or just ones? I don't know. We don't talk that often, he. it's difficult because. Like I haven't watched his dreams in forever and all I see are like these really ***** things that he's doing when like, ***** drunk and it's like. I feel compelled to talk about them, and it's not entirely like chat forcing me to do it because there's this one guy that's been asking me to talk about Dragon Lord for like 8 weeks. And I still talked about Dragon Lord, but. Yeah, it's, it's, it's just weird. I really wish you would just chill. Out a bit. You know what I mean. But yeah, it would be nice. It like it would be nice. If he was like, chill again and then we had stuff to talk about. It's like a cop out answer. I don't feel like chat. It's chats fault though. That makes sense. Anime for five, says Josh. I have learned that the fine lady who was raped and murdered trying to prove Muslims are peaceful was named Pippa Bacca. This is reminiscent of another Pippa, who is also a Baka parentheses, stupid Allah willing. She will also be raped and murdered. That's very mean. Yeah, I will leave it at that. You want the ***** rabbit to be raped and rude. OK. Yeah, that's that's pretty mean. But she is an anime and also maybe not a woman. So I don't know. Twinkle Tower for \$100 says good day, Sir. I hear you are in the market for a pickup truck. OK. Hear me out. Baldo for truck nuts. \$1,000,000 idea right there. Those already exists. You can put all. Sorts of stupid ***** on the *****. On the Ohh a baldo to put one truck nuts. OK, I got what you're saying. Yeah, it's a million. I pitch it to pitch it to Baldo, telling you trying to sell them a a truck nuts that have a baldo on. The pinnacle of ball sex truck, truck nuts, accessories. Thank you, Cookie for five cents die. No thank you. But thank you. Danza trigger for five says I like the money. I'm so glad we have that in common. Thank you very much. Roxanne will, for five, says bark bark parenthesis, is the only LGBT acronym I recognize is Luna got big *****. Happy heterosexual LGBT month. I do not. Endorse fraternizing with other furies in the furry chat in a sexual manner and bringing it to my super chats. OK, I do not cosign this at all. Forgetful Kiwi for 486 says they blocked passing out ropes in the party chest at the end of the Pride event in Falador. That wasn't the West has fallen. Ohh, you can't put rope into the party. OK, that was something. OK, so in Runescape there is a a party hall in Falador. It used to be in. Sierra's village, but they moved that to Falador now. And basically what you do is people can load up a chest full of *****, like rare ***** and money. And then you pull a a lever in the ground is covered in balloons, and people can run around and pop the balloons, and they can pick up loot and it's. It was a formalization of something in the original Runescape called drop parties, where someone would just literally run around the map and drop items and they had like a little delay before they became visible. So people used to do it like that, and then they added the chess, the party, chess, and old school

Runescape with membership only. And you could do that. So they would do that as a formal event, say oh, it's pride, everyone come have this nice drop party in the Falador Party chest and people would load it with ropes so that when the troops were running around picking up their goodies that the moderators had put into. The chest they would instead receive only rope as a subtle indication. Perhaps the party goes that they didn't felt a specific way. That's sad to hear that that's been fixed now for five. Says hello, Josh. I'm working on my feminine cough. Want to hear? I sound cute. It's a little loud. Everyone should send in theirs too. OK, this might be extremely cringe. Let me preview it. OK, this guy. Is just a smoker and he's very proud of his dying coughing. I think I think you need to work. On the attack. You just got to make the attack more feminine and the rest of. The cough will follow. Clear note for five, says YouTube ## dot hover hyphen area dot division greater than dot, YouTube hyphen reaction, hyphen control, hyphen, panel, hyphen view hyphen, model dot style hyphen scope is the filter I use to block the new emoji button. Your blocker might format that filter differently, but that's the dev code, so use oh. He's talking about how to get rid of that. Get on my ***** screen. OK, let's see. I will give you. One chance at this. They have a giant thing of display none somewhere I can find it. OK, I cannot find it. Ohh there it is OK. OK. Hey, it's fixed. Thank you, Nancy for 486 that I never really watched godwins and stuff until recently. He does seem very funny and entertaining, but so hard to enjoy him with his wrestling brain. What is everyone in the sector except you act over the top? And sensationalist, because it's a way to pad out content. I don't know. He calls it showmanship. You don't act like over the top about absolutely everything that it's not showmanship, but I disagree. I think it's best when things speak for themselves. Second mass for pipe says how do I use this? I think you're using it. Just fine my friend. Just fine and. I think you forgot the 0. Justiceburg for 10 says another 20 seconds. Thank you for doing. This Josh, OK. Here we go. This is Justin. Starting from 40 seconds into the audio. Specifically, whether it's never. OK, we're at one minute now that is very daft. Punk inspired, I would say. Thank you, the Emperor of Sega for 5000 here at Sega. We believe that love is loved in person is illegal. Science is real. Black Lives Matter, and most importantly, that all trans rights are human rights. I was led to believe these sentiments would be popular with listeners of your streams. Very popular. Feel free to contribute anytime you'd like with similar statements. Thank you chocolate wombat for 25 says finally catching alive. You have some pizza. I mean, even if you're gonna ruin it with hollandaise sauce, you gave us a place where we can sneeze the least. I can do is feed thank. You I probably. Will do exactly that. If when I think about it, but yeah, we. Fingers crossed we should have some good news this week and then we'll be back up. But yeah, it's been the pain in my ass and I'm just waiting on other companies at this point. Because I'm tired of. I'm trying tired of trying to find new new ***** to use and I would like to prop up existing people I know are reliable. So that's why I've just been patient as opposed to being more aggressive when. I could be though. I will become more aggressive and start doing reverse proxying and ***** if I have to pretty soon. Burger meat for 10 says

you will enjoy this paceboard.co slash link to an image. This is quite long. I'm thinking if I've already read this before. I don't think I have actually. OK, this is very funny. I will read this. This is bonus content for you guys, I guess even. It's quite long. There's a nice picture of a pooner watching *** **.

"Sex party disorder not safe for work. High F to M throw away because my main account had house blah blah blah. This happened pre COVID. I was invited to a sex party for men only on January weekend. My guy I know from my peer group at college I was really excited to go. He is queer and very inclusive of others. And was extremely validated to be asked to join. I asked him if other people there would be so inclusive and told me not to worry about it. Like I know, but I trusted him over at the house. The party was held at. It was quite different, 100% of them in there were cis. This isn't a problem generally. I noticed that even I wouldn't fit in even though. I sort of pass. FYI, two months on T. Two months on T, pretty top and bottom, but I dressed really masked so completely normal woman just except two months on tea. In his flat chested, the series didn't make me feel any more at ease. It was like nobody wanted to interact with me even though I made a. Lot of effort to help people and approached them. They all had this deer in. The headlight type expression they would just end up. Leaving the conversation abruptly or making some ***** excuse to go hit on another guy, I ended up just clinging to my friend for most of the night. The only thing I could do is try to ease my nerves by getting more drunk. I'm 21. Party gradually progressing, the people, taking clothes off, and eventually there was a full on doing it. My friend tried to convince me to join in the fun after a pep talk that the people there weren't transphobic, just I see I was feeling more confident because of the Dutch courage anyway, so I ended up taking my shirt off and moving into the main space where everything was happening. People physically recoiled for me when I walked near them and made faces at me. It was like I had a ***** forest filled around me. It felt like hours cruising around, but it was really only about two minutes before I had enough. I cried in the bathroom for like half an hour before my friend found me. While I was in there, a few people knocked wanting to use it and I told them to go away and cry on the other side of the door. I heard someone that even think I think that girl is still in there. I never had felt this for you like this before and I don't think I. Can go on with my life this way. I know my man, but never feel more invalid at that point in my life."

Gay men are brutal, OK? Of it, and this was the picture I meant to read this so you could actually see it, but this is the pooner meme that I mentioned. The gay men are having at it and he's. Just sorry, she. Let's not be gender invalid here. Standing in the corner, being a pooner, very sad about it. Such as life. Such as life when? You decide to chop off parts of your body. Ginger Digger for 21, says, hey, Josh, keep up the good work. I know you have a \$10.00 for clips. And I hope this is enough for two music videos. I'm honestly never gonna get the **** with this. What is this? It's just some a song. You want me to play like. Some of your songs like OK, I can do that.

This is Louis logic, the ugly truth, and I kind of liked it before the vocals kicked in.

And this is the Ukrainian version of the South Park song. I OK, I see what's going on. OK, I will show this one because it doesn't make sense. I don't know who this was. For I feel like. You made this and sent this to me. It has 14 views. Yes, you didn't make this. Who is this? I don't know if this is like Pro Ukraine or anti Ukraine. I don't get it. I mean, I like South Park. I just don't know who this is supposed to like. Make fun of Ukraine or or, like, be pro Ukrainian. I really don't get it. Thank you. Well. Rack Cooper for 50, says bark bark thanks for giving us a place to talk about the gross drama. The Lord Tony had his streaming career detailed by some block lenders. I figure you get. A kick out of it. OK, let's see. TinyURL to what? OK, here we go. I will read this cause this guy is a is a pet local and has been for about 25. King Tony with the O being when was crossed out Danish O's he gets banned every so often, so his name went from like King, Lord Tony to Lord Tony with the cross out. Ohh to King Tony to King Tony with the cross out. Oh, he's been to like 80 different count. So this is March 9th, 2023 by King Tony on the Blackland Forum in the Off Topic Drama section, which is the. Birthplace of the Kiwi forms. Basically he is posting on a dead website for a dead game. Nobody actually plays Blockland anymore and there's like a handful of people. 400 guests, mostly bots and five users online in the last 15 minutes, idle subpixel smashed eggs, Master King, Dead Dude in Una Nova two or one of the five active users on this ***** site talking about Blockland. Still, even though it's been dead and completely abandoned by bad spot for literally like 20 ***** years now. A few of you are asking why I'm acting weird or out of character all of a sudden. My Blockland history was uncovered and released to Twitter by a former Blockland user. Ohh goodness me, what a tragedy. Boo Hoo Hoo. What a what a what? A disaster would be a shame if that ever happened to anybody. They're Blockland history. What a what? What a real infringement of personal privacy. They pose as a regular and plan to troll the group to pose as regulars, and then they would wait until the time was right to release the Blockland info, imposing as regulars of the most damage because they befriended a lot of my followers and mods, they were not genuine fans of me. They were not genuine friends. The form was basically a Call of Duty lobby. We were just trolls trying to one up the other troll I was just. One who went above and beyond the other trolls and stood out. Now, I said some terrible stuff and nothing I can do to make up for that. I can't even begin to explain the context of 15 years of people outside of Blockland forms. But you guys know the context. You guys know that I was just trolling these in shock bait being ironic. Sarcastic, joking, etcetera. I've entertained you guys for years. It's like 30 something like 30. Some of you probably will mention me to your friends occasionally. Some of you guys know I was a character. Others could never tell, so I'm trying to move away from the Blockland forms to find new trolling targets. I was an admin for a stuffed posting group called Fallout Rad posting. I just like the like. I just like Blockland stood out and everyone recognized me. I went from absolute nobody to admin. Overnight, not only. Also, not only I moved away from Blockland, I moved away from tribal humor and rage. Posting started becoming an actual tribal cesspit of toxic people who weren't joking at all. So is Adam that tried to remove that

garbage only for the owner to tell me to forget off? Forget off his. That spot has for guests a not safer work fencer filter that's similar to. Something awful, so forget off. It's just buck off. I can't do that. So I left. Then I moved away from RAG posting and moved on to Adult Swim and used my personality becomes zero to nobody overnight. Once again, I met with several celebrities, been on a few shows. Mike Lazzo himself walked over and said to me I. Know what who you are. Your Lord Tony and shook my hand then. AT&T bought adults and merged it with Discovery, and the rest is history. Like I was forced out of Adult Swim thanks to AT&T and stuck with dead by daylight, just like Blockland right posting Adult Swim. I went from nobody that kind of well known overnight. My twitch was getting an actual following and I was making certain former block lenders jealous. Oh my God, the former block lenders gamers are saving with jealousy for Lord Tony. But it seems like I can never escape Blockland. My past will always come back and haunt. Me and tell me about it. *****. I tried living. Peacefully, you know, was thrown back into the chaos. I should have never tried to hide my Blockland passing away. We are kind of forget it up family or funk up family. I've known some of you guys for over a decade now. I've grown and moved away from this type of tribal. What does tribal mean? I'm trying to figure out what what word filter that is this type of tribal shock humor I displayed on Blockland forms. It's no longer what I do now. I never associate with tribals and never will. He's an ex Nazi in Argentina. Dude, you gotta when your ex Blockland, you have to, you have to go to a tattoo shop and get Eric Hartman's name lasered off. Your your wrist cause. That's the towel. They roll up your sleeve and start looking for it, cause everyone's got it. Very good, very funny. Average block lender very average. Let me sit on your face, Josh, for five measly dollars says even my normally booner Granny spoke up about not liking pride or all the *****, and she's kind of the person to talk about gays just being just like everyone else and just let them be. Dude, it's happening the the. Sisyphus, the boulder is rolling back down. Sorry to be a true and sorry you chopped off all your *****, but you will never be accepted. You will never be a woman. 10 says you're wrong about the meat. Gersh go to a US state that isn't some culturally enriched ship box. You city slicker. **** also, thanks for strings and doing two of them now. I've almost run out of podcast shows and other ****. I'm willing to listen to. I am not wrong if you know a store that is selling non USDA inspected beef, you are going to a store. That is operating in contradiction to U.S. Hate to break it to you. Thank you for listening to the show. Josman, 14, says Ringle is Deutsche Megaminds. Are owls or something? What do you think of this as a bumper sticker? And then said YouTube short. OK, he says don't do me out of this. And it is a short, so let's see. OK new rule for the Super chats #1. I'm about to make them \$50 minimum. Because I'm getting sick of this **** real fast. Other rule, if I've seen I have executive privilege to veto this fagot **** if I. **** see it again. If I've seen the TikTok. I am not watching it. This is the last time I'll give you this one. We'll watch the **** fish in the. Plastic bag cooked. But after this I'm done. I've seen it before. I don't know how it's. It's a little bit scary. This has floor likes. This has four comments. Is this your video? Is this

you? Are you are you? Advertising your your one video that you're proud of what is happening? Pride parade for 10 says the parade seems to be about avoiding a certain. The parade route seems to be avoiding a certain brown area. What do you say, Josh? Is this conspicuous Islamophobia or prudent parade planning this in Detroit? We're trying to avoid the Muslim center. Ohh the I thought this was going to be about a pride parade avoiding like the the. Like the black parts of town. Dude, that's strainer manner. The trees attack you there if you walk past the drain. Remainder, all the gay people will be getting lashed out by sentient trees. They're not trying to avoid the ghetto part of the map. They're trying to avoid the trees that attack you. And they're going through falador anyways. It's like a it would be a really short route if they just went South of Eric. Oh, they're trying to avoid alcohol aid, maybe. No, it Valador and America are. The nice places. Let's let's throw out the take. I mean, I guess they could have started in all care, but starting in Lumbridge makes way more sense because they're finishing Eric. People spawn in Lumbridge. That's why they're starting there, because you can just teleport. You can home teleport and be in Lumbridge. Yeah. No, sorry. This is just simply prudent parade planning. Theoretically, monkey for 10 says hello, Mr. Josh, I want to say thanks for streaming more often. I left my terrible Walmart job for a new job that's kicking my ass so that I can finally move out across country with her friend your streams. Make dealing with this **** a lot easier. Well, I'm glad to hear you're. Moving up, going up. In the world my friend, I hope that your new career is everything that you. Hope it is. Mega Man Appreciator for 5:40 says explosion. Since you are going all out this stream, would you mind reading this copy pasta in regards to rossman's experience of racism, revoking your consumer privilege. OK, let's see. the new train. Everyone's just gonna send me **** for reading so that the Super chat segments like 2 hours long. This based Serbia poster on 4 Chan posted this amazing quote about America American culture being centered around neighbors. Now I can put this on the screen, however I have to hard disavow whoever the Serbian guy is posting this explicit, explicit racism is disgusting and I must condemn him in the strongest words. Beans for 20 says I once again get back from handling radiation that work to catch a stream. God bless the streams during a merriment hours. I don't know the donation threat hole for songs, but here's. But if it's a Jackson, here's the link and there. Is a YouTube link OK, I'll. Play this for a couple. This is a hidden land Pokémon mystery dungeon. This is just an OST. I don't understand this. Like do people really only just like play random music or in the Super chat segment? It's a nice song, but. It's not really. It's not really entertaining in the way that I would want a video during a stream to be. That's my gym. OK? One guy liked it. One guy liked it be. Thank you, Kathleen Ann for 25 cents says when you get a chance, you could watch this body Cam footage of a guy literally every single one is. A ***** link and they're all over \$10.00, so I can't even complain. And you get a chance. You can watch this body can put up a guy in his transgender lover being arrested for kidnapping a woman. I will watch it, ***** . Well, I don't. Where's the good part?

Video Clip: Put a camera on this thing. Got a camera do you need? OK. Got it. Hey, it's.

Video Clip: OK, we're gonna get out of here, OK?

Video Clip: We're gonna get. You out here just say anything about what happened or anything.

Video Clip: If you need me to.

Video Clip: Don't worry about it. Don't. Worry about it.

Video Clip: Just hold on for.

Video Clip: Now, OK, can I get some pictures I'm gonna get. Just hold on. OK, dude.

Null: Where are they? Where? This is in Michigan. Right. Or is it in Minnesota cause the they have the, the funny. Don't worry about it, OK? Like the Canadian accent that you hear down there? That's really funny. How do they? What calls us people to pull this over the plate must have been in the system for the kidnapping. This is the term. I was singing Amazing Grace. He just ***** the training and kidnapped a woman. Now he's singing Amazing Grace. This is the training.

Video Clip: Is it OK to ask what's happening?

Video Clip: We got to figure out a few things. OK. OK.

Null: We got, we gotta. Figure out a few things about the kidnapping thing. We gotta take it on the station to ask about the, you know, woman tied up in your in your car. OK, not to not trying to offend you or anything or play anything, OK just want to sort this out. OK. I mean, OK, look, the name of the video was police body Cam video shows rescue kidnapped woman from police activity. Do any of the comments Jane's neighbor saved her life too, because he saw the abduction followed her abductions with her car and got a partial license plate, which led to the eventual rescue. A good neighbor is priceless. That's very awesome. Big chunk is. 30 year old the 31 year old got life in prison in the 19 year old, got 63 months and five years probation. The girl so the training he got 63 months. Or kidnap that. That definitely would be like a kidnap, murder, rape, living in the basement type thing probably would have harmed her out for ***** babies. Cause it's a gross *****. Always carry weapons and kill people that try. To hurt you. The President of Nintendo for five says. Did you know that ES was intentionally designed to resemble a BCR released just after 1983 video game crashed? DNS was designed to look avoid the stigma associated with other top loading video game consoles of the era. TND total Nintendo domination forever? I didn't know that. I also knew you didn't mention the more interesting thing is the US is called the NES, Nintendo Entertainment System, and not a video game. Console because they wanted to avoid being called in video game console even though they were a video game console. And somehow that worked. People were so ***** stupid. That they just assumed that it wasn't a video game console and they bought it even though it was exactly that. And whatever that worked. Mister Man for 10 says hey, Josh just graduated college with got my high school history teaching license. Do you have any advice for me other than don't become a teacher? If not, what are some teacher

classroom horror stories as you as a kid? Do I know not what to do? Always ask your students to spit out gum I. I did not like my teachers ever, but I really appreciated the ones that made people spit out gum because it was extremely I couldn't focus if I could hear gum chewing anywhere in the classroom. I was out. I was just gonna be passed off the entire hour. It was torture. As far as advice, no history sucks. Like history teaching sucks. You should just like assign everyone to play EU4. Basically that'll probably be better, better teaching than. Your degree and anything you could do and say or force people to learn through. I don't know. Maybe if you probably can't even adjust your curriculum because like they tell you what to teach now, so you can't teach American history, you can't teach the civil war as a war of rights. You can't really teach them anything that you want to. My advice would be go private. Don't become a public school teacher. You should really become a private teacher if you give a **** and you don't want to be raped by **** and forced to. They called kids by their preferred pronouns and all sorts of ****. My suggestion is go private. Julia Dante provides as Jim Sterling says, calling people anti-Semitic is just a trick to dodge. That's the little on the nose. It's true. I can't believe that Jim Sterling is identifying Jewish tactics like that by naming by naming them. That's extremely offensive and anti-Semitic. I hope that James Stephanie Sterling doesn't encounter any repercussions. Not only did he did he, he outed Bobby Kotick. I didn't even know that Bobby Kotick was Jewish. Jim Sterling knew something new. I didn't find a Jew 11. Video and then specifically told people hint. Hint, wink, wink, nudge nudge. Don't give them devil horns, cause that's an anti-Semitic trope. Very classy. Very subtle. Nice dog whistle there buddy. City slicker for five says after hearing Jim Sterling's **** bit. I think I'd prefer the company of Bobby Connick. Well, I can't. You can't blame me for wanting to join the winning team. There's always more. What is it? 144,000 chosen people welcome and have it. Maybe you. Can fit in there one day. Rex Cramer, 4-5, says item number C SCP-8669 object class. Like Clid description, this **** of a North Carolina female is unable to self lubricate. It's similar in moisture to a silica gel packet and it's totally unlike my past girlfriends containment procedures. You must destroy the Euclid at any cost, and you must bail out of there and leave no evidence of its existence. They don't call them agents, they call them like. K class personnel. Good luck class personnel. Play Dante, professors. If you're doing your own rendering, webcams display better quality at extreme compression than H264MP4. You can do weapons if they take longer to render. I suggest MP4 because it's a nice trade off. Anonymous for five says is it is that the second time this week you left someone a profile note regarding video size. I swear I saw that earlier this week on the what's new section. I did, in fact do that before. I don't think. I did that on stream, but I did complain about someone's video size cause it was like massive it was in. It was like 50 second. It was like a 15 second long video that was 15 megabytes. It was inexcusable. Anonymous for five said. Oh wait, no Mister man for 1081 says, well, I prefer the sinking the Commonwealth to the bottom of the ocean. Jim Sterling going back to the Fatherland to beat up British woman is an acceptable consolation. Prize it is true. And of all futures, the one where

Jen Stefani Sterling goes back to the UK to assault women and then pretend to be the best woman. Ever is pretty great. I don't think there's a better, maybe a couple better futures, but that's pretty high up there. Doctor Perky for five says hi. I love watching your older strings covering one cow like shoe on head. Would you consider strings like that again? Yes, I would. I would like to do more, but right now is not a good time. I can't really explain there's there's a lot of **** going on, not just including the site. And yeah, I would eventually like to return to form and do like a proper person stream. They're called spotlights, actually, if you wanna know the technical term use. Thank you very much very much question mark for 10 says someone in your chat just said that Jim can't swim as a furry. I looked it up now in my days room and I hold Josh personally responsible. Right.

Voice actor: Do you suppose it's possible that furies might be furries. Because we have. Or I think we have. A natural inclination to want to celebrate what we are. I mean, we of course want. To celebrate who we are.

Null: That's the voice actor. Like, that's the. That's just the guy that Jim can't swim pays to voice. He doesn't do his own videos. This isn't actually him. He just gets paid. That guy's a professional voice actor. He just gets paid to do the voiceovers. That's not the person writing the script. You're welcome. I just saved your day, my friend. I hope that \$10 is worth it. Teddy freezer for five says the seasoning is upon us, prepared to be freezed. I am so fees, right? Now my boy. Thank you, Chloe. Dante provides us kiss of me is the narrator of Jim. Not one of the back end staff remains unclear who researches and writes for the channel. They've alluded to being multiple people, but may just be using we to refer to a party of indeterminate number. Very smart play by him. The Patreon staff know who he is because they get his. They file. His WT was for his income, but yeah, it's a much better idea to do a voice, a narrator and not to. That's why everyone likes Jim, can't swim. He has no personality, he doesn't input anything like that into his videos, and he has no personality to cancel. It's very smart economically. Anonymous pretend says if you're a D transfer and you feel like you ***** ** your life beyond repair, remember corporate heads, international bankers, government officials and college professionals, professors all walk around in public like you and I, and there are plenty of hardware stores. That's true, those people. Do walk around like you and I and there are plenty of hardware stores, so if you want to get a hobby like. You can do that, or you can do a meet your government officials and say hello to them in the street and have a nice conversation. Thank you Nora Vanguard for 10, says the. That was this was an anime from the twenty 10s that had a subplot about a mother who was turning out her son and says well. So I put your audio from the few streams to go over it. It's gonna be ***** cringe every day, sweetie pie. I'm gonna make a woman out of you. Just like I always wanted going to make you the beautiful daughter that my mommy always want it. We can get rid of that ugly thing down there. My precious daughter. We can cut. We can undo God's mistakes through the power. Of mommy. Science sure can. Have I been turned into an AMV? Is this what is this what has happened? I've been AMV. That's very cursed cause it is very

funny but it's also anime. I don't know how you know about this force film anime from the twenty 10s. Enough to immediately think of it, and then apply my voice to. It so I cannot call it base but. I don't know. Pretty dangerous stuff. Pretty, pretty evil, pretty black magic. Thank you, Mick Mick neighbor, Mick neighbors for five says thanks for the laughs. Why did you **** these ***** *** thinking they women and ****? We was kangas and **** y'all like my book, not a, also TTD. TTD. Thank you, neighbor. Nerd. I appreciate it very much homie. Cities looking for 20 says YouTube link ohh boy, my favorites.

Video Clip: 6 million people. That's a pretty interesting number, isn't it? 6 million people.

Null: I played that on. Stream before, but it is very. Thank you very much. Anime for 20 says. Would you kindly pick out several representative moments from this video and tell me who is the lesser of two evils? The gentleman is an actual refugee who has had his residency revoked.

No, I would really not like to, but I suppose I will, because why not? my time has no value. This is about \$20.00 of value I guess.

Japanese immigrant officials torturing refugee refugee application the reality of deportation full and at 28 minutes. What are they doing? What are you doing to him? I don't understand how are they torturing him? You speak Chinese. So he's an illegal immigrant and they're forcing him to go back and they're, I don't understand. They're offering him food and ****. How the **** is this his fault? Are they bad? They're just trying. He's trying to fake being crippled. He won't calm down. The Japanese are on the right. I really don't understand how I could say the Somali guy who can't come the **** down. Is on the right. You gotta go back. The darkest night for five says. Hey, I see you sent that donation last time, saying I had dinner dysphoria. I'm sending this to let you know that I was facetious and meant to be a joke, but you answered it really earnestly, so I felt bad. You're way nicer then I think you try to come across I. Don't try to make myself sound tough. I was. I don't think I do. I try to. Be nice to people. I accept your apology, though anonymous, pretend says. Does your hatred of government wages extend to state employees? I fully support state employees unless they're Californian. I think that if you really want to join the government and do public good, you should do it at a state level. I think that states. We should try to replace. The federal government as much as possible. And I think that when the federal government collapses, you'll be shocked by how much the state governments actually do and how very little will change if the US federal government just went. How to smoke right now? You'd wake up the roads would still be maintained sewer, water, lighting and all. Public Utilities would still work. you go to work and you wouldn't notice anything differently. Cars would still have fuel. Life would just go on. Wow, what are these ***** people actually do? What do they really do every day? You'll never know. You'll never know until you're you have more money. Your money is back with, because now the states have to default to something. I guess they'll start using silver again. Sure, why not? And then you'll have more money and your money won't depreciate in value at

2% like clockwork every year at at a minimum, 2% like clockwork every year. And be like wow. Those people really didn't. Gonna collect Social Security anyways.

Speaker 5: What do those people really?

Null: Announcer Tim says. Josh, did you see some training flash their zipper kits at the White House? Yes it did. Actually I have that that was on. That was on this close. I can probably just.

Speaker 5: Pop pop this link in and show you.

Null: OK, yeah, this works.

Speaker 4: Welcome to the white. House Happy Pride month.

Null: Wait, sorry, I. ***** it up.

Speaker 6: Welcome to the White House.

Speaker 4: Happy Pride month, happy pride year, happy pride, life.

Speaker 3: Yeah, you are beautiful. Are and you belong. You are loved.

Speaker 4: The bravest and most inspiring people I've ever known. I mean, you're.

Speaker 4: Welcome.

Speaker 3: Let me take a little video. It is an honor fans rights of human rights. The monuments. Is that correct?

Speaker 5: Play news, by the way.

Speaker 3: We top this.

Null: You see that? OK, one of those ***** trying to play with his man. ***** , you see? How in the back there, there's actually three flags hung there, 2 United States flags, and then in the center there's the progress flag with the progress Chevron out of frame. That is a violation of the US Flag code. Under no circumstances may a foreign or any other kind of flag be more prominent in any displaying of the US flag than the US flag. If it was two US flags and then you had lower and to the right and left the progress flag, that would be OK, but you can't put the progress flag front and center and then be set by the US flag. Implies that the progress flag is dominant over the US flag, which no government official or U.S. military installation should ever do. Just say no. Steinhoff for five says I can't make this stream since I worked the graveyard shift, but I was wondering what kind of rap music you like. I saw you had some in your playlist. I like what's called retrospective in hop hip hop and it was popular in the 90s. Like I said, I think that the Best Hip Hop song ever made is dance with the devil by immortal technique. It's one of the most, I think, powerful expressions of like pain. In music form, it's really good. It's a really compelling story too, and I recommend it to people who like. Yeah, thank you. Legacy voyage for 25 says. Did you hear that Amber Lynn's ex Destiny admitted to having put her **** bull down by lead poisoning? Cause it wouldn't stop trying to attack people. Highest IQ Kentucky Lesbian. I saw that Amber Lynn had put out a video with a clickbait title about Becky. And I did not watch it. I haven't had time yet. I don't want to say that killing dogs is based, but I don't consider I don't consider shitholes to be dogs, so I will leave it at. That, thank you very much. Though Whoopi, for five, says the phrase you were looking for when talking with the way the system perpetuates self is the emergent behavior,

well, there you go. Word of the day emergent behavior. That isn't correct. For five, for five, for five, for five, for five, for five, for 10, and says only need 20 seconds of your time. I'm ***** sick of that justice idiot sending you ***** music. This mogs it. Breaking my heart long version by Gianna de Durante. Wow, bro, that's totally epic. Owns that other *****. I ***** hate you people. It's so ***** much. The president over vice has just heard the Emperor of Segas donation buying a Sega is just the first step in the journey to ***** your own mother. He can suck my Nintendo. T&D told Nintendo Dominations he at the treehouse this weekend. Thank you very much. You hear that second? Now let's pretend says we did it, boys. We found day's husband.

Video Clip: Hello today I'm going to show you how to make.

Null: Yeah, but it's blending beef chunks. Yeah, feels like actually. He's like blending beef chunks, OK. Oh my God. OK, that's ***** gnarly. This is the luck Pisa by Paul 4608 and I almost threw up in my ***** mouth. I'm not sorry I cannot watch that anymore. Angry watch for. Ohh, angry Wasserman says. Have you heard anymore wrangle, star. Ohh, my *****. God dude is pretty. Good at dispensing medical debt and home selling knowledge and really religious. You gotta culty a few years ago. But it's gotten based. YouTube ***** short like I'm done. This is it. I'm calling it. Do not send me any more ***** YouTube links like for next stream. Like just don't. I don't want I might for next. Stream I might just. Say total total YouTube link death. I cannot ***** stand it. Every single one of these. Is the guy didn't YouTube link like it's been an hour and 40 ***** minutes of YouTube links. I'm sorry for getting mad but really I'm like trying to get through this **** and everyone's like, can you like watch this entire ***** video and comment on it? Like, no, I can't. I'm trying to. Go pee I have. To **** do you? Can you excuse me?

Video Clip: If pro were to take an empty water bottle and fill it up halfway with black oil base paint, then add a little used motor oil and for good measure a few pinches of sand and then stretch a water balloon over the opening.

Null: Does it create a gas? He's creating a weather Balloon and then.

Video Clip: Lob this party favor. Let's say an occupying force. Goodness, that oil based paint is difficult to deal with, hard to wash off. And that oil? Well, it's slippery too. And the sand goodness. It plays havoc on face Shields. Not so good for optics either.

Null: That's pretty good, I do like. This guy, OK, wrangle, Sir. Call me with your anti government information. Is that it? Am I done? Is anyone else send? Me a ***** YouTube link. And these are the greasy. Prices, perhaps the minimum video dono link should be \$50 dues also Sneed. I agree I may I don't know how to relate this information. I don't know how to like put like a rule list to say like this is what I I'm looking for. Nor Vanguard for five says this show is assassination classroom. I watched it when it came, the subplot was interesting, but the rush to click it's funny how back then people talk about how much of a terrible mother she was, but now she is celebrated by Twitter freaks. Probably probably stop watching anime, but freak cut **** ****

off my boy. OK. Then honestly, there's nothing to rumble. Loads of money for five says Kill Rogers, the head writers Roundhouse kick rider into the concrete slim Dunk Rider baby into the trash can, crucify filthy redditors, defecate and render renders food. Launch renders into the sun. Stir fry renders and the walk cost renders into an active volcano. True and basin, I agree. Eugene Green Beer from says I just like to interject for a moment what you're referring to as Linux is in fact the new slash Linux. Or, as I've recently taken to calling it New Plus Linux new and an operating system unto itself, but rather another free component of the fully functioning new system. This is true. The line is actually says that. Stallman is a ***** and he needs to learn his place in response to this. That, that African says parentheses Lucifer did try and subvert God, just saying compelling argument. Perhaps we should actually give Bobby Kotick devil Ears or devil horns after all. And Rick and Becker, some says hope you're having a good week and here is some. Money for not. Watching anime biggest finally. Paying off every week, boy every week. Alright, I'm done. And we're ***** YouTube links. I can't take anymore. Right. One more necklace. Wage prices having night. Do you think the chances all the autism Peter Ship and anime is intentional to feminize and atomize them in Japan? I think that there's just something really wrong. With them, that's what I. Think about Japan. OK, I gotta go pee. Thank you for listening. I will figure out what to do about the YouTube **** cause every single person this week decided they're gonna try to do a YouTube. Video and I just can't ***** stand it. Go back for. Saying that, but you know how to. OK, this is a cover of a popular song because the more popular song is so popular that it would get me struck another what even when podcasts archives. So it's a shout out to my boy who saw it all coming miles away.

Outro music: Paradise put on the parking lot. Hotel boutique and a swinging hot spot that you don't know what you got till it's gone. Took all the cheats and put them in a tree museum and. People dollar and I have to see them. No, no, no. You don't know what she got till it's gone. I don't care about the bees, please. Paradise put up a parking lot. Last night I heard screen door. And the big old taxi took my. Got till it's gone. They pick their eyes, put up a parking lot. Hey, hey, hey. I don't want to give away. You wanna give you wanna give it? All the way. You wanna give it? You wanna give it? Just to give it away.

Comments

<https://www.onionfarms.com/threads/joshua-moon-megathread.475/post-67589>

Null said on MATI yesterday that he regretted not sending a fan letter to Ted Kaczynski before his suicide about how terrible everything is. Null wanted to tell Kaczynski that he's better off on the inside than the outside. But then he heard about Kaczynski's cancer diagnosis and decided not to write him a letter because he thought it would be too depressing. Null also worried that writing a letter to Kaczynski would have him placed on a list, as if he isn't already on a list along with all the Kiwis.

Null, ever the monocausal reductionist, then claimed that the reason Kaczynski went crazy and started bombing people was not because he had been subjected to sadistic psychological tests that had desensitized him, not because he felt encroached upon living in his cabin in the woods and was worried about the destruction of the natural environment by industry, but because he had a bout of gender dysphoria and had briefly convinced himself he was trans. Null claims that what broke Kaczynski was visiting the gender clinic and seeing all the disgusting AGPs there in the waiting room, which instantly cured him of his gender dysphoria but made him hate modernity even more. Null agrees with Kaczynski's claim that males are "oversocialized", that they care too much what others think of them (as if Null doesn't crave the respect of his peers for his antisociality; Null has simply created his own hierarchy where being antisocial gains you respect).

So there you go: Null thinks that simply seeing a tranny IRL will make a real "unsocialized" man start mailing bombs around.

The System's Neatest Trick

Source

June 18, 2023

4,849 views

Mad at the Internet

7,346 followers

Transcript

Hello. Hello, this is your mush mouth autist, I'm here to do a reading of an essay.

I know what you're thinking... Josh, you can barely read tweets, how can you read an entire essay? The answer is through editing.

This is the systems neatest trick by Dr. Theodore John Kaczynski. From what I understand. This essay was written in either 2002 or 2003. There is no fixed date that I can find, but the bibliography has sources from 2002 and it references George W Bush. So I assume that it's 2002 or 2003.

The systems neatest trick is kind of a compliment to *Industrial Society and its Future*, and it's kind of an explanation of what the system is in Kaczynski's writings. He uses a proper noun for system with a capital S. And it sort of describes an anomalous entity, a paradigm that exists which is not physical. It is not a construct of mankind. It is not a conspiracy that's actually deliberately laid out by any sort of complot any organization which many people would probably disagree with.

If you do agree that there is some sort of design like this you would probably attribute it to a conspiracy. He considers it the natural consequence of... He considers the capitalism that we live in and that the end of agrarianism and the reliance on

technology inevitably leads to these kinds of oppressive systems that exist that we live.

There now and whoever is currently in control of it is merely riding at the Crest of this technological paradigm shift and is not really in control of it. So if there is a small group of people who seem to be at the peak, they're not necessarily designing this system. The system is merely something that they've taken advantage of, whether they know it or not. So without trying to paraphrase. His writing any further, I will simply read what he has to say. There is a pre a prologue here. The supreme luxury of the Society of Technical Necessity will be to grant the bonus of useless revolt and of an acquiescent smile. The system has played a trick on today's would be revolutionaries and rebels. The trick is so cute that if it had been consciously planned, one would have to admire it for its almost mathematical elegance.

Audiobook

Chapter one what the system is not.

Let's begin by making clear what the system is not. The system is not George W Bush and his advisors and appointees. It is not the cops who maltreat protesters. It is not the CEO's of the multinational corporations, and it is not the Frankensteins in their laboratories. Who criminally tinker with the genes of living. Things all of these people are servants of the system, but in themselves they do not constitute the system. In particular the personal and individual values, attitudes, beliefs and behaviors of any of these people may be significantly in conflict with the needs of the system. To illustrate with an example, the system requires. Respect for property rights, yet CEO's, cops, scientists and politicians sometimes steal. And Speaking of stealing, we don't have to confine ourselves to actual lifting of physical objects. We can include all illegal means of acquiring property, such as cheating on income tax, excepting bribes in any other form of graft or corruption. But the fact the CEO's, cops, scientists and politicians sometimes steal does not mean that stealing is a part of. On the contrary, when a cop or politician steals something, he is rebelling against the system's requirement of respect for law and property. Yet even when they are stealing, these people remain servants of the system. As long as they publicly maintain their support for law and property, whatever illegal acts may be committed by politicians, cops or CEO's as individuals. Theft, bribery and graft are not part of the system, but diseases of the system. The less stealing there is, the better the system functions and that is why the servants and boosters of the system always advocate obedience to the law in public, even if they may sometimes find it convenient to break the law in private. Take another example. Although the police are the systems enforcers, police brutality is not part of the system. When the cops beat the crap out of a suspect, they are not doing the systems work. They are only letting out their own anger and hostility. The system's goal is not brutality or the expression of anger as far as police work is concerned. The systems goal is to compel obedience to its rules, and to do so with the least possible

amount of disruption, violence, and bad publicity. Thus, from the systems point of view, the ideal cop is one who never gets angry, never uses any more violence than necessary. And as far as possible, relies on manipulation rather than force to keep people under control. Police brutality is only another disease of the System not part of the system. For proof, look at the attitude of the media. The mainstream media almost universally condemned police brutality. Of course, the attitude of the mainstream media represents, as a rule, the consensus of opinion among the powerful classes in our society. As to what is good for the system. What has been said about theft, graft and police brutality? Also applies to the issues of discrimination and victimization, such as racism, sexism, homophobia, poverty and sweatshops. All of these are bad for the system. For example, the more the black people feel themselves scorned or excluded, the more likely that they are to turn to crime, and the less likely they are to educate themselves for careers that will make them useful to the system. Modern technology, with its rapid long distance transportation and its disruption of traditional ways of life. Has led to the mixing of populations so that nowadays people of different races, nationalities, cultures and religions have to live and work side by side. If people hate or reject one another on the basis of race, ethnicity, religion, sexual preference, etcetera, the resulting conflicts interfere with the functioning of the system. Apart from a few old fossilized relics of the past, like Jesse Helms, the leaders of the system know this very well, and that is why we are taught in school and through the media to believe that racism, sexism, homophobia, and so forth are social evils to be eliminated. No doubt some of the leaders of the system, some of the politicians, scientists and CEO's privately feel that a woman's place is in the home, or that homosexuality and interracial marriage are repugnant. But even if the majority of them felt that way, it would not mean that racism, sexism and homophobia were part of the system any more than the existence of stealing among the leaders means that stealing is a part of the system just as is. The system must promote respect for law and property for the sake of its own security. The system must also discourage racism and other forms of victimization. For the same reason. That is what the system, notwithstanding any private deviations by individual members of the elite, is basically committed to suppressing discrimination and victimization. For proof, look again at the attitude of the mainstream media. In spite of the occasional timid dissent by a few of the more daring and reactionary commentators, media propaganda overwhelmingly favors racial and gender equality and acceptance of homosexuality and interracial marriage. The system needs a population that is meek, nonviolent, domesticated, docile and obedient, and needs to avoid any conflict or disruption that could interfere with the orderly functioning of the social machine. In addition to suppressing racial, ethnic, religious and other group hostilities, it also has to suppress or harness for its own advantage all other tendencies that could lead to disruption or disorder, such as machoism, aggressive impulses and any inclination to violence. Naturally, traditional racial and ethnic antagonisms die slowly. Machoism aggressiveness and violent impulses are not easily suppressed and attitudes towards sex and gender identity are not transformed overnight. Therefore, there are

many individuals who resist these changes and the system is face with the problem of overcoming their resistance. Chapter 2 how the system exploits the impulse to rebel. All of us in modern society are hemmed in by a dense network of rules and regulations. We are at the mercy of large organizations such as corporations, governments, labor unions, universities, churches and political parties, and consequently we are powerless as a result of the servitude, the powerlessness. And the other indignities that the system inflicts on us, there is widespread frustration, which leads to an impulse to. Well, and this is where the system plays its neatest trick through a brilliant slight of hand, it turns rebellion to its own advantage. Many people do not understand the roots of their own frustration, hence their rebellion is directionless. They know that they want to rebel, but they don't know what they want to rebel against. Luckily, the system is able to fill their need by providing them with a list of standard and stereotype grievances in the name of which to rebel, racism, homophobia. Women's issues, poverty, sweatshops, the whole laundry bag of activist issues. Huge numbers of would be rebels take the bait in fighting racism, sexism, etcetera, etcetera. They are only doing the systems work for it. In spite of this, they imagine that they are rebelling against the system. How is this possible? 1st 50 years ago the system was not yet committed to equality for black people, women and homosexuals. So that action in favor of these causes really was a form of rebellion. Consequently, these causes came to be conventionally regarded as rebel causes. They have retained their status today simply as a matter of tradition. That is because each rebel generation imitates the preceding generations. Second, there are still significant numbers of people, as I pointed out earlier, who resist the social changes that the system requires, and some of these people even are authority figures such as cops, judges, or politicians. These resisters provide a target for the would be rebels, someone for them to rebel against. Commentators like Rush Limbaugh help the process by ranting against the activists, saying that they have made someone angry, fosters the activist illusion that they are rebelling. 3rd in order to bring themselves into conflict, even with the majority of the systems leaders who fully accept the social changes that the system demands, the would be rebels and systems solutions that go farther than what the systems leaders consider prudent, and they show exaggerated anger over trivial matters. For example, they demand payment of reparations to black people. And they often become enraged at any criticism of a minority group, no matter how cautious and reasonable. In this way, the activists are able to maintain the illusion that they are rebelling against the system, but the illusion is absurd. Agitation against racism, sexism, homophobia and the like no more constitutes rebellion against the system than does agitation against political graft and corruption. Those who work against graft and corruption are not rebelling. That acting as the systems enforcers, they are helping to keep the politicians obedient to the rules of the system. Those who work against racism, sexism and homophobia similarly are acting as the systems enforcers. They help the system to suppress the deviant racist, sexist, and homophobic attitudes that cause problems for the system. But the activists don't act only as the systems enforcers. They also serve as a kind of lightning rod that protects the system

by drawing public resentment away from the system and its institutions. For example, there were several reasons why it was for the systems advantage to get women out of the home and into the workplace 50 years ago. With the system as represented by the government or the media had begun out of the blue, a propaganda campaign designed to make it socially acceptable for women to center their lives on careers rather than on the home. The natural human resistance to change would have caused widespread public resents. What actually happened was that the changes were spearheaded by radical feminists, behind whom the systems institutions trailed at a safe distance. The resentment of the more conservative members of society was directed primarily against the radical feminists rather than the system and its institutions, because the changes sponsored by the system seem slow and moderate. In comparison with the more radical solutions advocated by feminists, and even these relatively slow changes were seen as having been forced on the system by pressure from the radicals. Chapter 3. The systems neatest trick. So in a nutshell, the system's neatest trick is this. One for the sake of its own efficiency and security, the system needs to bring about deep and radical social changes to match the change conditions resulting from technological progress. 2 the frustration of life under the circumstances imposed by the system leads to rebellious impulses. 3 rebellious impulses are Co opted by the system in the service of the social changes it requires. Activists rebel against the old and outmoded values that are no longer of use to the system and in favor of the new values that the system needs us to accept. In this way, rebellious impulses which otherwise might be dangerous to the system, are given an outlet that is not only harmless to the system, but useful to it. Five much of the public resentment resulting from the imposition of social changes is drawn away from the system and its institutions, and is directed instead at the radicals who spearhead the social changes. Of course, this trick was not planned in advance by the systems leaders who are not conscious of having played a trick at all. The way it works is something like this. In deciding what position to take on any issue, the editors, publishers and owners of the media must consciously or unconsciously balance several factors they must consider how their readers or viewers will react to what they print or broadcast about the issue. They must consider how their advertisers, their peers in the media and other powerful persons will react. And they must consider the effect on the security of the system of what they print or broadcast. These practical considerations will usually outweigh whatever personal feelings that they may have about the issue. The personal feelings of the media leaders, their advertisers, and other powerful persons are varied. They may be liberal or conservative, religious or atheistic. The only universal common ground among the leaders is their commitment to the system. Its security and its power, therefore within the limits imposed by what the public is willing to accept, the principal factor determining the attitudes propagated by the media, is a rough consensus of opinion among the media leaders and other powerful people as to what is good for the system. Thus, when an editor or other media leader sets out to decide what attitude to take towards a movement or A cause, his first thought is whether the movement includes anything that is good or bad for the system. Maybe

he tells himself that his decision is based on moral, philosophical, or religious grounds, but it is an observable fact that in practice, the security of the system takes precedence. Over all other factors in determining the attitude of the media. For example, if a news media editor looks at the militia movement, he may or may not sympathize personally with some of its grievances and goals, but he also sees that will be a strong consensus among his advertisers and his peers in the media that the militia movement is potentially dangerous to the system, and therefore it should be discouraged under these circumstances. He knows that his magazine had better take a negative attitude toward the militia movement. The negative attitude of the media presumably is part of the reason why the militia movement has died down. When the same editor looks at the radical feminism, he sees that some of the more extreme solutions would be dangerous to the system. But he also sees that Demonism holds much that is useful to the system. Women's participation in the business and technical world integrates them and their families better into the system. Their talents are of service to the system and business and technical matters. Feminist emphasis on ending. Domestic abuse and rape also serves the systems need, since rape and abuse, like other forms of violence, are dangerous to the system. Perhaps most important, the editor recognized that the pettiness and meaninglessness of modern housework and the social isolation of the modern house wife can lead to serious frustration. For many women, frustration that will cause problems for the system unless women are allowed and outlet through careers in the business and technical world. Even if this editor is a macho type who personally feels more comfortable with women in a subordinate position, he knows that feminism, at least in a relatively moderate form, is good for the system. He knows that his editorial posture must be favorable toward moderate. Anism. Otherwise he will face the disapproval of his advertisers and other powerful people. This is why the mainstream media's attitude has been generally supportive of moderate feminism. Mix toward radical feminism and consistently hostile only toward the most extreme feminist positions. Through this type of process, rebel movements that are dangerous to the system are subjected to negative propaganda, while rebel movements that are believed to be useful to the system are given cautious encouragement in. Media unconscious absorption of media propaganda influences would be rebels to rebel in ways that serve the interests of the system. The university intellectuals also play an important role in carrying out the systems trick, though they like to fancy themselves independent thinkers, the intellectuals are allowing for individual exceptions. The most over socialized the most conformist, the tamest and most domesticated, the most pampered, dependent, and spineless group in America today. As a result, their impulse to rebel is particularly strong, but because they are incapable of independent thought, real rebellion is impossible for them. Consequently, they are suckers for the systems trick, which allows them to irritate people and enjoy the illusion of rebelling without ever having to challenge the system's basic values because they are the teachers of young people. The university intellectuals are in a position to help the system play its trick on the young, which they do by searing young people's rebellious impulses

towards the standard stereotype targets racism, colonialism, women's issues, etcetera. Young people who are not college students learn through the media or through personal contact of the social justice issues for which students rebel, and they imitate the students. Thus, a youth culture develops in which there is a stereotype mode of rebellion that spreads through imitations, appears just as hairstyles, clothing styles, and other fads. Spread through imitation. The trick is not perfect. Naturally, the systems trick does not work perfectly. Not all of the positions adopted by the activist community are consistent with the needs of the system. In this connection, some of the most important difficulties that confront the system are related to the conflict between the two different types of propaganda that the system has to use, integration and propaganda. And agitation propaganda. Integration propaganda is the principal mechanism of socialization in modern society. It is propaganda that is designed to instill in people the attitudes, beliefs, values and habits that they need to have in order to be safe and useful. Tools of the system. It teaches people to permanently repress or sublimate. Those emotional impulses that are dangerous to the system, its focus is on long term attitudes and deep seated values of broad applicability rather than on attitudes towards specific current issues. Agitation and propaganda plays on people's emotions so as to bring out certain attitudes or behaviors in specific current situations. Instead of teaching people to suppress dangerous emotional impulses, it seeks to stimulate certain emotions for well defined purposes. Localized in time, the system needs an orderly, docile. Cooperative, passive dependent population. Above all, it requires a non violent population since it needs the government to have a monopoly on the use of physical force. For this reason, integration propaganda has to teach us to be horrified, frightened and appalled by violence so that we will not be tempted to use it even when we. Are very angry. By violence I mean physical attacks on human beings. More generally, integration propaganda has to teach us soft, cuddly values that emphasize non aggressiveness, interdependence, and cooperation. On the other hand, in certain contexts the system itself finds it useful or necessary to resort to brutal, aggressive methods to achieve its own objectives. The most obvious example of such methods as warfare and war time. The system relies on agitation propaganda in order to win public approval of military action. It plays on people's emotions to make them feel frightened and angry at their real or supposed enemy. In this situation, there is a conflict between integration propaganda and agitation propaganda. Those people in whom the cuddly values and the aversion to violence have been most deeply planted can't easily be persuaded to approve a bloody military operation. Here the systems trick backfires to some extent. The activists who've been rebelling all along in favor of the values of integration propaganda continue to do so during war time. They oppose the war effort not only because it is violent, but because it is racist, colonialist, imperialist. Et cetera, all of which are contrary to the soft, cuddly values taught by integration. The systems trick also backfires where the Treatment of Animals is concerned. Inevitably, many people extend to animals, the soft values and aversion to violence that they are taught with respect to humans. They are horrified by the slaughter of animals for meat

and by other practices harmful to animals, such as the reduction of chickens. To egg laying machines kept in tiny cages or the use of animals in scientific experiments. Up to a point. The resulting opposition to mistreatment of animals may be useful to the system because a vegan diet is more efficient in terms of resource utilization than a carnivorous 1 is. Veganism, if widely adopted, will help to ease the burden placed on the Earth's limited resources by the growth of the human population. But activists insistence on ending the use of animals in scientific experiments is squarely in conflict with the systems needs, since for the foreseeable future, there is not likely to be any workable substitute for living animals as research. Objects all the same. The fact that the system's trick does backfire here and there does not prevent it from being on the whole, a remarkably effective device for turning rebellious impulses through the system's advantage. It has to be conceded that the trick described here is not the only factor determining the direction that rebellious impulses take in our. Society many people today feel weak and powerless for the very good reason that the system really does make us weak and powerless, and therefore identify obsessively with victims, with the weak and the oppressed. That's part of the reason why victimization issues such as racism, sexism, homophobia and neocolonialism have become standard. Chapter 5 and example. I have with me an anthropology textbook in which I've noticed several nice examples of the way in which university intellectuals help the system with its trick by disguising conformity as criticism of modern society. The cutest of these examples is found on pages 132 to 36, where the author quotes in. Adapted form an article by 1 Rhonda K Williamson, an intersex person, a person born with both male and female physical characteristics. Williamson states that the American Indians not only accepted intersex persons, but especially valued. She contrasts this attitude with the Euro American attitude, which she equates with the attitude that her own parents adopted toward her. Williamson's parents mistreated her cruelly. They held her in contempt for her sex condition. They told her she was cursed and given over to the devil. They took her to charismatic churches to have the demon cast out of her. She was even given napkins into which she was supposed to cough out. The demon it is obviously ridiculous to equate this with the modern Euro American attitude. It may approximate the Euro, American attitude of 150 years ago, but nowadays almost any American educator, psychologist or mainstream clergyman would be horrified at that kind of treatment of an intersex person. The media would never dream of portraying such treatment in. A favorable light. Average middle class Americans today may not be as accepting the intersex condition as the Indians were, but few would fail to recognize the cruelty of the way in which Williamson was treated. Williamson's parents, obviously were deviants, religious kooks whose attitudes and beliefs were way out of line with the values of the system. Thus, while putting on a show of criticizing modern Euro American Society, Williamson really is attacking only deviant minorities and cultural laggards who have not yet adapted to the dominant values of present day.

Haviland, the author of the Book on page 12, portrays Cultural Anthropology as a kind of classic as challenging the assumptions of modern Western society. This is

so far contrary to the truth that it would be funny if it weren't so pathetic. The mainstream of modern America, anthropology is objectively subservient to the values and assumptions of the system. When today's anthropologists pretend to challenge the values of their society, typically they challenge only the values of the past. Now moded values now held by no one but deviants and laggards who have not kept up to the cultural changes that the system requires of us. Haviland's use of Williamson's article illustrates this very well, and it represents the general slant of how the lens book HOWLIN plays up ethnographic facts that teach his readers politically correct lessons. But he understates or omits altogether ethnographic facts that are politically incorrect. Thus, while he quotes Williamson's account to emphasize the Indians. Acceptance of intersex person. He does not mention, for example, that among many of the Indian tribes, women who committed adultery had their noses cut off, whereas no such punishment was inflicted on male adulterers or that among the Crow Indians, a warrior who was struck by a stranger had to kill the offender immediately, else he was irretrievably disgrace. In the eyes of his tribe, nor does Haviland discuss the habitual use of torture by the Indians on the eastern United States. Of course, facts of that kind represent violence, machoism and gender discrimination. Hence they are inconsistent with the present day values of the system intend to get censored out as politically incorrect. Yet I don't doubt that havelin is perfectly sincere in his belief that anthropologists challenge the assumptions of Western society. The capacity for self deception of our university intellectuals will easily stretch that far to conclude. I want to make it clear that I am not suggesting that it is good to cut off noses for adultery. Or that any other abusive woman should be tolerated. Nor would I want to see anyone scorned or rejected because they are intersex or because of their race, religion, sexual orientation, et cetera, et cetera. But in our society today, these matters are at most issues of reform. The systems needed trick consists in having turned, powerful, rebellious impulses, which otherwise might have taken a revolutionary direction to the service of these modest reforms.

Outro

And there you go. I hope you have found that insightful as I have. Thank you for supporting me. I appreciate everybody's assistance in the last few months especially. And until next time, take it easy.

Comments

Mountain Trucker 4 days ago

Hilarious that farmers fawn over Ted considering he was a kind of oddball troon.
<https://www.unz.com/isteve/the-unabombers-autogynephilic-transgenderism/>

Mad at the Internet 4 days ago

It's not coincidental at all. Ted was coaxed into gender identity issues by Academics and when he went to a gender clinic in Colorado, one of the first of its kind, and saw what transvestites actually looked like, he decided to isolate himself and then start killing people.

The Jolly Heretic

Kaczynski's Co-Author Dr David Skrbina Tells Us About Technological Slavery

Source

October 20, 2022

Edward: Hello and welcome to this edition of the Jolly Heretic. I have supposed guests for you today, for today. And that is the Unabomber, Ted Kaczynski's. Sort of co-author. Well, well, anyway. His correspondent, let's call it that, and that is Doctor David scrubbing, and we're going to talk today about the issue of technological slavery. So while I signed into the old entropy, I'm gonna ask David to introduce himself. So David, over to you.

David: Very good. Thanks, Ed. Yeah, so I'm, I'm an American academic, been teaching philosophy. I have a PhD in philosophy actually from the University of Bath. From the UK. I was teaching philosophy at University of Michigan for about 15 years. I left there about three years ago. I'm currently working with colleagues here in Europe and I have. A position as a visiting researcher at the University of Helsinki. In fine. Working on several several issues.

Edward: Well, cheers, everybody. Cheers, David. Earth stick. Cheers cakey. Cakey quimby. Cheers, Hugo. Voucher, everybody. And welcome to this edition of the Jolly Heretic. We're of course online public house for meet on Mondays and Thursdays at 7:00 PM UK time. 2:00 PM New York in which we discussed based science and based research of all kinds, which is increasingly expunged from our increasingly last woke joke universities. And as you know, on Mondays, it's normally me on my own answering the assorted intelligent questions that you've sent it over the preceding week. Yes, slanger. Kate, kiss. Saludo and Frostproof skull and all that? and on Thursdays I have a very I hopefully have a very interesting guest and we have a very interesting guest. Someone you've been asking me to get on for quite a while and that is David. I hope I'm pronouncing it right. David Scribner and David has written all kinds of fascinating stuff he's written with Ted Kaczynski on. You know, dominance of technology and its negative effects, our lives. He's written on that on oh, God, that things come on the screen again indicating not Internet. And he's written on Jesus, and he's written on all kinds of stuff. He's written on all kinds of malarkey, but today, they're gonna be focusing on tech brazinski and on technological slavery. And if you have any questions on technological slavery or anything else, stuff that David has. So then do send them

in on the old entropy link is on the screen or on YouTube. If you want to, and we will of. Course answer them today. And if you want to help to see the show, you can see ways to do. So below and. I'd just like to say with regards to this. For us, it's been a it's one of those days where you can just get popcorn and watch reality. It's a pretty extraordinary, but there, there, there you go. I shall be on after this on a show and we should be talking about that. But anyway, cheers. Everybody OK? So David, take the Kinski. He's a bowl, accounts for a bit of a murderer, isn't he's? He's a very bad man. But if you. Read his manifesto, his manifesto. I was struck by how intelligent, articulate and superficially logical it was. And he made a number of points about dealing with reality and about coping strategies and about living in an evolutionary mismatch and things like this, which I thought were extremely intelligent. I was just unfortunate that he had to draw upon those to kill University University administrators, but to tell me how, how did you get? How did you start? To become interested in tech beginski and how how has this all panned out?

David: Yeah, well, I was interested in technology for a long. Time actually I. Was really a. Sceptic a kind of a technology critic, even a. Decade before that, anybody ever heard of a Unabomber? That that was things I was studying. I was even as an undergraduate graduate in college, and I was studying computers and physics and basic other science courses and. You know, it was really sort of feeling like there was kind of something, something troubling here with the way this the whole process was working, I could see that it was causing problems for the environment. It was a. Kind of environmental. Early environmental philosopher, when I was a student, I ran into a put a prominent environmental philosopher named Henrik Skolimowski, who was also a early technology critic. And so he got me thinking on some of these. Tech critic ideas he put. Me on to people like. Jacques Ellul who wrote this book called The Technological Society. It's quite a famous critique of technology from 1964, as the English translation, so I had a long history of kind of really being concerned about problems with technology. And thinking about. You know, and how it controls our lives and. How we can't. Really guide this process and where is it headed? Thing. And so that was kind of all my back back background for a good ten years before. Suddenly this Unabomber guy comes on the stage in the mid, early to mid 1990s. So I was really kind of already thinking in those lines. I was really primed to to agree. And I saw, just like you said, a lot of. Interesting and well. Argued points in in the.

Edward: Hmm, but why? I mean, we are able. It's extraordinary if you think about it, you're sitting there in Switzerland or somewhere. And I'm sitting here in in Olu, in Northern Finland and we are able to have this conversation and that would be impossible as recently as 10 or 15 years ago. So in terms of communication and academia. Is it's about. Communicating to other people and about developing. And so on. So from an academic perspective, OK, on in that level it's a good thing technology. It's a bad thing in so much as Twitter and whatever can lead to academic pylons and cancellations and basically nasty anti anti freedom people can get together very easily and do a lot of damage and can basically over the over the last 15 years make us all live

in the mind of a neurotic 15 year old. You know who who? Self harms and is adored. I mean, there's, there's, there's good and bad sides, but wouldn't you say it's a it's a net positive really. I mean, we'd all probably be dead. If it wasn't for technology.

David: Well, I mean, there's of course there's always positive sides to really any aspect of technology. You can always say, yeah. OK, I can communicate better. I have more access to information I can I can look up facts you know much quicker. OK, obviously there's certain things that you can do now that you could never do in the past, but every every little benefit comes with multiple. Effects, right? So none of these things come come as a unvarnished. Goods. I mean, they're. They're all very mixed goods. and I've argued, and Kaczynski's argued as well, that it really on the whole, it is a negative, it really is kind of collectively damaging to society, to the planet. You know the human well. Ian and yeah, I mean obviously right, it's keeping people alive. It's keeping 8 billion people alive on this planet. But of course, the planet never evolved to handle 8 billion people. There shouldn't be billion people on the planet that's destroying the planet, and technology is keeping those people alive. So that's part of the problem.

Edward: So what I had Robin Dunbar on here a few weeks ago, you may have heard of Dunbar's number and all that. So, and he's saying, well, well, we're evolved to live in about 150 people whom we all. Know and if and if we're not like that, then that will gradually send the more environmentally environmentally sensitive of us slightly mad. Such such such some of us, some of US outliers, nevertheless some of us will do bonkers things. So that's just that's one aspect of it. So what, what would you say as a society are the negative consequences of I don't know where we start the line with technology, do we start with industrial revolution or do we do we go back 100 years where where we should start? what would you say the main negative consequences to humanity of this technological society that we now have where it's just. Everywhere now.

David: Well, right. So it kind of depends on. How what level of technology? What level you view it how you view? It over the over the. Time frame, right? I mean but. Yeah, it it's. It's producing vast human numbers that have accelerated exponentially since the industrial revolution it's caused people to live in highly dense, extremely dense cities, which we were never had done before. It gives us lots of power to disrupt and destroy the natural environment that never existed before. It produces unnatural foods. I mean practically everything that we eat is processed, or hybridized, or GMO or. You know, or it's toxic in some way. So I mean, I mean, I mean we're surrounded by chemicals, we're surrounded by electromagnetic radiation. All these things simply did not exist right in in historical human human history. So I mean. It's almost impossible to pick out one or two things that are really the problem it's this entire complex, this whole system. And that's why Kaczynski likes to talk about the system. It's really a complete system of kind of control over human existence, human society. And now over the planet that's really the problem.

Edward: OK, so if we well I said before, we look into that sort of philosophically anymore. Can you tell me a bit about how you got in touch with Kaczynski, if it's not in, in this, it's a betraying a confidence or something, how you got in touch with Pinski and how your relationship with him sort of? Developed and so on.

David: Yeah, sure. Well, I was. I was just had started teaching philosophy at the University of Michigan back in 2003, and I was interested in teaching a course on philosophy of technology. And they said, yeah, sure, that's a good idea. But nothing like that exists. So you'll have to create a course from scratch. So I said well, OK, I can do that. I have enough background. So I was started pulling together material to present to the students about a new course in, in technology and it was like a historical thing. I go back to in ancient times to. The Greek critics, and then through the middle. Ages and the. Renaissance and so forth. And of course, I wanted to include recent. Recent day critics as well. So I had a. Bit from Bill Joy he wrote a famous piece back in 2000. Why the future? Doesn't need us. Quite a quite a popular piece. And then, of course, Ted Kaczynski, who was at the at the time that you know and still is, probably the most prominent living technology critic, and I knew about the manifesto, which at that point was eight or nine years old. Kaczynski been in jail for seven or eight years at that. Point and no one had. Heard anything about him at all? So he they the media, at least in the states had done a really good job of just sort of really isolating him completely. You knew nothing about the guy. You heard nothing. You didn't even know he was. Alive or dead? But I was pretty sure that he was probably still thinking about things. Maybe still writing things had new ideas about technology. So just just. Out of the blue, I wrote him a letter. Just on university letterhead and they. Sent it off. To the prison like you know, hey, here I am. I'm professor at University of Michigan, which, by the way, Dr. Kaczynski is your home university. He got his PhD from Michigan and I said yeah, I'm creating this course and I wanted to include some material. From you and. I had a handful of questions and I just kind. Of sent it. Off and never expected an answer. I had never written to. Prisoners before I had. No idea how that really works. But he responded in a in a couple weeks, he sent me a nice shorthand, handwritten letter said he would be happy to reply and then a couple weeks after that I got about 20 page handwritten letter detailing lengthy answers to my questions. And that really sort. Of picked off this sort of letter writing process that we did for several years.

Edward: and what? What are his? I mean, when it was the early 90s, when he engaged in his activities, wasn't it? So what? What are? What are his observations? Since I mean or his, it's it must be for him. It must be just this dystopia as far as he's concerned, to the extent that he's entitled. What's going on? I mean that, that it's in every aspect of life now you can't get away from it. No. What's what? His thought.

David: Well, right, I mean, so in one sense, I'm sure he feels vindicated because things have gotten much worse. I mean, he, he like you say, he wrote in the in. The 80s and the 90s. I mean, even in the early 90s, there was really nothing like the stuff that we. Have today right. There was really no functional Internet. People weren't using emails, there wasn't cell phones, there wasn't social media. I mean, none of that stuff

really even existed. And you know, cause since he was talking about where, where things were heading and then all this stuff came in the last 20 or 25 years. So it's gotten. Much, much worse. You know the the, the planet continues to go downhill. Human society continues to suffer. Human numbers continue to increase. Wilderness is continuing to vanish. I mean, so all the trends that he cited back in the early 90s are only only getting worse, even even to the pros.

Edward: I what I think is particularly worrying if you think about the collapse of civilizations and civilizations always collapse. I I've got a lot of research and I've got a paper under review. At the moment there's all kinds of theories behind it, but when the when Roman civilization collapsed because it was no longer intelligent enough to be able to sustain the population that it had, and because it got colder. And people were are subject to harsher conditions and whatever most people were still farmers and so. Although there was mass death, I mean. 60% or something in the Justinian plague. Most people could retreat to the countryside and just take up farming, and they knew. How to do? It now, even when I was a kid, our people of my in the 80s, my people of my grandparents generation, they would use their front garden to show off. And have flowers and whatever. And they would. Use their back gardens to grow food, and that skill is lost. And people just don't do that. There's this decadent idea that. Oh, there's always gonna be food in the supermarkets. It's always gonna be cheap. That was not the attitude of people born in the 20s. At least if they were work. Glass and then in in addition they would make and mend their own clothes and all this they and they would cook. Come in. Increasingly, we have this cost of living crisis they talk about in the UK and people needing food banks, it's often because. They can't cook. So they have to spend about £3.00 a day a day for one person on a ready meal, cause that that knowledge is not passed on. That's how bad it is. And so it strikes me if there was a collapse now, then that the. Death toll would be incredible. I mean, people can't, Gus? Oh, was it the pentti linkola that said, well, shouldn't they teach you at school to Gus? Fish wouldn't that be helpful? No one gets.

David: To yeah, right. No, exactly right, I. Mean you expect sort of just basic survival skills? Then you think. People would at least know how to. Feed themselves and prepare their own food. I mean you. Know I used to tell it to. My students all the time because. I you know myself, I do. A lot of cooking. I make my own bread and I do a lot of things. My own and. You know that then? The students sort of like laugh. At me like. You know you make. Bread. I mean, we just. Go to the store and. Buy the bread. So you know, I mean. People can't even do the basic sort of you. Know food preparation things. Let. Alone grow the food. Like you say, so yeah, absolutely. I mean, if systems start going down and the lights the power goes out and the lights go off and you're just. Like you know, we run out of your canned food after you know a month. Like, wow, you're gonna really. Be in a world of hurt here and. And yeah, absolutely. I mean very, very quickly if local farmers aren't able to keep somehow going and supply the local community if you're not within some. Reasonable distance of a of. A of a

farm of. Some kind that you could work with or barter. With, I mean, you're gonna really. Be be in a lot of trouble, absolutely.

Edward: This is what happened in North Korea during the famine. So you have all these people that have got qualifications and their doctors and or whatever but. It's suddenly meaningless. And suddenly you you've got to be able to fire. You've gotta. Be able to. Cook, you've got to be able to catch food every minute of every day is left over to obtaining food and water. And if you can't do that, you die. And so very quickly, tall people die, people that are about putting on weight die. And there's this fascinating process in the North Korea fact. So what's he? I mean, to summarize for our? Viewers that will not have presumed not, not not, have read it with Ted Kaczynski's latest book, which you edited, which you or rather you edited, and you wrote the introduction to can you could you give us A flavor of the kind of things that he's arguing based on his more recent observations.

David: So you're referring to technological slavery. Which which is actually his. First book that came out originally in 2010 it with a with a small US publisher. I wrote the introduction to the book so yeah. Really all I. Did is I wrote the introduction. Not I'm not in any sense of co-author so. I don't want. I don't want to throw that.

Edward: No, that's fair enough. No, that's fine. But what? What kind of thing is he for those that aren't familiar with it on here? What kind of things he are?

David: Yeah, so in in his book, he's his. Since he's had a second book. So there. Is a second book called. The anti tech revolution, so that is also. Out there but.

Edward: Are you involved in that?

David: No, he cites me a number of times, but I was not really directly. Involved in that second book.

Edward: Yeah, let's talk about either. Whatever you think is. More interesting. So what's?

David: Well, right. So I mean, in even even in. The first book, it's probably a better general book for for. People to read this technological slavery. So it has a it has. A full version, a corrected and completed version of the manifesto. There was a number of smaller errors and problems when it was published in in the Washington Post back in. Five, it has five essays that were new that that Kaczynski published or wrote while he was in prison. And we're not able to be published. Before talking about problems of primitive life, how to attack the system, questions about the morality of revolution and so forth. So he was elaborating some of those points. About 1/4 of the. Book technological slavery is his response to me, so I had written him dozens of letters over the years. and much of what I was doing was I was pushing back on his. Thesis and I would say, well, you know a critic of Kaczynski would say this, and then someone might say this, and a defender of technology would say this. And I kept pushing back, and then he was responding to. These criticisms that I was throwing. At him and he wrote it him in quite a quite a detailed form. And so he included. A large section of these letters that he wrote. Back to me, he. Put that also in the book and it was a

kind of a defense of his own. So I mean that's the kind of thing that that you would see in, in the books it's kind of an elaboration and a continuation.

Edward: What were the kind of? What were? The kind of criticisms that you leveled against, again against him. And how did he? How did he reply?

David: Well, you look, I mean there's basic questions like that. Anyone would say like for example, why do you need to revolt against technology? I mean, this is Kaczynski's basic thesis, right, the system. Is dysfunctional, cannot be salvage has to be destroyed or brought down. The kind of revolt against technology. So the. Obvious pushback is well, you. Don't really need to do that. Why don't you just fix it, right? Just focus on reforming the system. Take the bad parts. Try to get rid of those, or solve those. The good parts and. And try to you know. Implement some kind of reform action. And so, I mean, it's a common response. He talks a little bit about that. In the manifesto, excuse me. I sort of threw that out there and try to give some examples and Kaczynski. Was really pushing back, right?

Edward: But I suppose the issue is that if we agree with this idea that what make, what makes us happy? Ultimately, the people I've ever, I mean just the person that my grandparents talked about this one time years ago. I was talking to them. What was it like I said, when you were younger and people witnessed their brothers and sisters die and all this and people would die. Long and people would. and they said we have people happier. My our memory of when we was kids in the 1920s was people were happier yet yes. You die. Yes, you. There was death everywhere. But people were religious and people had the sense that that life had meaning and that certainty. And you didn't question things. If the policeman. Said something. It was right and you didn't question it and people were just happier. And now we have. All the death has been death. Has been pushed to the margins. It's so rare that anyone loses a child that it's newsworthy. It's so rare that anyone dies young. It's so and death, but yet we are very, very. And it and it's almost as if we are evolved to our evolutionary match is to be surrounded by mortality salience to be with people who are, are you still there? You're frozen or die frozen, right?

David: Yeah, yeah, yeah.

Edward: OK, to be surrounded by people that are like us to be. Mortality salience is high. And if we and. What Kaczynski was right about is if you move away from that. I don't know. How far? But. If you move away from that, then you will be very unhappy and you'll have to create these. What was the term he used in in the in the in your post? the his.

David: Very good activities and.

Edward: Yeah, yeah. And that's what I'm doing with my research. And perhaps that's what you're doing with your research, and that's what we all do. And they're ultimately hollow and so and that there's I think there's no. Getting away from that is there.

David: Well, right, so you know. That that, that's sort of. The basic position that cause. Musinski takes right is that you know people evolved to live under these very

primitive conditions, right? Small like you said, small groups, hunter, gatherers, people, you that you knew, a very small group of people that you were connected to, you were relying on each other. Everybody counted. Everybody was important. Everybody mattered. And you were in a vast wilderness. That was basically a clean, wild, uncontrolled natural environment. So yeah, there is dangers. Obviously there's dangers and wild, wild nature and wild animals and there's dangers from getting injured, injured are getting diseases and getting sick. And there's problems with childbirth, of course. That was always a big problem for humans but Somehow we did that for 2,000,000. Years we evolved. To deal with those problems, to understand those problems, to accept the loss in childbirth and whatever else. And you know, whatever battles with other tribes and lost to being attacked by wild animals, we sort of evolved the ability to deal and handle with those things. And we still had a basic grasp on. The of the key conditions of our lives. Right. We knew how to. Find food. We knew how to shelter ourselves. We knew how to defend ourselves against in most of the problems that threats that we faced. and it was a. It was a. It was a human scale society, right. You understood where you fit into nature. You didn't really understand how nature worked, but you really sort of understood how you fit into the big picture. And that's been completely lost right in in huge like I said, 8 billion people on the planet, you've got nations of millions of people, you've got cities of millions of people. All these things are so unnatural and so complex and so be so far beyond what we've evolved within our DNA to live in this much simpler condition. And now we live in this hyper abnormal artificial constructed environ. And it and it plays on your mind, on your psyche and your consciousness on your stress levels, on your hormones. I mean there's I think. We barely even. Understand all the problems when we've come so far out of the conditions that we evolved to live under of over 2,000,000 years and. And so it's just going to. Be an endless parade of problems that we can never really solve. Because short of engineering humans to. Be a new kind of. A being some kind of transhumanism or something short of that, you can never really solve your problems until you get rid of the. System because that's the problem. The whole civilization that we live in, the technological civilization, that's the problem. And you can't just solve cancer and you can't solve depression and you can't solve anxiety. By you come up with new pills. That won't work. It's part. Of it's built into the system and the.

Edward: Can I?

David: System has to go.

Edward: Can I just can I just? So someone saying entropy is not working for them. I'm try if you can't send things to entropy then send them through YouTube and I will I will answer. I will go into YouTube and I will answer things with YouTube. I will also try. I will also try also see but eventually is not working. So try that. Yeah, but I mean it. I mean, that's the thing. it's. I was thinking this with Liz Trust. So I don't wanna sort of speculate about this. But people will say, well, I do. People were saying today, why is it that when Theresa May resigned, she she? As did that. Yeah, she welled up, you know the eye and control on her emotions left her and she welled

up cause she's a woman. and Liz Truss didn't. Liz Truss was almost smiling when she, when she resigned today. And it struck me. She's probably. On head pills. I mean that that's the only...

David: Got it.

Edward: The only way I can make sense of that kind of reaction to that kind. And this is a woman that's evidenced neuroticism. She's had adulterous affairs cause she feels insecure. She's all kinds of things so that but that that, that. Seems to me to. Be the life will be an. Evolutionary mismatch will make you unhappy. Unless you basically take pills to stop you worrying, whereas under normal conditions when you worry this thing hits in called religion. and that suppresses the anxiety. and then you're right and you feel and you feel better and you know you have a sense of eternity. Whereas we don't allow for that, but we don't have that now. And so it's died off or it's. Considered weird? And so the only solution is to just to change the balance of your brain. That's how extreme it's got. And I think that that's Escapable isn't.

David: Exactly right. Yeah, I mean, I mean any, I mean. The word trust or anybody any of these political leaders, any corporate leaders, these people in high positions of visibility, people are billionaire class and all these. You know, celebrities and star athletes, these people under so much scrutiny and attention and pressure whether they're competent or. Not that's another matter. But you know, they're sort of under the microscope 24/7, and that's such a hyper abnormal bizarre. There are way to live, you know.

David: You can't imagine how how they able. To sleep, how can they function? They can't have a normal life. They can't have a social life. And so, yeah, of course they're gonna retreat to to drugs or. Psychotherapy or whatever. It takes just to keep them functioning day-to-day. It's a it's a near disaster and these are the most influential people in our societies.

Edward: So it's got, it's got to a point where the level of abnormality is so extreme. I mean, even even with the with Boris Johnson when he was when when he was Prime Minister, I mean he's. He sort of coped with life by by thinking of his life as a kind of Greek tragedy. And I a sort of a a, a kind of a sort of a self created religion. He seems to. Have come up with, but whatever it is that it's so even in the last, this incredible thing, even in the last 25 years since the rise of the Internet, the level of normality is so extreme. I know of cases of. I mean, I think. To have God help me if I've been at university 20 years ago, I've I've for I'm 41. If I'd been at university 20 at now rather than 20 years ago, I'd have been on Twitter saying regrettable things I'd have. I'd have been. I'd have been. Doing all that, I'm. I would. I know of cases of people that have had. Legally change their name. You know, because of things they wrote when they were 1819 in all, in order to get a job. And you can't just disappear. I mean, in the old days, remember, you could you could go and get a criminal record for something, and then you could move house and that that nobody you couldn't check the newspapers. For God's. Sake and And now these people, that's it. It's forever. Something crap you

did when you were 18. That's it. It will follow you for your rest of your life. and that's such. An abnormal it's just so wrong.

David: And I can't. You know, it's sort of like the old, you know this what some science fiction movies about where you can never forget anything. And it drives you insane, right? I mean, that that's sort of what happens. Everything in your whole life is never forgotten. It's always recorded, it's. Always out there somewhere and it's. Kind of like, yeah. It just kind of leads to mass insanity when that happens. You can't just forget anything. You can't. You can't put anything in your past. Move on. That's that's.

Edward: That's crazy. And then? But then I suppose in a sense is that in in a weird way? Is that a kind of evolutionary match? Because traditionally we would live in a group of 150. And it's exactly true that if you had a bad if you did a had a bad reputation, there was very little you could you could you could do about it. It was very. I suppose you could leave the village and found the new village or something, but that that was quite rare. It was you had to be extraordinarily careful. You had to suppress a lot of impulses to be an individualist and whatever, because. You had to get on with these people. Because there was no way of, there was no way out of it. In a strange way. Haven't we got back to that? Haven't we recreated a kind of village?

David: Well, yeah, I don't I think. I think in a sense probably in those small communities, I mean there was this kind of constant corrective pressure where you had to fit in, you had a role to play, you had to do your, your job. And if you. Repeatedly failed to do that or you cause some harm. To the group. I mean they, they probably if they were kind, they just booted you out and send you out in the wilderness to die because no one can live in the wilderness alone. You know, or they or. They just killed you up, right? I guess right. So I think there. Was probably a lot of pressure of various pressures to sort of you know? You know, sort of whatever. It's conforming pressure but it. Was sort of fitting in, you know. Doing your part carrying your part. Of the load. but now it seems like we had these sort of like alternative realities that these people can live in and they can function them for, for years or decades, right. And there's somehow so departed from the real reality. And I think technology and social media and the Internet really enables a lot of that stuff. So it allows people to spin off in these multiple parallel universes. I yeah, I mean, you could never get away with that before you know. And there was one world. There was one nature and you were in it and you had to, you had to fit. Fit in and survivor. You were gone. So yeah, it's a. It's a much different situation tonight.

Edward: but those alternative realities, as you put it, I mean they kind of crossover they imbricate with with normal reality in the same way that with a I know you could be a farmer and then at the at the at the weekend. You could be a Methodist preacher. And so you'd have these these two separate lives in a way. But then they would cross over because you're in a sense, your status as a farmer would be elevated by the or not by the fact that you were a Methodist preacher. And in the same way you you can be in your alternative reality and be it being good at my son, if you're if you're good

at. Let's say Minecraft or Fortnite? Yeah, separate reality, but that crosses over into real reality, cause this gives you status among the 10 year olds. you're you. You, you, you're not a. Noob you're good at at at at Minecraft or whatever they play. And so it's very and so all their pocket money, these kids, they want to spend on these €20 little things that you can program in. So you can get better skins. and you can. You're very lucky to have older children. They don't have to deal with. This nonsense I'm telling you. but. So they kind of cross over, don't they? They cross over these these that's kind of what Ted? I mean, right, they they.

David: they have to, they have to overlap. It can't be completely detached. I mean your list. You're living 24/7 in some virtual reality. I mean, there's got to. Be some some interaction. With with you know kind of. the real physical world, but. But yeah, I mean it's sometimes it's not just. Sort of what video games you're playing? More of your. Worldview and your outlook. And your value system you know, and these these can kind of spin. Off in very bizarre. And kind of you know. I don't know, sort of. What would normally be called insane? I mean or I don't know, hyperbolic sort of directions which could never have existed to prior to mass society and mass technological interaction so. Yeah, I you. Know again humans. People just really aren't. Aren't designed to handle those kind of things, and I think it causes massive psychological problems.

Edward: Yes, and but is there. I mean is it, do we have to just go to what he's saying, what Kinski is basically saying is that that we have to. Just go back to. I mean I I. I think I think the only way. You could get out of this issue this, this this situation that we have cause we're always going to strive to ensure that our kids don't die. We're always going to strive. Doing is some sort of eugenic system where where, whereby, where, where, whereby for the population to remain healthy, you basically have to submit. Contrary to pre modern levels of child mortality, IE 40% or something like that and that seems to be a almost impossible, you couldn't ask people to do that. So isn't it? Inevitable that in the same way that we know that that all mammals and all there's a lot of resources, they all go through these cycles they. All go through these cycles where they. Where where levels of kinship go are, are, are high and where levels of kinship are high. The population grows, and then with the level of kinship seems to become lower as a consequence of that, fertility starts to go down and then and then. Eventually, because the closer you get to speciation, the lower is fertility. And then you just collapse and this happens in my fruit fly. It happens among voles. It happens, and it seems to happen among humans. And so don't we basically. Just have a sort of extended Malthusian cycle. That there's just nothing we can ever do anything. About and that. we are at just the stage in the cycle of unhappiness.

David: Well, OK, so that's that's. A that's a higher level argument, right? That says. Yeah, right. Conceivably we can. Do nothing about. Social large scale social factors, I mean, so you could argue philosophic that we don't even have free will, so you can't really do anything about any of your personal decisions. So I mean, there are arguments that you could make that you know really everything that we do is

kind of pointless or hopeless and we're just sort of compelled to. Respond and react in very mechanistic sort of ways. So I mean. That's, I don't know, I guess you. Know like free will, it's. Kind of a disputed point. You know, I think most people would say, well, it is possible to have some kind of influence on social events and social progress, at least at some level and. People who speak out and. Communicate and write and you know, publish and so forth. Have some level of. Ability to help influence the larger conversation the larger discussion. And you know and It made a lot. Of these factors, may. Well, be out of our control. I mean, Kaczynski talked about this too, right? I mean, he wants to bring down the. Technological system. But he says, well, look, you know you can't do this. Until the system is extremely weak, it has its own intrinsic vulnerabilities. It may. Collapse on its own. And you know. But all we can do is sort of help the process along. We can just sort of assist the process at this point and so you know it's really an open question how much we can do, can we do anything you know at the very minimum you would say well look, I can I can sort of prepare myself. For whatever potential technological catastrophes that are coming up because they're sure to come in the in in the, in the, in the coming few years and. Decades, you can prepare yourself. You can. Prepare your family. You can kind of. Sort of be you. Know mentally ready? You can relearn the skills of survival. You can buy some land, you know I. Don't know. Maybe find a way. That you can survive. I mean the. Sort of very individualistic and personal actions that you could take. And then there's things.

David: You think you can take that.

Edward: You think I'm. I'm sorry to interrupt. I'm sorry to do you. Do you think that's the case that we are? We are moving towards some serious some serious problems that are going to take place that undo everything that we're used.

David: Yeah, absolutely. Well, right, I mean, you know that we're guaranteed to face a technological catastrophe, the whole COVID crisis was basically a technological catastrophe. You know whether or not it was created in the lab, it was an engineered thing that it was obviously technological disaster. But the fact that it's spread around around the globe with lightning speed through. High speed transportation. The fact that it's spread through highly dense, unnaturally dense human communities. You know, the fact that we have a solution which is a host super high Tech M RNA vaccine, which is the, you know the fix to this problem rather than solving the. Root causes. I mean the whole thing about COVID. Was it was, it was a. Technological disaster, but it was relatively small scale because the fatality rate was relatively low. You know, something like COVID comes around or some other pathogen that has a high mortality rate. Yeah, you know. You could you could easily see billions of people.

Edward: We have, we have, we have things like that. I mean, again when I go back, when I go back to this discussion, that sticks in my mind with my grandparents. They have things like that in 1968 there. Was Hong Kong flu? But the world doesn't go mad. The world doesn't shut down. Hey, cause it's not rich enough to. Shut down but B because it just doesn't. There, there is a sense in which look you just get on with it and if you die, you die. and People do die. I believe my great grandmother

died during the Hong Kong flu outbreak of 63 or whenever it was, there was some flu outbreak in. 63 and now the idea which. They said originally. OK, we need to get herd immunity. Let's get her immunity to this and no. And the reaction to that was one of horror. One of selfish. Individualistic horror? How dare you say that? What are? You gonna kill my granny? and the whole attitude is different and that's the. That's why we couldn't. But now we have hyperinflation at this. What a hyperinflation. We have severe inflation because there's too much money because no one's been spending any money for the last. Couple of years and then. We have. It's, isn't it just our attitude that we've become less we just can't deal.

David: Well, I mean, we have, we have the. Technical means to solve some of these problems, right? So we can stop, we can pretty much end or close to end infant mortality. We have vaccine process processes that can circumvent a lot of diseases. You know we. Can keep old people alive for. Much longer than we used. To be able to so. and it would be like insane you say. Well, look, let's get rid of vaccines or let's just let children die. Or just let Granny die like you say. I mean, nobody's gonna nobody's. Gonna do that voluntarily. but the problem is when you when you. When you take all those. Collective actions, then it you know the population skyrockets and you know. You, you, you sort of develop. Reactions to your vaccines and you know when the two too many children. Are born right and this. Causes you know, sort of social problems. Multiple levels and. You know, then there's the genetic. Problems where you know children who died often, that was a sort of a nature's filtering process. To weed out. Genetic problems, genetic abnormalities and now you don't have that anymore. All those children survive. I know you've talked to people. About that as. Well all all.

Edward: Well, yeah.

David: The children survive and the abnormalities.

Edward: I mean that's I think this is. This is a huge. Problem this is a huge problem.

David: Increase it it's extremely counterproductive.

Edward: Why have we got? Why have we got all these men? Tools that that that want to block people from buying milk or wanna dye. Their hair blue. Or whatever that it and it seems to be obvious that the correlation between physical and mental illness is. About point 3.4. And so obviously, what nature was doing in selecting out the physically sick was selecting out the mentally sick because those two things go together. And we have. A more and more of these, these just mutants. Who, who, who? Would have been selected. Out under half. Darwinian. Conditions and can influence the culture and they are influencing the culture and they're pushing people towards not having children and you saw this a lot with the BLM riots, not with. The black BLM people. Those people are just sensible and are acting in their. Genetic interests, but with the with the white ones and it's hell and this just they are these. These people correlate. That's why leftism correlates with not just leftism, but also Pete conspiracy theory. Reason it correlates with mental illness and that's and it's. Ripping apart society and it's so quick, though it was as though some tipping point happened,

or the Internet amplified it. Maybe technology amplified it. It amplified the ability for Mentals, who previously had to had to suppress their. That that their abnormalities to find other abnormal. Goals and work together to subvert things. This is a serious problem.

David: and then. And then they get married and they reproduce and they have. Children who are passing along those characteristics as well. So it's a compound problem and it and it really accelerates. I think we lose sight of how fast these these problems will, will will self compound it only takes a few generations of this going on and it really becomes an accelerating process. So this is just sort of one small aspect of what technology does to humans that that really it could quickly lead to kind of the collapse of society, even if. Nothing else went wrong.

Edward: Well, yeah. I mean I do think that's the one thing that the one terrible thing that social media has done really in well, since when social media started to rise up about 2006. 2007 that it's it allows these people. It's a good thing insofar as it allows adaptive people to find each other, and perhaps it does do that. And that's a good thing. But it also allows and it's a much. More significant thing. If you think that probably only 10% of us should be alive under normal conditions. But it it it allows just these. Insane people to find each other. And to and to cooperate. And if they? Are Machiavellian, and you know then then they can really have influence and the influence they've had on even in my.

David: Exactly right. So it's. It's another example of the damage caused by the negative aspect, by the by the deranged ones who are cooperating, working together, that outweighs the benefit of sort of the same ones who are just chatting together and learning things and sharing good ideas. So it's like anything, it's like any any new. the guy who wants to use a new power for destructive purposes has more more power than the than the guy who wants to use it for sort of constructive, because it's always easier to sort of destroy than to build up and to break things down than to than to construct. So as we get more potencies in terms of through technology, technological systems and communication. Systems and so forth. Yeah, the sort of the worst aspects seem to be manifesting more than the positive ones, so that every new advance in technology is a net loss for humanity. And the planet.

Edward: So really we should follow. I mean as I mean it's topical in so much we just had a Prime Minister that resigned today in in 1902 a 122 years ago. The Prime Minister, who resigned, was. The Marquess of Salisbury. And he famously said that basically all change will be for the. Worst so our policy as a government should be to ensure there is as little. Change as possible.

David: There you go. Exactly right it's almost it is. That's actually true. It's almost impossible to change things for the better. and so all changes only for the worst. You know, I had a Friend and then. In fact A1 of. My Co advisors for my PhD was Brian Goodwin. And he was quite a quite a progressive kind of a British fellow over evolutionary biologists and so forth. And he said, well, look nature has evolved over 4 billion years to sort of be like. Perfect. And nothing we can do can improve that.

Everything that we do makes it worse, right? Nature, Nature, the collective biosphere is already. At its peak. It's producing as much benefit and as much diversity and everything as as it possibly can, and we can do nothing but. To screw that up so yeah by. The more people and the more we actively intervene. And what was? Otherwise, as perfect as it could be, we're just gonna destroy it. We're just gonna degrade it so yeah. In that sense, every interaction is A is a degradation. Everything we do brings brings the system down. It brings nature down. It brings humanity down. You're that's right.

Edward: Yeah, there was a comedy sketch it this is in the late 90s, mid 90s, called Lean Herring, Fist of fun and it was a satire of the of the Amish. And it said that the Amish, they they decided to stop progress round about sort of 1800 or 1700 or something like that. That's where you draw the line 1700 and this guy. a conky Ian Conkey. I had a commune that he set up and the idea was that you stopped progress in. 1983. Everything, everything after 93 is too modern and so they've played computer games, but they couldn't be a computer game after 1983. And it was that that was the border. And I think perhaps that might be a good idea. I think we should stop. We should have stopped it. Well, frankly, on the as a conservative Englishman on the 1st of May 1997, that was when we. Got New Labour? That was when it just got all this. It just got too much. I think it should have been Internet. No 1st of May 1997 stop. I don't think anything after that was a good thing. And yeah, you can say I wouldn't have my Internet channel and I wouldn't be talking, but we'd be writing letters to each other. Maybe or something like that? I mean, and there was. An infrastructure that young people say forget this. I say that there was an. Infrastructure you wrote. If you wrote a letter, it got it. The next day, if you wrote. It to America, it got there within a week. This isn't the case now. It takes months and so the infrastructure was there to dig out some barn door is saying pen pal. I had a pen pal in. Korea for years before before the Internet and I have my whole relationship, my with my finished girlfriend without Internet and we wrote letters and things and telephone occasionally it's expensive though, but then that was that was it's just gone too far. OK, we're about halfway through. So if you knew the jolly Harry, I'd just like to say hello. Welcome to jolly hero. Of course, on my public house, what is this guest here for? Says ACT. Not concentrating, Sir. He's he writes about technology and so forth. Anyway, and we a lot of public house to Monday the 37th UK time, 2:00 PM, New York, which we discussed based research and of all kinds is increasingly Spanish from our work joke universities and on Mondays normally on my own answering very interesting questions that you send in which you send on the link below which isn't working for some reason and on Thursdays I have all the interesting guest. And today we have. David scrubbing, Ana. Where is that name from Czechoslovakia?

David: Well, it's a Slovenian name.

Edward: The Slovenian name. OK. They don't believe in. Vowels in in slim.

David: No, they don't like.

Edward: I didn't like girls. No, no. OK, so we have. We have doctor David, Sabina of the some type of the University of Michigan and now of where are. You of now.

David: University of Helsinki I'm a. Usually have a position as a visiting researcher at University of Helsinki.

Edward: Ohh, so you're just down the road from me, you. Know like, OK, there you go.

David: They've found the road there.

Edward: Just just a one hour flight down the road. OK and yes. And so. And I've gotta drive to Helsinki in in December. To get a plane and it's gonna be awful. It's gonna. Be snow. It's gonna be. Violent. Anyway. So. So yeah. So if you have any questions for Doctor Speer, we've been talking about Ted Kaczynski, with whom Doctor has has corresponded, and he's he's done the introduction to all his books and all this sort of thing. I'll then do send them in, and we would, of course ask them today. And I'm sorry they're. Just a bit of a ***** up. On the old the old entropy front I went into it earlier and it was fine and then somebody I think it was Carlotta or our Spanish barmaid mentioned she had a problem with it and it's not working, so I'm going to try and get back into that, but I'm gonna turn to the questions that have been sent in via the old YouTube, which is unfortunate because you know that funds evil, but what you're going to do. OK, so first of all, we have a question from narco Republican. And he says God invented tools, the devil machines, NGD. OK, I know all that means, but do you have any comment on that?

David: God invented tools, devils, the devil machines. Yeah, I guess. OK. I guess I don't know. What the last bit? Means, but you know, I mean people say, well because he wants to get rid of technology or scrubbing. He wants to get rid of technology because I've made similar arguments in a sense, you cannot get rid of technology. I mean, it goes back to stone hand tools that we had two million years ago. So you always got something that you're. Going to use as a tool. So you got tools you. Got the you know the simple tools simple. Tools like you know, levers and pulleys and And you know. Ramps and screw screw mechanisms and so forth. I mean you have sort. Of these simple tools and. And that's that's historically that was used to create great civilizations and it was sort of the complex devices. You know the machines, and in particular the powered machines, which really seems to have accelerated the problems. So you could make a case that. We can survive quite well. And we can flourish as a species and. As a culture with tools. But just not machines, certainly not powered machines, certainly. Not fossil fuel. Powered machines, so I myself have argued, for example, that you know if you you want to go back to 1990. Seven, I said well. We need to go back to about the year 1300. So we need to get it well. Back before the beginning of the industrial. Revolution, we still have tools. We still have basic ability to to, to, to create things elementary tools. And you can create a high level of culture, but you can't have sophisticated machinery. You can't have fossil fuels. You can't burn oil. I mean that's that's what's really kind of destroying the planet. So on the.

Edward: What is that?

David: I mean the subject. That's I agree.

Edward: the the. Sort of the sort of, sorry, the sort of pseudo type people will say, oh, what do you mean by tall? Where do we draw the line between tall and and? And a machine, you know all this. So are you saying we can draw a line and that line is the use of fossil fuels almost to be using fossil fuels? That's it. We're bugged.

David: Yeah, I mean, so it's right, not just me. I mean, a lot of people. Said. Well look. You know things like the steam engine, right, comes comes up around 17117 fifty, right? So this is kind of. A. a even if. It's wood, wood fueled. I mean it's still it's still kind of a engine fueled. Machine that it kind of operates under an external energy source, right? That's not. Animal or human? so yeah, I mean those are sort of obvious dividing lines to try to get out of those, which seem to have caused the worst damage, the worst damage to the planet and the greatest growth in human population has occurred since the year 1700. So you could make a case. Well, look, we need to go back to kind of prior to those levels. and maybe we can get to a sustainable and sort of a sane, you know. Existence at that point.

Edward: OK, I'd like to say, entropy is definitely not working, chaps. It's not work. I can't get into it. So if you have any questions for doctors to be in a on anything at all, then please send them in via YouTube. Do not send them in via entropy. I cannot get into entropy, it's not working. Don't say I'll. I'll try and unpin it from the taskbar it's not. Looking if I should probably put in a thing, send questions via entropy on the screen, so I'll do send queues via YouTube. There we go. And then I'll put that this is technology at work here. Two people are talking. Hang on. There we go. Right, good. There you go. So there we go. Alright, good. So the next question. I'll send a telegram in. Ohh for God sake then I. Gotta go and get my. Ohh Jesus. Just go upstairs and get the iPad. Oh, no. Oh, no. I can use two. I should. I should read the poem. We have a poem here at the jolly, A poet. Here at the Jolly Heretic public house, and he has written a poem for tonight's event. And he says, we welcome Professor Scrivener, a man with a wholesome demeanour tonight. He had explained in a manager main why we should all become, why we should all become. So there you go. So that's the poem for tonight. So I hope you. I hope you like that he's also I think written a poem on Liz Trust but I'll read it out on the on the other show. OK. So the next question comes from Hang on. OK, good. Yes, right. So yes. So from Harry and he says, is there a place where this stream is saved? I missed a lot of this. Yes, all streams are placed on bit shoot and obviously right, good. Carlos Acosta says the undiscovered self by Carl G Jung explains this as the plight of individual. And they're seeking. Of God being the mass man mass mindedness. OK. Are you familiar with that? I'm not. I'm not familiar with that.

David: No, not really.

Edward: No, no, we don't, we don't. We don't. We don't know much about young on here, I'm afraid so. Now I have to go in. I have to go question from Chester Burbage. They literally coming in now. I'm holidaying in Helsinki in December. He says any good recommendations? It's not particularly intellectual question, but OK, what? What are you what are your thoughts on Helsinki so far?

David: Well, yeah. I only spend part of the year there because lately I've only been teaching in the fall. But yeah, it's great. It's great place, I mean. It's yeah. Yeah, it's a. It's a nice little human scale city. You know, that gets along quite well. So I have nothing but good things. To say about Helsinki, it's a great, great place.

Edward: You have nothing but good things said about Helsinki. I have friends that went there for a stag night and they were so God knows why and they were so appalled by it that they very quickly realized they could get a boat to Talon and have a better stag night. What, what? What, what?

David: Well, OK, maybe maybe if you're.

Edward: I what he what he?

David: Maybe if you're a wild and crazy party or. There's better places you. Know but that that. I don't do that, so I guess I. I can't comment on that.

Edward: What do you what do you what do you want? Is what do you wanting of a city Helsinki is the most decadent place in Finland. People dress in modern in in the it's. I can't stand the place. I hate it. That's why it's called hell. Hell Sinky, it's a it's an awful place. Full of awful people, it's the reason why Finland.

David: Well, OK, right. So. Yeah, it depends on your perspective, right? I mean it provides sort of a modest level of culture and it's not too insane. And it's not too busy and. It's not too noisy and. People are pretty polite and they're really good. I mean, which, which is nice for you and me, because then we don't have to learn. And yeah, I mean it's kind of a I think. Of it's kind of. A small big city and yeah, I don't know. I've been lived there so I can't comment on what it's like for years. But you know, when I've spent time, I've enjoyed it.

Edward: Ohh, but they they talk funny though, don't they? I mean normal for they. They sort of like like knee. Ohh up here. In the mouth? Yeah, it's very irritating. For people you know. From from there. But yeah, it's I I'm not. I'm not. I'm not too much for fun. OK, while we have time because I don't have any more questions. This pan psych this psychism. Kind of idea that you've you've talked about in. A in an can you could you. Could you explain a bit about?

David: So, so another area of my. Interest is philosophy of mind. And when I was doing some. Of my PhD. Work by back in the late 90s. it came upon this idea about, you know. Like it, it even relates to technology. Because people talk about. Computers and consciousness or intelligence, right? Or artificial intelligence, right? Our our computer. Is really intelligent and what does it mean to have intelligence and you know, I was thinking about this and I was thinking about animal intelligence. And there's is. Even increasing discussion and. Over the past couple of decades about plant intelligence. Just kind of think about this idea like, well, you know who has intelligence, who are the in minded things. Out there. and it seemed to be quite quite at sort of a universal, potentially universal characteristic right across everything out there in nature. And I was studying this idea and it came. It came across this old idea called Panpsychism, which is sort of everything is sort of a psychic kind of intelligent sort of thing, right? Hmm, which which affects? You know, whatever technological systems,

cultural systems, things in nature and so forth, it's quite a quite an interesting sort of intriguing idea. When I published my book called *Metaphysics of Technology* a few years ago, I basically sort of merged those ideas and I said, well, look, there's a reason why panpsychism, which? I think is true. Sort of. It sort of kind of merges with this kind of technological picture of the world in some larger sense. And I tried to play out some of the metaphysical aspects or components of this, but. But yeah, I mean. There's there's very solid rational arguments. There's a strong historical basis for thinking everything in in the world, everything in the universe kind of has a psychic. Aspect to it.

Edward: So how would how would that influence you? You go through certain periods of history where you where you seem to have the foundings of great religions and things like that. So how how? How would that relate to that in some way? Would there would people somehow be more in tune with some? You're saying this basically dualism would be more intuitive alternatives during certain times.

David: Yeah, well. to so, to me kind of modern religions, whether they're sort of monotheistic, which we've sort of migrated to sort of came from polytheistic religions, where primitive peoples we're seeing. Conscious entities in nature, whether it was the animals or the plants or the lakes and the streams and the mountains and so forth, they were seeing evidence of kind of conscious or aware awareness in nature. And so to me that that was kind of the obvious lead in to say, well, these things have spirits in them. Which was kind of the classic animist view, right? That that we would say. But primitive cultures, all they saw spirits. And everywhere in nature. But I think in a sense they were right. They were right to see that cause there is a kind of an awareness and consciousness in things in nature, certainly animals and plants and systems of living. Things and so that sort of concept led to polytheistic views. We're seeing multiple spirits of nature. And then you said intended to anthropomorphize them, and they became sort. Of human like. And then we sort of fuse them together into smaller groups or eventually to into one being. So to me that's. Kind of that. In the short version, sort of this history of kind of monotheistic thinking which started really with a pan psychic kind of kind of primitive sort of worldview that I think was fundamentally correct.

Edward: OK and so but does that imply that that we should we should reject any sort of traditional materialism that that, that, that, that that it's wrong basically it's incorrect.

David: Traditional materialism says that my things have no mind in them, they're. Mindless right? And they're. Just particles and forces and they're interacting. The laws of nature, that's the traditional materialist view. And you say, well, look, where did the human mind come from? Where do human consciousness and they say. Well, I don't know it just. Sort of came. Out of nowhere. It came from. Nothing or just popped up. One day they have. No answer. It's just like a miracle you might. As well, bring God to the picture at that. So that they have no explanation so the traditional view of standard materialism is incoherent it's actually technically irrational to think

that, you know and minded beings like human beings came out of revolved from or emerged from. Insentient matter that doesn't even make any sense. we can't even begin to explain how. That can happen. So the alternative is to say, well, really everything was sent. To you at. Some level and it became complexified. Or you know. Increased in levels and depths and so forth. Through time, that's what evolution does, and. And so here we are, kind of the end of this long, long. Process, but it's sort of built into the structure of. Sorry, I can't hear you, Ed.

Edward: I'm saying when, when, when, when people have religious experiences and things like that. Are you suggesting that they are actually experiencing something real, that that that there's something actually there, that they are experiencing?

David: I mean, if it's an awareness kind of larger spiritual entities, I mean, I think that's probably true. I don't think it takes a mystical experience to do that. I mean if they have sort of traditional. I don't know. You know, visions of God or Jesus or the Virgin Mary or something. I think that's just hallucination, but yeah, if you if you're sort of seeing some kind of spiritual aspect or awareness or subjectivity to nature or to things in nature to the universe as a whole. I think that's probably a legitimate sort of thing.

Edward: So that's the kind of thing that the that the Native Americans are saying that they experience they that they take ayahuasca or not even do that, they just sort of get into a trance through music and so forth and they have this feeling of being in touch with the universe and of something greater, something something beyond them. That's what we the even dark kind. Commented on this that you you get to this, this state, this state when when you're in a ritual and you and you feel something greater we're somehow in touch with something real. But if that's right, then shouldn't that be sufficient to give us meaning? Why is it? Why is it going back to Kaczynski? And whatever. Why is it that we feel so strongly this this sense of deracination and so on, if if. This reality is there and one can get in touch with it.

David: Well, right, I. Mean that can be part of the picture. Part of the solution. But that can't. Really solve all the problems, right? I mean, if you understood that you were sort of connected to some larger conscious entity or some universal entity. I mean, you still gotta live. Your day-to-day life. You still gotta get in your car. And go to your job and sit behind your office and you know, get stressed out and eat. Your junk food. And everything else. So you know the you know the most benign spiritual view is isn't going to solve those concrete day-to-day problems. So we're sort of. Pushed, pushed and pulled on both sides as it were, as it were. And I think you. Know that you you want to make that connection, but that that can't. That can't solve all your problems. You gotta get down to the to the nitty gritty and deal with the technological society if you really. Want to get get? People to a healthier state.

Edward: Yes, sorry I was sending a. Message people are asking me do we have to pay YouTube to ask questions? I'm afraid the answer is yes, because I cannot get this entry thing to work, which is. Very irritating. It's worked for years. So sorry, we've got a question about young. I mean, isn't that it? It seems to be what you're saying is? I

mean what? What young argues that there's need something, something quite similar, he effectively assumes that there is this, this world of archetypes, this this religious world with, with, with which we can we can get in. Touch and that. If, if only we could, if only we could do that, we'd, we'd all feel a lot better and. That's sort of the way forward, isn't it? Isn't that what? He's kind of saying.

David: Maybe in one some loose sense. Again I you know, I know. So little about you. And I don't. I don't. I can't really comment very intelligently, but I mean I. From what I know, that's. Probably in the right direction. I don't know that there's a lot of rational argument there, and I don't know that it's. Grounded in the sort of you know, philosophical concepts in the history of ideas and so forth. I don't know where you draw drawing all his views from I. You know, if he's just kind of arguing for some mystical connection to things, I mean that that only gets you so far. I think you really need. To take more of a rational kind of analysis, at some level of. Of these kind of things. And I think we can do that, so you know. You you're the sort of 1 sort of soft, softer or you know, intuitive side of this thing. But I think we. Can do better than that.

Edward: Right. and OK. We have a question from Hibernian perspective and he says, was agriculture just as harmful to humanity as industry? Early farmers benefited little from its adoption. Yet without it, we would never have had civilization. Is there a wider mechanism at work? Thank you, Sir.

David: Yeah. So well, you know. Jared Diamond wrote a famous article back in 1987 said the was titled The Greatest Mistake in the History of the Human Race. And the greatest mistake, he said, was agriculture. So, yeah, you could say, look, agriculture put us on this road to abnormal. You know dense civilizations, which led to technological breakthroughs and to more more, more access to energy sources and so forth. So yeah, in a sense, agriculture maybe was the original sin where we broke away from our long standing hunter gatherer existence and started gathering in large numbers. It's fixed in one place and tried to extract to repeatedly food out of the earth in in sort of a constructed sort of way. So I mean there is. A kind of a good a good case to. Be made that agriculture is a kind of. Kind of. You know, original like I say, original sin or first mistake of humanity that put us off that road of sustainable existence and set us down a really very bad path.

Edward: And we know that we know that to be the I mean we that's recorded when you in in Genesis or whatever it's as if on some level we know that that that was that was the fundamental mistake to people.

David: Exactly right, I mean. That's right. That's right. That's why it shows up in our mythologies there. There's kind of an inborn idea that somehow that was an error. It was a mistake to start plowing. The land and scattering. Seeds and you know, now you're fending off the. Animals and you? Gotta look out for disease and you gotta hope that you get the rain and all these kind of things. Yeah, I mean, I think there's a lot of cultures. Sort of recognize. Well, look, there was some. Kind of original sin. There and it and it is connected to how we relate to the land and I think. That's correct.

Edward: But then on the other hand, I suppose you you'd it's. It's not some dramatic black and white thing, is it? I mean, we would have started off in as the sort of most simple hunter gatherers, like the Pygmies or the Bushmen or whatever. And then you get those that engage in. Well, I say, let's call it gardening. A bit of agriculture. A proto agriculture, but they're not totally agricultural.

David: Right.

Edward: And then at some point for some reason, and goodness knows why. I mean, what would? Make you do that because it's such hard work. but they decided some people have suggested that it was Quebec. Tep Quebec, TEP, that that you you, you, you you build this big religious structure and you become obsessed with it and in order to do that you have to have lots of people in one place at the same time and then you go full agriculture and then once you start then there's no going back because you can. Store grain and you can become rich and other people and suddenly you have social classes of a pronounced degree. And that's it.

David: Arguably that goes back. That goes back to the. Egyptians right? I don't know if that's what you're referring to, but I mean, you know you. Can look at. Ancient Egypt around 3000 BC and they would seem to be the first to create these complex societies. These hierarchies, these priestly hierarchies, and it was built around grains and wheat that they could store. And they could. Use to. To feed. And to and to build their numbers. So yeah, I. Well, they. You know, there was.

Edward: Make the tent goes around, goes back to about 10,000 BC. Which is, which is the time when we innovate. When we went Neolithic revolution, it's then.

David: It was very that was very early in the. Process right did. It maybe the very, very earliest original settlement. Would have been back then but.

Edward: Yeah, exactly. And so and so. And then we and then perhaps, I don't know, perhaps you could imagine that they taught this group that founded agriculture, perhaps they taught it. To some other group. That's the descendants of that in Iraq or whatever. That's the descendants of Adam and Eve. And they remembered this. Oh, God. That was a bloody stupid. Thing to do. And it and it's and it's carried on to this day, but the only thing the weird thing about it, though, is that of course we would the evolution speed up on the whole scene is we are evolved we you know we white people anyway we are evolved to agriculture. There's only a small number of people on the planet that are not evolved to agriculture such. As the Inuit. And the Australian Aborigines and. the Bushmen and Whatever most people are evolved to agriculture, so it's so it's actually. A kind of a match. In a way that it it's more so for us, it's more of a match than in in a way than Hunter gathering, but yet that's what the.

David: Well, well, right. Well, right, we succeeded. We drove them out. Right. we defeated them because it was able. If it was. Possible for some. Period of years to produce excess amounts of food, food that could be stored which allowed human numbers to increase and therefore you know when. It came to. Fighting for land or battles or whatever, right? the city dwellers, who are more numerous and also had more sophisticated tools were always able to defeat the you know, the primitive people

or the forest dwellers or the hunter gatherers. So you know that that's kind of been the story over the last 10,000 years. We really just literally outnumbered them and drove them off the land, drove them to marginal land and. And you know, now they're. Like you said, there's very few humans in. Existence to our agriculturalists. In some sense.

Edward: So you, yeah.

David: I guess you could say, well, look, you know we succeeded we defeated that view, right. The agriculture view won out over the end of the hunter gatherer view, but I think that's a short term view. I mean I'm saying, OK, 10,000 years is a short term, but certainly on the scale of evolution and we need to see how that plays out that that. Story is not complete yet. And it could could well. End in sort of catastrophe and sort of defeat for the agriculturalist. And you know, and then in another 100 years, we could sort of be back to a handful of hundred others. And that could be the human race.

Edward: Well that's one of the things that that I've I'm writing about this in a book at the moment and that's one of the things that makes sense to me is that, what would happen is if there was a collapse now, then the world is so interconnected. Everybody is part of this mesh that if there was a collapse, now all that would be left would be basically the. Imminent hunter gatherers. They're not part of the system, the, the, the, the primitive people like on the Andaman Islands or whatever they would, they would survive this because they're not part, they're not in meshed into this into this system, whereas everybody else would just. That's why you get some people speculating that there was something. I don't think they're right, but there was something to like. Graham Hancock you know that there was something like that 12,000 years ago that there was some mass collapse of high technological civilization and that all that survived was the was the hunter gatherers. OK, the next question comes from. Yes, from artesian farmer and he says, Hi, Ed. This might seem like a silly question, but it is not. Can you ask your chap like? A poll how many of them have seen the portal film? The Wizard of. Oz, while being intoxicated like OK, half on Monday again, The thing is in West Nathaniel, Westerman says hypothetical. How likely would it be for mankind? To eventually experience a second industrial revolution after being reset back to the Stone Age.

David: No, about about 00 because the.

Edward: In fact.

David: First one only. Occurred because the fossil fuels were easily accessible. The oil was bubbling at the surface, the coal was you just scraped away the dirt and there was coal there, and that's all gone. So all the accessible fossil fuels are gone, and you'll never get those back again. So once this system. Goes down, it will never come back. There will never be a second industrial revolution.

Edward: Well, why not? Couldn't there be an alternative form of? I mean we we've. Had we've had a civilization based around the bronze, we've had a civilization based around iron. We've had a civilization based around coal and we now have a civilization

based around oil. Isn't it possible somewhat in the future there could be and someone measuring nuclear energy as well. But couldn't there be a civilization? Something else?

David: if there's a. Collapse. You're good. You're gonna. Go down to very primitive levels, then what? All you'll have left. Is, you know. OK, wood, you can have a wood fueled civilization. But that only gets. You so far. You won't be able to access the fossil fuels. You won't. Be able to. Process the metals beyond a very crude state. So you. Yeah, I. I don't think in any conceivable time you want to be able. To rebuild that.

Edward: I think that's a good point. I think I go further than that though. I think we have to think about that there has to be a certain level of intelligence in order to have sufficient capital geniuses in order to do these things and come up with the brilliant inventions and foster civilization. And we've been in a particular situation with regard. To our climate patterns, where it was very, very cold. We've been through this cold period between. That sort of 1250 and I, I suppose a couple of 100 years ago, this very cold but intensely cold, a mini Ice Age. And that was what allowed us to become sufficiently intelligent to be able to innovate the industrial revolution, plus the fact of the Black Death which killed about 1/3 of the Europeans. And it probably would have been the stupid of their. All right and there's other things like that. And so you you've you've got, you've got to think that could that happen? Again, and it probably not. So if we were to go, if we were to go back, if we were to collapse, let's say from what we have now 100 years from now, we'd have a an IQ of 85 or something, it could conceivably take, if we collapsed back to solid edge conditions. It could take thousand. It wouldn't be like 1000 years and we rise up again, not up. To this, a 1000 years. We might rise up to something like ancient Greece. Maybe, maybe. But even that this was the set was underpinned by a cold period. Say so you you you'd have to. Have a long cold. Period of intense selection and unless that we don't know, I mean that could happen, but it might not. So if we go for a warm period, then it's thousands and thousands of years. And as you say, well, on what on what do they build the civilization? I mean, the Inca, the Aztecs. Managed to build on Obsidian. but they only got so far. So yeah, yeah, yeah. It's just luck. It's not good. OK. The next question comes from Carlos Acosta. And he says, David, read the undiscovered self. You'll thank me. Remember that? I don't. I don't do Generation Z acronyms and I don't know. What they mean? but. OK, apparently you should read the undiscovered self by. Well, what do you? Think of that chap you know. That's what's his name, the bike caramel. Mind going back to what we were saying earlier, this idea that the that he's saying that we we. That there wasn't a self until the Bronze Age and you just had a sort of a God side of the mind and a non God side of the mind communicating with. Each other you have thoughts on that?

David: I I like what Nietzsche said. So Nietzsche said it was sort of came with, again, probably like the the, the advent of agricultural civilization, the fact that people who used to be free as a hunter gatherer, you were sort of had total freedom, at least within your band. Your band had sort of. Absolute freedom to do what? That wanted when you became trapped into society, into civilization. You your psyche felt like it

was trapped. In something that didn't exist before. So I I. Think that this was what niche niche seem to think is that this idea of. The self came about. With the advent of. Civilized, civilized society because. Then suddenly, you felt like there was. A you who was. Stuck in a system, it was a me I maybe I'm. Stuck in my. Body or maybe I'm stuck in my. Role in society and. That's where the sense of self can. From and I think that I thought that was always an interesting point that maybe maybe even primitive people never really had this kind of. Modern sense of self, because they were just sort of there, just just in nature, they were acting more spontaneously or creatively and maybe like like an animal presumably would do. It's only in these abnormal. Conditions of civilization that you sort of get this sense of. Well, there's a me. There's a distinct in me and it's separate from my body, and now my soul and. Can you know can maybe? Live forever. I hope that I'll be free someday. I mean, that's all built on this idea of the civilization and trapped and imprisons us because it's an unnatural way of.

Edward: I mean, I mean it's. Still, I think that the idea of being on your own, of being alone, and you've got people that write about this Anthony store or whatever they write about solitude and it's importance. But being on your own was something really quite rare until really quite recently in our I mean things like having your own bed. In in, in. In the old days, everybody just slept around the fire. They slept around the source. Of warmth you didn't have. You'd be on your own. Maybe when you when you defecated or something. But that was about that was it I, and otherwise you'd be with other people all the time. And so this idea of being alone in your bedroom or in the shower or what you it's new. It's quite new.

David: Yeah, exactly.

Edward: And that must be.

David: Well, right. You were always. With other people. But it was, as you said, it's a small group. 100A. 150 people and you were. Surrounded by vast, dark, open wilderness as. Far as the eye could see. So in a. Sense you were. You were happy to. Be with other people. You needed to be with other people. Your survival was to be there around the fire with. You close to the other. You know your family members or your children or your mate or whatever it was, right? I and I think now because we're so bombarded in these complex. Hyper modern. You know, crowded, overly dense societies that that's where this pressure to be alone comes from because you think Oh my God, there's too many people. There's all these strangers and I go I see thousands of people every day and that's so at such an. Abnormal thing for a human being to do. And you say, well, look, I just want, I want to get away from these masses and these crowds. And this is like driving me crazy. And I just I want to be alone. I mean, that's the obvious reaction. I would. I just want to be alone because there's so many people around and. I think that probably is a driving factor behind that.

Edward: It's very good point. I'm someone saying defecate alone. You don't do that in the Russian public loo, that's for sure. Series I don't you've been to one, but it's serious, loose and you can see each other. OK. The next question comes from from Hibernian perspective. Thank you Sir. And he says, could agriculture have impacted

genetic diversity? Did it exacerbate individual speciation or class in society and change our nature forever? Would you want to answer that? I can answer that or do. You wanna do you have any views on that?

David: Well, it certainly led to larger societies, which led to class structure and hierarchies, right? That didn't exist in in at least a much lesser degree. In a small nomadic. Band of people. and you know. Yeah, eventually it did. It did genetically alter human beings because we sort of became, in a sense, domesticated, right? Sort of being existing in these large, complex societies. So in a sense, we have domesticated not only wild animals like cows and pigs and chickens and dogs and cats. We've in a sense, we domesticated ourselves. and I think in that process. We've, we've, we've certainly altered our own genetic nature from what it would have been had we not embarked on that path of agriculture and civilization.

Edward: Yeah, I concur. Well, we know that there's a book called the 10,000 year Explosion and it looks at this in detail. It's called explosion for a good reason, which is that that it's called huge genetic diversity because it means that there's more pressure to find more niche niches in order to survive as we move into colder areas and all kinds of stuff. And so, yes, absolutely. It caused us to be much more. Genetically diverse, I mean, there was no blue eyes before the agricultural revolution. There was no blonde hair before the agriculture revolution. There was no white skin before the agricultural revolution, so certainly it is. It has caused genetic diversity. Did it exacerbate individual specialisation in the class society? Well, yeah, because once you get, once you get, you're competing within your group for, for, for power and resources. And so you end up again, more niches and what social classes are basically niches. And so basically you're creating a more key strategic society, which is harsher yet more stable. And So what that creates is more niches, more social classes. So it's changed the nature of who we are. Are and what one of the things that's interesting is people who are hunter gatherers, like Greenlandic people or whatever. They do have tremendous difficulty coping with various adaptations to an Agricultural Society like alcohol, which is adaptation to Agricultural Society. They can't cope with alcohol so, so. And when you give them alcohol, they. Basically, just drink themselves to death. So there's two kinds of people in in Greenland, drunks and Chris. that's pretty much it. OK. The next question comes from Annun Kiuru and he says should we accelerate localism to save humanity from science and technology? That's an interesting question, isn't it? If you think about it, what is woke ISM doing? Woke ISM is pushing people along a maladaptive road map of life. It's kind of saying don't have children, don't look after genetic interests, just live for the now. And that's gonna reduce the population down to those that are genetically healthy enough to resist it.

David: Right. Celebrating homosexual lifestyle or transsexual or whatever, right? Those are sort of anti family anti reproductive movement maneuvers, right? There's there's a kind of a point to that, right? I mean, the general, the general term is accelerationism, right? So some people say, well, look, you know we need. To kind of speed. Up the decay so that we collapse sooner rather than later because the longer

we hang around here, technology is only going to get worse. It's going to be worse for more species are going to go extinct. And you know. Humans may increasingly suffer, so maybe, maybe we need to do these accelerating tendencies explicitly to drive the system to the. Brink of collapse? You know, rather than trying to pose them. So I mean that there's that's an interesting sort of debate and I guess you know I I. Can see both. Sides of that argument there is possible reasons. We should hasten these factors that would speed up the collapse, because and Kaczynski made this point as well a sooner collapse is better than a later collapse. Because the system is. Smaller and less destructive today than it will be tomorrow and a year from now and 10. Years from now.

Edward: And so on. Yeah, I mean the. The suit? The. Sooner we collapse, the more people there. That will still have the knowledge to survive the collapse.

David: Right, exactly.

Edward: I don't know if that's a good or a bad thing, but the but what the less likely the collapse is to be just absolute. Because if you think that if let's say a I know with the car I put, you have to have a really, really high IQ to go to. Invent the car, a slightly lower IQ to be. Able to fix the. Car a slightly lower IQ to be able. To just you. Know use the car and a slightly lower IQ to be so stupid that you can't drive a car.

David: Driver fire.

Edward: And the more, the more we go on like this, the higher which we are getting stupider. There's no question about this, but we're losing about 1.5 IQ points per decade at the moment in Western countries. The more people there are that are so utterly stupid that they can't do anything and anything used. and that and that leads to a collapse and the brilliance of localism in that way we can see it as kind of like Satan's avenging Angel. Is that it? It will get people that are remotely, genetically, and healthy that can be inculcated to do maladaptive things, and it will remove them.

David: Right.

Edward: And so all your, oh, I've got the Internet. Thing happening now. Somebody must be streaming upstairs. And so and so and so all you get there is a much worse thing when it happens, but couldn't that be argued that's all in a sense, once we started down the road of anything that wasn't pure, pure, a pure fully Congress with the environment, agriculture or whatever. We were just waiting. For a collapse. There would have to be a collapse. How did he justify to you, Kaczynski? You know, the whole killing people thing. Did you? Did you?

David: Well, yeah. I mean, his official story is he was in a unique situation and he needed to gain the notoriety. Through the killings and the injuries, there were more injuries. There was only three who were killed at. 2022 or something who were injured? He needed to gain the notoriety to force the publication of the manifesto in a high visibility venue. So Kaczynski seems to have viewed his case as unique because he really needed to push this manifesto into a A a circumstance where would be read by millions of people, which it which it did. So he succeeded, but he never talked about people. Following that example, he never wrote about people you know needing to do

the same thing. So I'm trying trying to be copycat killers or anything, I mean. So I you. Know he, he. He sort of justified it in his. Own case and. And he never really to my knowledge. Never extended it to other. People at all. So you know I. For what worth you know?

Edward: So it's a, it's a purely it's a. Purely utilitarian approach. those three people.

David: Yeah, exactly. It was it. Was a utility in a sense. It was utilitarian approach and it served its purpose. And then in the sense he. Succeeded at it.

Edward: Yeah, I see. Well, yeah, it did. But I mean, it doesn't help really much for the, the poor, innocent souls that got themselves in, in, in one case wasn't the wrong. Person, wasn't it aimed at a particular person, and it was some some other person that opened.

David: Yeah, a couple of the early, the early. Bombings were picked up by random people. and it and it. And it was not the targeted person. But I think. the the. The three fatalities were all the intended people.

Edward: OK, Carlos Acosta says if forests burn too hot, they don't grow back. Well, I didn't think about. That tell me. About that, yes.

David: That's true. Normal forest fires, which are normal and natural, will burn the. Low the low. Growth and the tall trees will survive. And the forest regenerates, and that's a normal cycle when you use technology to stifle the fire and the debris builds up, you get a catastrophic super hot. Fire condition, which burns to the crown of the forest, destroys all the trees and then it's an extremely long process to renew that. So yeah, that's a good example of technological blowback. When we put forest fires out, cause we think we're doing something good for whatever, for the for nature, we're actually causing the build up of an eventually catastrophic fire which destroys the whole fire and destroys the landscape for hundreds of years.

Edward: I see. I didn't know that. So really we should. So what you supposed to do, though, when we get these forest fires now every single summer in. America, or in Australia or whatever.

David: Yeah, it's, it's because they've been suppressing virus for decades and now they're. Now they're screwed because. They can't let them burn like natural because now there's too much debris and fuel built up. that's an unnatural condition. What they should be doing is lots of prescribed burns where they can do small control. There is they've tried to. They tried to do that now. They eventually figured out that we do have to burn the stuff. Every once in. A while and. They and they try to do prescribed burns in certain areas, but you'd have to prescribe burn. You know your whole state or your whole country? Once in a while to. To try to get back to a natural kind, to kind of.

Edward: Right. And presumably that we can extend that metaphor, that's not a metaphor with literal, but we can take that as a metaphor. We can extend it. It wouldn't follow to kind of humanity.

David: Exactly right. I mean, in a sense, we put off all the forest fires. We used every technological tool at our availability to put off all the all the metaphorical forest fires. And now the debris is building up, and when the inevitable lightning strike hits and you get a catastrophic fire and everything's destroyed, like, well, what the hell was the point of that? Because we didn't. We didn't save ourselves anyway. We just we just put. Off the problem made it worse down the road.

Edward: Right so basically trying to save everybody all lives, always particularly of children is kind of like putting off a forest fire that will manifest down the road.

David: and right in. The sense that it will it will destroy us. It'll be like a. Catastrophic collapse and then then they'll be mass. Death because we thought we were doing a good thing. It's like the forest fires. You think they're? Doing a good. Hey, we're just trying to keep the fires down. We're trying to save the plants. No, no. Nature has the different plans. Nature says we need fire. Nature says we need to lose. Children, unfortunately, at relatively. High rates because that keeps the species. See if you circumvent that, you'll pay a price, and we're gonna. Pay a price for it.

Edward: Well, we are. I think we're already paying a price. In the form. Of woke people.

David: Exactly. Well, right there, you. There you go.

Edward: And what are they saying?

David: We're already taking place.

Edward: If you dye your hair blue or green or something, what you're basically saying is that you're a different species because it's not natural to. Have that hair colour. So you're like a wasp or something. You're saying you're poisonous? Which you probably are.

David: To to. To me it's like self mutilation. You know, all these tattoo guys get tattoos all over your face. I mean that's it's just a kind of self mutilation which is a, it's a path, it's a pathology, right, it's a sign. Of mental illness, right? I think so.

Edward: Yeah, but it spreads. I mean I it, it spread very quickly. There was a period in the 19th century where a few people got tattoos, church had a couple of tattoos, the Tsar had some tattoos in places they. Cover up, but you don't get it on your face. You don't, you? Don't get somewhere you can't cover up, cause that's like saying to society you know, I don't need to work or. Something that's it's.

David: Exactly I have. It's just. No, exactly. You're right. Now you're right.

Edward: I was met a girl that had she had. FTW on her forehead. And I said on the forehead and I said, what does that mean? Said means ****. The world and I said well. Yeah, I mean.

David: OK, there you go.

Edward: You know, it's just, well, why would anybody? That's kind of what they're. Saying like I was gonna see. There's any more questions? And then we better we better wrap up. So I'd like to apologise to people that have sent questions through entropy, which is selfishly not working tonight. If you have sent a question for doctors. Been

through entropy then I is this one last question. Yava Scudo says Mr. For you, are you familiar with Pierce's Cosmo theism?

David: Yes, William Pierce's cosmos. Theism. Yeah, I like it. It's kind. Of it's kind of a. Pantheistic view it's kind of. Kind of compatible with the. Ancient Greek view. It's compatible with Spinoza, so I'm. A little bit familiar with it.

Edward: So what is he actually arguing? What's he say? What is this cosmic theism?

David: Oh, it's kind of. It's a kind of a it's kind of pantheism kind of seeing God in nature, right, kind of a naturalistic God is part of nature. God is built into nature.

Edward: OK, I can't get into entropy, so I'd like to point if you said any questions of entropy, it should be working by Monday, and if you send any four doctors pravina, then I will. I will. I didn't even read your question, says Harry. Well, if your is your question by entropy, Harry, I did read. I did. I did read a question. By somebody called. Harry, I remember because there was the there was. The code ohh I haven't. Ohh sorry yes I have. Sorry Harry. Does Dave. That's you think the agricultural revolution was only bad.

David: Well, it's a it's a mixed event. I guess my short answer is it was a mixed event, had some positive things, lots of negative things in the story is still unraveling and we can't say it, it's like it's like. to talking. About a novel and you're halfway through it and just say, how was the ending? Well, it hasn't ended yet, so I can't really. Tell you I mean. It's it's looking pretty bad that agriculture, for whatever its few benefits you know, is put was potentially catastrophic for humanity and nature, but it remains to be seen. And we only probably need to. Another few decades or till the end of the. Century and I, and I think we'll know.

Edward: OK. Well, I'd like to apologise for everybody, including Heidi, who reckons she sent a \$5000 gift 500. I don't believe her for this guest but that, that that wasn't that. Send anything through entropy. I hope you'll be working on Monday. If I get when I get the questions, I will send them to Doctor Sabina and hopefully he will tell me the answers and that I will read them out on Monday. Ohh, I'd like to thank you. It's a very interesting conversation. Thank you very much for coming on and I. Is there anything you'd like? To tell people about that you're working on. At the moment. Or what's what's going on? Up, up your way?

David: Just you know, to get people. To get interested in in and read books you know, like I said, I published my own book, metaphysics of technology. I think people might like that I. Published a reader of historical critiques called confronting. Those are both out there on Amazon. So people can take a. Look at that. Look at my website, David Scorpina. Dot com. So I actually have a little. Little really, terribly crude website that I try to get to keep people informed on things, so yeah.

Edward: OK, thank everybody. And I will see you all. On Monday and goodbye.

Joseph Bronski

A Critique of the Unabomber's Ideology

From 1978 to 1995, Theodore J. Kaczynski sent sixteen bombs to airlines and universities, leading the FBI to codename his case the University aNd Airline BOMBER, or “UNABOMBER.” It was not until the publication of his manifesto, *Industrial Society and Its Future*, published because the still anonymous Kaczynski had threatened to send a bomb with the intent to kill if he did not see his manifesto in the paper, that it became clear why he had chosen his targets. In his manifesto, he explained why he thought the techno-industrial system had to be destroyed for the good of the human race, hence his hatred and targeting of airlines, scientists, and programmers. While the man committed acts of terrorism and was sentenced to life in prison for murder, his manifesto is not simply the ramblings of a mentally ill evil genius. It contains a considerable amount of argumentation justifying the author's deeds, and as political scientist James Q. Wilson wrote, “If it is the work of a madman, then the writings of many political philosophers—Jean Jacques Rousseau, Tom Paine, Karl Marx—are scarcely more sane”. Despite the actions of the author, a work of such ideological austerity deserves to be considered.

Ted Kaczynski's main thesis is that “industrial-technological society cannot be reformed ... in such a way as to prevent it from progressively narrowing our sphere of freedom ... thus, permanent changes in favor of freedom could be brought about only by persons prepared to accept radical, dangerous and unpredictable alteration of the entire system. In other words by revolutionaries, not reformers”. As indicated, freedom is the highest good to Kaczynski, who defines freedom not as rights but as “the opportunity to go through the power process, with real goals not the artificial goals of surrogate activities, and without interference, manipulation or supervision from anyone, especially from any large organization”. In regards to his term, “power process”, Kaczynski thinks

Human beings have a need (probably based in biology) for something that we will call the “power process.” This is closely related to the need for power (which is widely recognized) but is not quite the same thing. The power process has four elements. The three most clear-cut of these we call goal, effort and attainment of goal. (Everyone needs to have goals whose attainment requires effort, and needs to succeed in attaining at least some

of his goals.) The fourth element is more difficult to define and may not be necessary for everyone. We call it autonomy.

To Kaczynski, not all goals are equal. He uses

the term ‘surrogate activity’ to designate an activity that is directed toward an artificial goal that people set up for themselves merely in order to have some goal to work toward .. For many if not most people, surrogate activities are less satisfying than the pursuit of real goals ... Here is a rule of thumb for the identification of surrogate activities. Given a person who devotes much time and energy to the pursuit of goal X, ask yourself this: If he had to devote most of his time and energy to satisfying his biological needs, and if that effort required him to use his physical and mental faculties in a varied and interesting way, would he feel seriously deprived because he did not attain goal X? If the answer is no, then the person’s pursuit of goal X is a surrogate activity.

Therefore “science is a surrogate activity because scientists work mainly for the fulfillment they get out of the work itself,” as is everything but goals that involve the satisfying of biological needs. Kaczynski classifies everything people do in modern society, from money making to research to social climbing to politics as surrogate activities and believes that these are less satisfying than “real”, biologically necessary goals like hunting for food. Modern society disrupts the “power process” because “real goals” no longer take any effort and for people to approach happiness they must engage in surrogate activities which are less satisfying in themselves and which are often set up for them by “the system”, disrupting the fourth element of the power process, which was evidently so necessary for Kaczynski that he developed out of his frustration a pure hatred for technological society and those who develop the technology that Kaczynski believes necessarily limits his freedom, regardless of who is in charge, as

The System is not George W. Bush and his advisors and appointees, it is not the cops who maltreat protesters, it is not the CEOs of the multinational corporations, and it is not the Frankensteins in their laboratories who criminally tinker with the genes of living things. All of these people are servants of the System, but in themselves they do not constitute the System (Skrbina & Kaczynski, 2010).

Kaczynski never clearly defines what the system is, but it becomes clear that the system is some abstract singularity of technology that influences human behavior in its own service, meaning the production of more technology and the restriction of “freedom”, and not any particular oligarchy of organic tissue that actually has consciousness and can make decisions. This is of course lunacy yet it is clear that this is what Kaczynski thinks given his description of the “System” and his belief that no

reform is possible, no changing of the guard, but only a revolutionary destruction of the technology itself is enough to bring back freedom.

This is how he justifies his bombings, and there is reason to doubt every bit of it. Kaczynski's ethical assumptions are conventional for his time period but not necessarily correct: the idea that human freedom and the happiness he associates with it are goods in themselves is not necessarily a correct one. Furthermore, on the descriptive plane, Kaczynski seems to ignore variation within the human population and essentially project his psychological make-up onto the masses. There is reason to believe that the average man would not be happier running around in the woods, under the threat of starvation by the unforgiving Mother Nature if he fails to find a deer to spear, with no freedom to choose any differently, and finally, Kaczynski's technologically deterministic view of history is bizarre yet orthodox and itself might be a trick played on him by the system he wants to see destroyed, as to prevent him and those like him from acting in an effective manner.

Beginning with Kaczynski's ethics, it is clear that he sees his definition of freedom as one of if not the highest good, meaning that a system that necessarily restricts freedom should be torn down. This ethic, however, is suicidal and based on parochial hedonism, valuing the momentary pleasure of Ted Kaczynski above and beyond the pleasure of future humans and even the existence and security of life itself. Kaczynski is not combatting what he sees as impending destruction, rather, he believes that the continuation of "the System" will lead to "permanently reducing human beings and many other living organisms to engineered products". This is bad if freedom is the highest good, but would engineered products even feel that way? Probably not. Kaczynski is like a wolf lamenting the creation of dogs. "They're engineered products with no autonomy" says the wolf. But the dog's existence is infinitely more secure than the wolf's and furthermore the dog probably suffers less because the dog does not want autonomy like the wolf does, due to domestication. A dog on its own would be in trouble but in the instance of the creation of a domesticated class there must necessarily be a creator class that rules over the domesticated. It is the quality of this aristocracy that determines the morality of the domestication process insofar as existence and its security is the highest valued good. Kaczynski, being suicidal, does not recognize this and thinks that existence involving domestication is bad by default because freedom is the highest good and its lack is in itself bad. But dogs are not bad and Kaczynski's self destructive actions easily show the result of his ethic as it relates to existence. In defying his own valuation of freedom, his philosophy resulted in him pleading guilty to murder charges in exchange for a life of no freedom as to avoid execution. Kaczynski failed to consistently live by his ethic and when he did its results proved to be destructive and freedom depriving.

Furthermore the ethic seems to be based on Kaczynski's thought that it is the freedom of the power process that leads to happiness and contentment: "Consistent failure to attain goals throughout life results in defeatism, low self-esteem or depression". He does superficially admit that some people do not suffer from unhappiness due to a

lack of freedom, saying “These are docile types who would have been happy as plantation darkies in the Old South”. He thinks, however, that these are rare types and nonetheless he sneers at them, indicating that for Kaczynski, freedom is necessary for self-happiness and that his ethic is actually about the attainment of personal pleasure and only about the pleasure of the rest of humanity insofar as their psychologies are mere projections of Kaczynski’s: “To their credit, most of the slaves were NOT content with their servitude. We do sneer at people who ARE content with servitude”.

Kaczynski seems to fail to deeply realize that surrogate activities are not “less satisfying than the pursuit of real goals” and that the modern loss of certain freedoms does not result in “low self-esteem or depression” in the majority of the population as it is. One analysis found that rights negatively correlate with national happiness, and when controlled for other factors their presence or lack explains no variation in national happiness (Diener³, 2009). Income was the second strongest predictor and while “individualism” was the strongest predictor, this factor is heavily correlated with more technological societies, primarily those with European populations, not less technological societies. Another analysis, this time of individuals, found that the quality of social relationships is as good of a predictor as work life, and health and positivity are both better predictors (Lyubomirsky et al, 2005). And work life itself generally means job ease and income level, not the degree to which it is similar to running around in the woods hunting. In fact, as Kaczynski demonstrated, almost anyone who wants to can still go live the hunter gatherer lifestyle in rural America can do so, yet people seem to be happier with their families, their electricity, and their white collar jobs. Kaczynski was highly neurotic, a trait that is a good negative predictor for individual happiness, and seems to have projected his painful perception of society into everyone and onto technology, when the data indicates that it was not modern comforts but more likely the lack of social relationships and positive perceptions of self and others that explained Kaczynski’s unhappiness (Lyubomirsky et al, 2005).

As people become more and more like “manufactured products,” they should become, on average, more and more content with restrictions to their freedom, and already the extent to which a nation has rights has a negative or null effect on the extent to which that nation is happy. Kaczynski would have been more correct to argue, then, that technology reduces social connections and positive perceptions of others and that because this causes a “lack of satisfaction” and “low self-esteem or depression,” technological progress is immoral. But this hypothetical argument and his actual argument are both flawed for another reason: nothing is inevitable without technology. Kaczynski’s technologically deterministic view of history is flawed. Technology has increased human autonomy in many ways and the recent trend of freedom restriction via control technologies is not inevitable. Like a hammer, any technology can either be used to build houses or to bash in the skulls of scientists: its use depends on the wielder.

While also implying that the system is some type of abstract technological singularity, bound to the will of no men, which is not true, and that therefore it cannot be reformed, only destroyed, he more explicitly states he believes in history as be-

ing “the sum of two components: an erratic component that consists of unpredictable events that follow no discernible pattern, and a regular component that consists of long-term historical trends”. These trends are not controlled by people: “ Societies develop through processes of social evolution that are not under rational human control”. Societal trends are, of course, dictated by technological changes and not by rational human will:

The conservatives are fools: They whine about the decay of traditional values, yet they enthusiastically support technological progress and economic growth. Apparently it never occurs to them that you can’t make rapid, drastic changes in the technology and the economy of a society without causing rapid changes in all other aspects of the society as well, and that such rapid changes inevitably break down traditional values.

Kaczynski seems to ignore the variance of human will, thinking that all societies will respond to technological changes in the same way. Saudi Arabia’s existence is a strong testament to this fact. Israel is rich but still prohibits gay marriage and has many policies, such as those prohibiting or discouraging non-Jews from voting, that are seen as racist relics of the past in the United States. So no, there is nothing about the invention of the radio, car, television, internet, or automation that necessitates the breakdown of freedom or other values. While these technologies may allow certain changes, or make them affordable, they certainly do not necessitate them, even if they were evolutionarily optimal. One example that Kaczynski uses to try to argue that technology inevitably reduces freedom is the car: he observes how now to get around people must buy a car, they must obey all the rules of the road and walking is more difficult because of intersections and dangerous highways. This ignores the fact that in many other countries walking is much easier and if vehicular travel is necessary at all there is abundant public transport, cutting down on the frustrations of driving and maintaining a car, allowing people to either walk like they would in the past or to sit on a cheap bus and do something else while they are easily taken from one point to another far more efficiently than before the invention of vehicles. It was a choice made by American leaders to not have this foreign reality, but rather to develop unlikeable highways and car-crammed cities sprawled out so that a car was necessary. This was despite the fact that public transport and having things in walking distance is more optimal in terms of a nation’s fuel consumption and productive space. The leaders made an error, possibly to line their own pockets by selling cars, and they are the problem in Kaczynski’s traffic frustration, not the invention of the car itself. This can be even further illustrated since it can be demonstrated that the car has actually increased travel freedom, even in the US, compared to how it was in the past. Previously, it was obviously functionally impossible to travel as far and with as much ease and with as much choice as it is now with a car, or if it was possible it was a highly onerous and dangerous Pilgrim’s expedition that often resulted in death. Furthermore, even

in terms of locations that are in suitable walking distance, Kaczynski seems unaware of the fact that free travel was illegal in medieval Britain and elsewhere! In fact, he seems ignorant of the conditions of serfdom and ancient peasantry in general. In a far less technological time Kaczynski would not have been allowed to go to Harvard as a nobody from a small town, and then to go sit in the woods and hunt and make bombs and freely travel to the mailbox to send them. Hunting was illegal for serfs, and they were expected to work their whole lives on a piece of land assigned to them by birth. In no way could these people satisfy their power process as much as Ted Kaczynski was allowed to in the technologically developed, American 20th century. He would not have been allowed any choice in his surrogate activity, which was math, much less the option of dropping out of society to pursue the “real goal” of hunting or starving in the woods. And since any destruction of technology would be more likely to revert humanity to a pre industrial farm life instead of a hunter gatherer lifestyle, since farming is not a technology as much as it is a different set of food acquisition instincts versus those of the super-ancient proto humans, Kaczynski is essentially advocating for a return to serfdom in the interests of people being better able to achieve the “power process”. It’s absurd.

Kaczynski’s entire scheme of self justification is extremely shaky. His primary stance is that he was justified in his bombings because the technological system must be annihilated in the interests of human freedom. However, it is unclear that human freedom should be of any good in itself. It is also unclear that technology necessarily limits human freedom, even as Kaczynski defines it. It is likely that Kaczynski developed this ideology by projecting his own psychology onto everyone else, leading to his determinism error which ignores variance of human wills and his empirically unsupported claims about what gives people satisfaction and happiness in life. What this means is that more than being something he wrote because it is true, Kaczynski wrote this manifesto as a post-hoc rationalization of his criminal urges. While it would be unimaginable for a Harvard graduate math genius to go 35,000 words without making an interesting point, Kaczynski’s central thesis is empirically suspect and his motivation are of course even more so. His lasting semi-popularity indicates a common frustration with “the System”, but mail bombs and techno-regression are not the optimal way forward. Rather, it is human behavior, caused by certain genotypes which use technology as their tool, that causes Kaczynski’s frustrations. Some sort of genetic intervention like embryo selection is the only way forward.

References

- Diener, E., Diener, M., & Diener, C. (2009). Factors predicting the subjective well-being of nations. In *Culture and well-being* (pp. 43-70). Springer, Dordrecht.
- Finnegan, W. (2011). The Unabomber Returns. *The New Yorker*. Retrieved from <https://www.newyorker.com/news/news-desk/the-unabomber-returns>

Kaczynski, T. (1995). Industrial Society and Its Future. *Washington Post*. Retrieved from <https://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/national/longterm/unabomber/manifesto.text.htm>

Lyubomirsky, S., King, L., & Diener, E. (2005). The benefits of frequent positive affect: Does happiness lead to success?. *Psychological bulletin*, 131(6), 803.

Skrbina, D. & Kaczynski, T. (2010) Technological Slavery: The Collected Writings of Theodore J. Kaczynski, A.k.a. "The Unabomber". *Fitch & Madison*.

The Ted K Archive

A critique of his ideas & actions



A text dump of right wing videos on Ted K

www.thetedkarchive.com