

# Insane government policies

## From the perspective of Britain and NATO

### Introduction

National governments are meant to be representatives of the people to govern a country for the common good. Under western parliamentary systems this is intended to be the will of the majority of people; however, it is rarely thus. David Cameron had 36.1% of the UK votes cast in 2010 and 36.9% in 2015; but since only two thirds of the country voted this percentage is even less of the whole country. Far more people voted against him than for him (in 2010 nearly three quarters);<sup>1</sup> nevertheless, the government is meant to be deciding policies for the good of all and according to the will of the people.

Yet we find that over and over again policies are drawn up and strategies enacted that are directly opposed to the good of the common man and are downright detrimental to the safety of the country as a whole. One has to ask that if these have a negative effect on most people, why were they enacted and who gained?

Of course the beneficiaries are the members of the global elite, who really rule nation states in the west, and their subsidiaries: the bankers, financial organisations, NGOs, the wealthy, global corporations and so on.

Governments are supposed to be benign and in control of society for its good; in fact they are supposed to employ experts in every field to ensure security and safety. Tragedy after tragedy has proved this to be nonsense: think about Hillsborough in 1989 or the Grenfell Tower disaster in recent days. Both were events of corporate manslaughter. Not only were administrations incompetent and lacking through deregulation, but there were active moves afoot that put people's lives at risk; such as deciding to utilise combustible cladding on social housing all over the country.<sup>2</sup> In what world is that acceptable?

Despite this glaring situation, most people are sheep who either don't know what is going on or don't care, being distracted and fascinated by the fodder they are fed to keep them from political activism or rebellion: TV soaps, pornography, hedonism, video games, reality TV, social media and so on.

In this paper I want to reveal policies that are pursued by governments that are simply insane. They worsen the life of common people; they put the nation in danger; they waste money; they foster our enemies and they lead to loss of life. To make this simple and brief I will mostly use a question and answer format. I won't use multiple sources for issues covered in previous papers but I will for issues that require it.

---

<sup>1</sup> The 75% that did not vote for him then suffered the brunt of authoritarian austerity measures that damaged jobs, social infrastructure, security, health etc. while the top echelons of society benefited from tax cuts and cheap money.

<sup>2</sup> Over 70 tower blocks alone have been identified as at risk which does not include smaller blocks, schools, hospitals, libraries and other public buildings.

## National security issues and foreign policy repercussions

### Background

American (elite) foreign policy for the Middle East has been partly pre-determined by a long-term plan developed in the 1980s by Israel called, *'The Yinon Plan'*.<sup>3</sup> This advocated the destabilisation of Iraq, Lebanon, Sudan, Libya, Syria and elsewhere, followed by regime change and then partition of the various states to enable Israel to annexe areas and form 'Greater Israel' from the Euphrates to the Nile with a large buffer state. This includes most of Syria, Jordan, half of Iraq, Lebanon and part of northern Saudi Arabia. It seeks to ensure that Israel has regional superiority in the Middle East, dominating all nations as an imperial power. The Yinon Plan is the cornerstone of the Zionist Netanyahu government, the Likud Party, the Israeli military and Israeli intelligence services. Any ideas of a two-state Israel-Palestinian territory are a foolish pipe-dream as Israel's strategy is annexation of most of the Middle East.

This was supported and worked up as formal American policy by the *Project for the New American Century* think tank under the Bush administration. This was a Neocon think tank founded in 1997 to influence US foreign policy, chaired by William Kristol. The founding statement of principles was signed by many people in GW Bush's administration, including Zionists Dick Cheney, Richard Perle, Robert Kagan, John Bolton, Donald Rumsfeld and Paul Wolfowitz. The overriding goal of the PNAC Neocons was the domination of the world by America. Zbigniew Brzezinski, former US National Security Advisor and chief elite strategist, had long argued for the Balkanisation of 'Eurasia'. The Yinon policy was also absorbed and re-presented by reports from the Council on Foreign Relations (an elite think tank on Foreign Affairs).

This was then delineated in various sub-plans, such as that revealed by Condoleezza Rice in 2006.<sup>4</sup> The US Armed Forces journal, 'The Atlantic', published maps that closely followed the outline of the Yinon Plan in 2008.<sup>5</sup>

The proposed regime change included: Iraq, Lebanon, Egypt, Syria, Turkey, Somalia, Sudan, and Libya. It proposed war on Iraq, Libya, Syria, Lebanon and even Iran (avidly supported by Hillary Clinton). It then seeks to partition these areas to enable a 'Greater Israel', subdividing Iraq, Syria, Egypt, Turkey, Lebanon, and creating a Kurdish State. Many Pentagon officials have opposed this imperialism pursued by various presidents, notably GW Bush and Barack Obama.

The 'Arab Spring', which fomented rebellion and disruption in various Arab nations, is no accident.

What people do not understand is that the appalling mess that the world is now in with ruined, failed nations (Libya), civil wars (Syria), destabilised states (Afghanistan, Iraq) and

---

3 Oded Yinon, 'A strategy for Israel in the 1980s'. Quote: *'The dissolution of Syria and Iraq later on into ethnically or religiously unique areas such as in Lebanon, is Israel's primary target on the Eastern front in the long run'*. Association of Arab-American University Graduates Inc., comment, *'Israel must 1) become an imperial regional power, and 2) must effect the division of the whole area into small states by the dissolution of existing Arab states'*.

4 Condoleezza Rice laid out plans, including a map, for the partition of Syria in 2006 as part of 'The Project for a New Middle East'.

5 This map, 'The New Middle East', was published in the Armed Forces Journal in June 2006. The map was drawn up by Lieutenant-Colonel Ralph Peters and has been used in the training programme at NATO's Defence College for senior officers.

nations under constant aerial attacks (Yemen, Pakistan)<sup>6</sup> is deliberate. The elite hope that out of this awful mess they will be able to build a global empire.

*Why is this called 'Balkanisation'?* This is because the elite have successfully partitioned a major country in the past. Through various means, and supporting various radicals, the elite initiated bombing campaigns in Yugoslavia, followed later by wars (the Bosnian / Kosovo Wars). The purpose of these was to fragment the former Yugoslavia into a series of smaller Balkan states that would then be allied to NATO. [See later, 'Expansion of NATO'.]

### **The Afghan War**

*What excuse was given to invade Afghanistan?* To eradicate the supposed cause of global terrorism that was claimed to emanate from the Taliban.

*Were the Taliban involved in the 9/11 tragedy then?* No, not at all; most of the claimed perpetrators were Saudi.

*Wasn't Osama bin Laden hiding in Afghanistan?* He stayed there for a time but fled to Pakistan before the US got anywhere near him. However, he declared that he was not the perpetrator of the 9/11 tragedy. Denying such a powerful victory over the US would be incredible if he was the perpetrator. It would have been the biggest feather in his cap. Osama bin Laden was a suitable scapegoat for the elite to blame.

*Were the Taliban a threat to Britain?* Not in any way.

*So, was there any legal basis whatsoever to invade Afghanistan?* None at all. It was an illegal war and is still continuing.

*Have wars in Afghanistan ever been successful?* Not since Genghis Khan, Tamerlane (Timur) and the Mughal Empire. The previous Anglo-Afghan wars were mostly a disaster or a stalemate<sup>7</sup> and even the Russians with all their military technology had to withdraw.

*Was this a successful war?* No it was a complete failure and is still continuing. It is the longest war conducted by America in history. Britain still has 500 troops there; Donald Trump has recently sent more US troops there. Only small areas are controlled by NATO, the corrupt puppet government is ridiculed and hated, with little real power and warlords still rule most of the country. All it has done is kill innocent civilians.

### **Insanity**

This CIA dominated war (to restore heroin production) was completely unnecessary. It killed thousands of civilians (including generations of families at weddings) and involved war crimes (such as torturing and killing innocent civilians).<sup>8</sup> It did nothing to undergird national security but actually worsened it by motivating Islamic jihadi blowback. Britain had no reason to join in his war whatsoever.

---

<sup>6</sup> American-made drones are killing civilians in Yemen and Pakistan on a regular basis; even the US government admits to the killing of hundreds of people. In addition there are American-made warplanes used by Saudi Arabia to indiscriminately bomb Yemen.

<sup>7</sup> Britain was defeated in the First Anglo-Afghan War (1838-1842), initiated to limit Russian influence. The Second (1878-1880) succeeded at a cost (including torture of captured soldiers) and only captured the major cities; the British army withdrew after a treaty. The Third after WWI (1919) was a stalemate continuing the status quo.

<sup>8</sup> One poor taxi-driver was hung up and literally beaten to a pulp by US soldiers so that a doctor could not recognise his legs. The man was completely innocent.

## **The Middle East / North African conflicts**

*Who are (or have been) the claimed enemies of the West in the Middle East / Africa?* Iraq, Syria, Iran, and Libya.

*Have these countries been guilty of sponsoring terrorist acts in the west in recent decades?* No, not at all.

*Were any previous allies of the west?* Yes. Iraq had been a US ally and was encouraged to initiate the war with Iran. Libya had entered into peaceful relationships with the US and UK. In fact Libya, under Gaddafi, was the most prosperous nation in Africa with a standard of living higher than America.

*Were these countries a clear and present danger to the west?* No they were not.

*Did these countries support al-Qaeda and ISIS?* No; they were enemies of them. In fact, the countries invaded and destabilised by America and NATO were the very countries that were logical allies of the west, being essentially the only secular, tolerant Muslim states in the Middle East.<sup>9</sup>

### **Insanity**

The US has initiated wars, regime change, threatened and incited rebellion in these countries for no reason of security. In fact, the US / NATO has allied with the worst possible Muslim terrorists (ISIS / al-Qaeda / al-Nusra etc. who are the natural enemies of the west) in order to overthrow Gaddafi and Assad.

The US / RAF and NATO are currently bombing Christians in Iraq and Syria, especially in Mosul and Raqqa, whilst supporting and funding jihadi terrorists.<sup>10</sup>

Common sense would have said to make alliances with Saddam Hussein, Assad, Gaddafi and Iran who opposed jihadi terrorism and Wahhabi radicalism. Instead we attacked our natural allies in order to facilitate a 1980s Israeli plan for Greater Israel (The Yinon Plan).

### **Syria**

*Who are the illegal belligerents in Syria?* It is America and NATO directly and via proxies.

#### *Why?*

- The US initiated a CIA backed rebellion in Syria, with full prostituted mainstream media coverage, based on claims that Assad is a ruthless and corrupt violator of human rights, a torturer and a murderer. Rebellious separatists were then funded, resourced and supported with a media campaign to overthrow Assad because Israel / America wants regime change like Iraq and Libya to further the Yinon Plan for Greater Israel.
- In fact Assad is a highly popular leader who was elected in a free and fair contested election where he gained a majority of over 80%. He has continually been widely supported and even celebrated throughout the Syrian conflict by all strata of Syrian society. Assad is a secular Islamic ruler that protects minorities such as Jews, Druze and Christians who have lived there in peace for centuries. In fact, Syrians tend to identify themselves as 'Syrians' and not Alawites, Shi'ite Muslims, Christians, Jews or Druze.

---

<sup>9</sup> Note that Iraq under Saddam Hussein had women MPs and tolerated ancient Christian churches. Syria has many women in positions of authority including the leader of its parliament. Assad has also protected Christians. On the other hand the allies of America, such as Saudi Arabia and Qatar, exclude Christians entirely, persecute women and even execute women that have been raped and make a complaint.

<sup>10</sup> For more information on these issues see my papers: 'Syria, What is going on' and 'Fake News'.

- America and her allies then encouraged the growth of ISIS and other terrorist groups that are waging an invasion of Syria and deliberately killing Christians. These rebels are Sunni Wahhabists, supported by Saudi Arabia, because Sunnis hate Syrian Alawites. Many of the terrorists are Muslims from elsewhere in the world, such as Chechnya or Pakistan and Afghanistan, intent on jihad. These have been funded and supported for several years by America, Israel and Britain; the coalition involved in airstrikes includes others nations as well. Israel and Turkey even give ISIS wounded medical treatment in hospitals. The SAS and US forces are also training jihadis in Jordan. They are supporting the people that they are supposed to be fighting.
- The entrance of Russia, by invitation from the Syrian government, has turned the tables on the ISIS / al-Qaeda invasion but this has provoked America.
- As part of its plan to start a world war with Russia and others, the US is continually provoking Putin, who has proved to be exceptionally patient.
- For example: Turkey (a NATO ally) shot down a Russian warplane (an act of war). American missile strikes have killed Russian military officers and staff; including a colonel (an act of war).
- The US and UK established military bases in Syria (which is illegal); such as the al-Tanf Marine base. As of July 2017 there are now eight US military bases in Syria. Imagine that Russia suddenly built military bases in Sussex without permission? These bases include airbases, military outposts and missile bases. Military airports have been established at Hasaka, Kobani, Qamishli, al-Malekiyeh and Tal Abyadh. In addition Israel has bases in the illegally occupied Golan Heights. The patience and long-suffering of Assad is immense. Coalition airstrikes have attacked Syrian government troops that advanced towards the US base at al-Tanf. The excuse for these bases is positions from which to attack ISIS, but multiple commentators have proved that the US colludes with ISIS. The reality is that it is preparation for annexing Syrian land. US troops involved include the 621<sup>st</sup> Contingency Response Group at Kobani. Civilian deaths from US-Coalition airstrikes increase with each new base. US Senator Richard Black has called this '[an] *obvious violation of international law*'.<sup>11</sup>
- The US launched 59 cruise missiles to attack a Syrian air base whose sole task was to attack ISIS positions. It killed scores of civilians including five children. This alone was an act of war and a war crime.
- A US FA-18 Hornet warplane, launched from an aircraft carrier, shot down a Syrian government Sukhoi SU-22 in Raqqa province, south of Tabqa city piloted by Lieutenant Ali Fahed (since recovered).<sup>12</sup> This US plane was allowed through Russian controlled airspace unharmed due to a prior agreement between the US and Russia. The SU-22 was attacking ISIS positions, the Hornet attacked the SU-22 to protect the ISIS positions. It was also flying close to a US artillery base. [American aircraft have continually defended ISIS, attacking as air-cover.] This alone is an act of war. Russia has now cancelled the military agreement and stated that it will shoot down further planes.<sup>13</sup> This attack is shocking: a foreign country has attacked a Syrian government plane from within Syria and reneged on a demilitarised zone pact. Imagine if Russia

---

<sup>11</sup> For details see Vanessa Beeley; 21<sup>st</sup> Century Wire, 'US expands military footprint in Syria to eight bases' 5 July 2017.

<sup>12</sup> Note: The SU-22 is a thirty-year old plane but it was able to defeat the first missile fired, one of the America's most modern missiles. It took a second radar-guided missile to bring the plane down. This shows a military weakness of the much vaunted US systems. In a hot war US soldiers know that Russian military capability is much greater than America's and they fear it.

<sup>13</sup> This is serious. As a result Australia has pulled its warplanes from the coalition.

shot down a US warplane over Connecticut. The US said that the Hornet was defending the SDF.<sup>14</sup>

- Israel has recently launched a series of missile strikes on Syrian territory (five in eight days) against Syrian government targets; this is an act of war. The excuse for this was a stray missile that fell in open ground in the Golan Heights, an area illegally annexed by Israel decades ago. The Syrian military action was against ISIS forces in the area, which Israel has effectively served to defend. No mention of any of this in western media.
- In summary of a complex situation, America is deliberately provoking Russia over and over again to initiate world war and the western media says nothing. America has also broken agreement after agreement and pulled out sponsored rebel groups from peace talks. Even an imbecile can see that its purpose is aggressive war.
- The current road to world war is being prepared by another false flag chemical attack purported to be by Assad.<sup>15</sup> The intention is to lead to boots on the ground in all all-out offensive against Assad and Damascus, which Russia will defend. Assad, Russia and independent commentators have been warning about this for some weeks but now it seems to be in train.

#### *What does America want?*

- It wants a Balkanised (fragmented) Syrian state with a large portion given to Israel as part of the 1980s Yinon Plan. Another part will be given to the Kurds.
- It wants Assad removed and Wahhabi terrorists in government allied to Saudi Arabia and Qatar. This would mean the banishment, flight or execution of Christians that have lived there since the time of Christ.
- It wants to enable the construction of one or even two major oil/gas pipelines through Syria to the Mediterranean to weaken Russia's exports of oil/gas to Europe.
- It wants to break the alliance between Syria and Iran to weaken Iran (which it will later declare war on).
- It wants to set up a Rothschild central bank in Syria.
- It wants permanent military bases to help gain more control on the Middle East.

#### *Insanity*

This is insanity of the highest level. It is a miracle that Putin has not already declared war on America and it shows the calibre of his statesmanship; compare the incredible stupidity of American leadership.

As well as multiple other provocations to war around the world (such as mobilisation on Russia's eastern borders) the situation in Syria alone could lead to world war.

*Are politicians gearing up for world war?* Michael Fallon (British Defence Secretary) has already stated that he is prepared to launch a pre-emptive nuclear strike on Russia.

---

<sup>14</sup> Syrian Democratic Forces. Which includes a large number of Kurds. The U.S. claimed that the plane was bombing the SDF and the Hornet responded defensively. No one believes this. Furthermore, why does the US, therefore, not attack Turkey, which repeatedly attacks the SDF and the Kurds?

<sup>15</sup> The Khan Sheikhoun chemical attack was a false flag. Assad does not have any chemical weapons, confirmed by UN inspectors, while the rebel forces do, and they have used them; they were supplied by Hillary Clinton from Libyan supplies and were transported by an operation controlled by the CIA and MI6 via Turkey. Recent US military intelligence has now confirmed that Assad did not launch a chemical attack (see article by Seymour Hersh, which western media ignored). The Tomahawk launches by Trump were a knee-jerk, ill-thought-out reaction to false information which killed civilians, despite warnings from the Pentagon and officers on the ground that Syria did NOT launch a chemical weapons attack and stated the danger of a Russian reaction.

Russia's response is that it will completely annihilate Britain (which it has the capability of doing with bigger, more effective, nuclear weapons than the US). Why is a British Defence Secretary threatening Russia regarding a sovereign nation (Syria) that has nothing to do with us? Fallon is a very dangerous stooge of the US that will do anything to further the US agenda. He has also recently supported enhanced military action in Syria and has threatened missile strikes on nations that enact cyber-terrorism. [Aside: one should note that the programs that are being used by cyber-terrorists were designed by the US NSA (secret service) and released on to the web for hackers to use.]

### **Dangerous Islamic factions**

*What is the form of Islam that produces international terrorism?* That is the Wahhabi variant of Sunni Islam.

*Was Saddam Hussein, Muammar Gaddafi, Bashar al-Assad or Iran supporters of Wahhabism?* No. In fact they were opposed to this.

*Who supports Wahhabism?* Saudi Arabia and the Gulf States.

*Who funds Wahhabism?* Saudi Arabia and the Gulf States.

*Who funds radical Muslim extremism in UK mosques?* Saudi Arabia and the Gulf States.

*Is Wahhabism tolerant and peaceful?* No; it demands jihad (violent holy war) against all non-Muslims (called *kafirs*).

*What is the objective of Wahhabist Islam?* To kill all kafirs and establish an Islamic caliphate over the whole world ruled by Sharia law.

*Can Wahhabist Muslims peacefully integrate into western society?* No; in fact it is their duty to wage jihad against western nations.

*What does jihad mean?* It means 'struggle' and the struggle is to establish the rule of Allah over the whole world. Jihad can involve anything that promotes the advantage of Islam. This includes lying (*taqiyya*) to secure positions of responsibility in the west to undermine the rule of law and social stability (note Sadiq Khan<sup>16</sup>). However, throughout history it has mostly meant waging war to advance Islam and this is the main meaning given by Muhammad in the Qur'an.

*What is the history of jihad?* It was the conquering of many nations extending from Spain to India. In 1400 years the minimum number killed by Islam is 170 million (some say it is nearer 800 million). On many occasions civilians and troops were beheaded and their heads piled into towers 15-foot high. After one battle there were 120 of such towers.

*Is this true Islam?* Yes it is. The Qur'an demands, in 109 verses, that all Muslims kill kafirs, including beheading them.

*What else is commanded?* To enslave those that are not killed, such as women and children as sex-slaves. Rape and pillage is also commanded. In fact kafir women are seen as fair game for rape and death as part of jihad. This is why Europe has had a massive rape crisis since the Muslim migrants entered by the million; even girls five-years old and women 80-years old have been raped multiple times in one attack.

---

<sup>16</sup> The Muslim Mayor of London who has shared platforms with radical Islamic clerics.

*Who are the main Arab funders of ISIS and al-Qaeda groups that commit terrorist atrocities in the name of jihad?* Saudi Arabia and the Gulf States. The Islam of ISIS is exactly the same as that practised by Saudi Arabia.

*Who are the main Arab funders / suppliers of ISIS and al-Qaeda groups involved in Syria opposed to Assad?* Saudi Arabia and the Gulf States, plus the USA, UK and NATO.

*Who are the main protagonists against ISIS and al-Qaeda groups in Syria?* Assad and Russia.

*Is Saudi Arabia a formal enemy of the west?* No it is a key ally.

*Why is that?* It is due to the establishment of the Petro-Dollar banking system in 1973 when the dollar was taken off the gold standard by Nixon. This dollar / oil system drives western financial systems based on debt.

*What was this deal?* It was an agreement whereby Saudi Arabia would sell all its oil in American dollars and then invest all its profits in US bonds/gilts. In return America promised to continually support the Saudi government and protect it in every possible manner. This has, in reality, made America the prime supporter of Wahhabi jihadi terrorism while pretending to be opposed to terrorism and blaming countries that do not support terrorism (like Iran). The political union of the US and Saudi Arabia is the prime cause of all international Islamic terrorism – which is thousands of attacks every year (about 20,000 globally since 9/11).

*Where does Saudi Arabia get its weapons?* It gets them from the US and Britain.

*How much is spent on arm sales to Saudi Arabia?* Since the war in Yemen started in March 2015 the UK government has approved 194 arms export licences to Saudi Arabia worth more than £3.3bn. Under Obama the US sold a record amount of arms to Saudi Arabia which has continued under Trump. In March 2017 Trump approved a resumption in the \$400bn sale of precision guided missiles and other weapons. These arms sales are in contravention of international law. British courts this week have approved them.

*Where does it use these weapons?* It uses them to commit war crimes on civilians in places like Yemen. It also uses them to resource ISIS and al-Qaeda. In Yemen 4,600 civilians have been killed and over 8,000 injured by Saudi Arabia airstrikes.<sup>17</sup> British-made cluster bombs have been proved to have been used on villages in northern Yemen. Defence Secretary Michael Fallon denied this in the House of Commons<sup>18</sup> but Saudi Arabia admitted it.

### Insanity

The greatest security problem in the west is Islamic terrorism. The main supporters of this are Saudi Arabia and the Gulf States who not only train and resource terrorist groups but also finance radicalisation by imams in UK mosques who call for the killing of all non-Muslims and the establishment of a caliphate in Britain. They seek to erect the ISIS flag over Buckingham Palace and use it as the central London mosque.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> The Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights. The Independent, Rasha Mohamed; 22 March 2017.

<sup>18</sup> Under Parliamentary rules he should be punished severely for lying to the House. This would include losing his ministerial portfolio and resign from being an MP.

<sup>19</sup> You can see videos of British Muslims saying this on YouTube.

Instead of isolating and condemning Saudi Arabia and the Gulf States they are our close allies and business partners. This is deep insanity for the sake of money.

### **Trident**

*What is this?* Trident is the UK's nuclear deterrent comprising of nuclear-armed ballistic missiles that can be fired from patrolling submarines.

*How many missiles and submarines?* There are four Vanguard-class submarines, which can carry up to 16 Trident II D5 ballistic missiles, each armed with up to eight nuclear warheads. At any one time one submarine is on patrol, one is being maintained, one is preparing for patrol and one has just come off patrol and is recovering. So Britain's nuclear deterrent at any particular time is one measly submarine with up to 16 missiles.

*What does it cost?* The cost of maintaining and renewing this is scandalous. Replacing Trident, which is under discussion, will cost £31bn. Then there are additional costs of £10bn. So far the government has allocated or spent £4.8bn. This is just the cost of the submarines. In addition extending the life of current Trident missiles into 2060 will cost £250m.

The annual operating costs of Trident are about £2bn, which equals the amount spent on the NHS every week.

*Is it effective?* Not at all; in fact it is absolutely pointless. In the event of a nuclear war the whole world would be destroyed so using them at all is unthinkable. Russia can destroy all of Texas or Britain with just one missile (the 'Satan-II'). Having a few nuclear missiles in this scenario is a waste of time. Furthermore, Britain only has a tiny percentage of the nuclear weapons held by Russia and the USA. This percentage makes us of no account whatsoever in nuclear deterrents. In reality we have only 16 missiles available at any one time compared to thousands in the world.

*Does it work as a deterrent?* No; we have too few and we have missiles that are too weak to be a deterrent to any nuclear armed power. In any case, our treaty arrangements with the USA means that their missiles form our best deterrent.

*What is the world's nuclear inventory?* As of 2017 Britain has about 215 nuclear warheads but the US has 6,800, Russia has 7,000, France has 300, China has 260, Pakistan has 140, India has 110, Israel has 80 and North Korea has 10. Of the total 14,915 Britain only has 1.4%. To think that this capacity would make the slightest difference in a nuclear world war is laughable.

*Do all other advanced nations have this capability?* No; many western nations do not; such as: Sweden, Norway, Finland, Switzerland, Denmark, Hungary, or even Germany.

### **Insanity**

There is no reason to waste public money on this white elephant at all; it is a pointless exercise. Key western nations and strategic partners do not have nuclear warheads; why do we? The answer is that we are obligated by the elite to purchase these weapons from the military industry complex.

At the same time as money is wasted on Trident, our navy, army and airforce are in near meltdown due to cuts. We have no operational aircraft carriers at this point,<sup>20</sup> and the main fighter-bomber (Typhoon Joint Strike aircraft) is already out of date and unsuitable for the time. The prospective American F-22s and F-35s are way too expensive and totally outmatched by Russian warplanes like the Sukhoi SU-35. Russia also has the best modern tank (the Armata) which makes our tanks virtually obsolete. In a major land war we would be completely outmatched, underfunded and outnumbered (just as we were when WWII started).

[Aside: facing economic sanctions and global hostility against it, Russia determined to make the most of its budgets and concentrate on improving military hardware by ingenuity rather than throwing money at military corporations (as America does). The result was far better designs than anyone else for a fraction of the cost. Its missiles are better, its tanks are better, its warplanes are better, its submarines are better, its army service weapons are at least as good as America's if not better, the AK47 is the world's most popular and most reliable carbine, and so on. As a result, top airforces, such as India, are buying Russian aircraft rather than American.]

## The expansion of NATO eastwards

### How did this start?

Zbigniew Brzezinski co-founded the elite Trilateral Commission and was the planner of resourcing the Islamic rebels in Afghanistan (that would become al-Qaeda etc.) and then stimulated Russia into entering an unwinnable war in Afghanistan (1979-89). He dominated the ill-fated Carter presidency and this Russian hating fanatic then dominated the foreign policy of the elite.

At the time of the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1990, in return for assurances that Soviet Russia would not oppose German reunification, the US government (under GW Bush Snr.) promised Gorbachev that that NATO membership would not extend '*one inch to the east*' to include the nations of eastern Europe. The US also affirmed that troops and nuclear missiles would not be stationed in the east.<sup>21</sup>

In 1991 Gorbachev dissolved the weakened Soviet Union into 15 sovereign republics.

In 1998 Brzezinski published *The Grand Chessboard* where he laid out his plan for the US to control Central Asia and set up bases to encircle Russia and China. The Project for the New American Century's report, '*Rebuilding America's Defences*' was based upon this (as well as the Yinon Plan). Brzezinski recruited Barack Obama at Columbia University to be the stooge to implement the plan.

### What was the beginning of the expansion?

In 1998-9 NATO and its proxy army the KLA separated out Kosovo from Russia's ally Serbia. At that time Russia under Yeltsin was powerless to do anything. Subsequently, Yugoslavia was fragmented into the puppet states of Serbia, Croatia, Kosovo, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Montenegro, Slovenia and Macedonia. Russia's former allies would later become NATO stooges.

---

<sup>20</sup> The new Queen Elizabeth carrier is not yet commissioned and there are no aircraft for it. It has also been revealed that its runs on Windows XP out of date operating system that is open to cyber-attack and it is also defenceless against relatively cheap missiles.

<sup>21</sup> American ambassador to the Soviet Union, Jack Matlock, said that the west gave a clear commitment not to expand. Gorbachev's memoirs confirm this.

### **Give a timeline of further expansion.**

In 1999 Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic became part of NATO. In 2002 anti-ballistic missiles were stationed in Poland and the Czech Republic.

In 2004 Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Slovenia, Slovakia, Bulgaria, and Romania joined NATO. NATO established air bases in Lithuania.

In 2008 historian Dr Webster Griffin Tarlpey saw the writing on the wall and affirmed that the project of the next US administration was to smash both Russia and China. He stated, '*foreign policy is to have a global showdown with Russia and China*'.<sup>22</sup>

In 2009, after Obama announced the cancelling of the missile defence system based in Poland, the Vice President, Joe Biden, announced quietly in Poland the deployment of a different missile plan, but this time the missile bases included Romania. In 2009 Obama arranged for Aegis Combat System missile bases to be established in Turkey, Spain, Portugal, Romania and Poland.

Also in April 2009 NATO was again expanded as Albania and Croatia were added to the anti-Russian military bloc. NATO recognised Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia and Macedonia as aspiring members.

After 2009, tactical B61 nuclear bombs were stationed in Europe along with the F-35 Lightning II warplanes to drop them.

After the 2014 Russian annexation of the semi-autonomous Crimea (which had been attached to Russia for centuries and the majority of its population speak Russian),<sup>23</sup> NATO committed 5,000 troops at bases in Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, Poland, Romania and Bulgaria.

2014: The US Marine Corps announced an update of storehouses hidden inside caves in Norway. Marines also work out of bases near the Black Sea.

In 2016 the US reopened its old strategic military airbase used in WWII in Iceland. This was previously abandoned after the Cold War ended in 2006, but it was reopened to pose a threat to Russia. It sits midway between the US and Europe and is strategic for deploying troops and reinforcements. One hangar was built to house B-52 bombers.

2016: America announced that it is upgrading troops and equipment in Europe in general. On top of the 70,000 troops the Pentagon already has in the region, it planned to add a full armoured brigade of 5,000 soldiers with tanks, artillery and other vehicles. The US already has a tank battalion in Europe. Special operations Forces were to receive \$25m to improve effectiveness in Central and Eastern Europe. The 20 F-15C fighters stationed in the UK would be joined by A-10s and F-22s and B-52s. At least two MQ-1 Predator drones were stationed in Latvia in new facilities. The Airforce received over \$63m to build new hangars, fuel storage and other facilities in air bases in Estonia, Bulgaria, Romania and Poland.

---

<sup>22</sup> Dr Webster Griffin Tarlpey; 'Obama: the Postmodern coup – making of a Manchurian Candidate'.

<sup>23</sup> The referendum and annexation was a masterstroke of statesmanship. The CIA sponsored rebellion and coup in Ukraine was a threat to Russian national security and the Crimea was Russia's only south-western naval base. If the Ukraine civil war had resulted in a US puppet state (it virtually is already, apart from Russian-speaking areas, which are attacked) Russia's defences would have been severely compromised (which was the elite plan).

2016: Sweden (not in NATO) signed a defence co-operation agreement with the US in June. Swedish and Finnish leaders also participated in a NATO summit and their armed forces have taken part in NATO exercises. Finland (not in NATO) also signed an agreement enabling it to host NATO troops in a crisis. Finland had been neutral in the Cold War. The US also sent F-15 fighters to Finland for joint exercises close to the Russian border.

5 June 2017: Montenegro became the latest member of NATO.

### **How serious is this expansion?**

This expansionism, with the threats of nuclear missiles on top, is nothing less than shocking. What's worse is that most Americans don't even know that it has been going on. Note Putin: *'It is NATO that is moving towards our border and we aren't moving anywhere'*.<sup>24</sup>

The US Navy getting back to Keflavik [Iceland] puts in jeopardy Russian Navy and Air Force operations in the Atlantic. This step cannot be perceived as anything else but the implementation of broader plans to launch a large-scale war against Russia.<sup>25</sup>

America reneged on its promise not to expand even an inch east and then effectively militarily annexed most of Eastern Europe and the Balkans, putting missile bases next to Russian borders. The only reason for this is to prepare for a coming war with Russia, in line with global elite plans going back decades. This hawkish posturing is insane; yet the elite dominated western media constantly portrays Putin as the aggressor and a threat to the west.

### **Why this hatred of Russia?**

The reason for this is that Putin has single-handedly turned Russia around from being a social, economic and military basket case to be a global superpower. His statesmanship is admired throughout Asia and his approval ratings in Russia are constantly high.

Putin turned the economy round through sensible economics and unlike Britain or USA Russia managed to eradicate its national debt. He has managed to build up the military at a fraction of the cost of the west and has now surpassed the US in terms of military capability and ingenuity. Russia has the upper hand, for example, regarding ICBMs.

Putin also developed a trading bloc with China (SCU) which multiple nations are clamouring to join, even Turkey is considering ditching the EU in favour of this bloc. Then the BRICS banking system was developed to oppose the US dollar and elite central banks. More recently the Russia-China transfer system has overturned the elite Swift banking transfer system in the east. Putin has also overseen a Russian Orthodox Church revival, which he sees as fundamental to moral social values.

The more that the US (elite) has provoked Putin and sanctioned Russia, the more Putin and Russia improved. Even when America goaded Putin in provocations of war, he resisted and waited. More and more Americans now understand that the real evil in the world is America and Putin is a master statesman. Russia Insider is an alternative news source on Russia that is staffed by Americans living in Russia who expose the lies and deceit of US politicians.

For all these reasons (and some historic ones going back over 100 years)<sup>26</sup> the elite hates Putin with a vengeance and is intent on destroying Russia. This is why NATO keeps

---

<sup>24</sup> Strategic Culture Roundation, Andrei Akulov; 'US military returns to Iceland', 23.2.2016.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid.

expanding east. [This does not include the missile bases and fleets encircling Russia to the south as far as Northern Australia.]

## Immigration

*What is immigration?* It is the entrance of foreigners onto British shores who seek permanent residence.

*Is this good or bad?* It can be either. If controlled then it can work for good in supplying the lack in employment not filled by British people. This is when people coming in are vetted and allowed residence because they bring needed skills, such as nurses and doctors who make up the ranks of the NHS.

*When is it bad?*

- It is bad when there is uncontrolled immigration causing the country to be unable to cope in local infrastructure.
- It is bad when terrorists are allowed in.
- It is bad when the UK has no say in who can enter. This occurs with residents of EU countries where the freedom of movement principle of being in the Single-Market is a treaty obligation.
- It is bad when millions of unskilled workers come in and flood the labour market, degrading pay levels and taking jobs from British workers.
- It is bad when very large numbers of people come in that deliberately will not integrate into British society.

At the moment Britain suffers from all these factors.

*Have we had waves of immigration?* Yes, but only recently.

*Explain.* After the English people had settled down into some kind of norm after repeated invasions of Celts, Jutes, Saxon, Angles, Danes and lastly Normans there was relative stability for 1,000 years. There were some waves of immigration from Jews (allowed back in by Oliver Cromwell) and French Huguenots escaping from persecution in France. However, these were fairly low-level and both sought to integrate into society.

In the 20<sup>th</sup> century there were waves of immigration from British colonies after the World War II. These were largely from Caribbean islands, India and Pakistan. Most of these eventually began to be absorbed in society after some trepidation in the 50s-60s. Caribbean colonists tended to be Christian, while Asians tended to be Sikh, Hindu or Muslim. Sikhs and Hindus gradually integrated with second and third generations entering professional jobs, such as doctors. However, Muslims tended to set up ghettos and remain isolated from society due to the teachings of Muhammad.

Recent waves of immigration have resulted in huge numbers of Muslim immigrants entering the country from Africa, Syria (not necessarily Syrians), Turkey (not necessarily

---

<sup>26</sup> For example, the Rothschilds hated the Russians for their expulsion of the Jews in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century and the expulsion/jailing of the elite oligarchs. Tsar Alexander I also hindered a Rothschild attempt to control Europe through its banking systems and debt in the early-19<sup>th</sup> century (Congress of Vienna, 1814). Nathan Rothschild determined to destroy the Romanov line as a result, which he did through the Bolshevik Revolution. Russia issued an arrest warrant for the Rothschilds and George Soros as a threat to the security of the state in 2014.

Turks), Afghanistan, Pakistan and other areas. In many cases these are not 'moderate' Muslims but hard-line jihadis. Most of these are not refugees but economic migrants.

In addition we have had Islamic terrorists entering in large numbers so that the police are now monitoring 23,000 suspects that could commit terrorist acts at any time.

*Are there examples of the downside of Muslim immigration in Europe?* Absolutely.

The waves of Muslim immigration encouraged by Angela Merkel, George Soros and others has led to Muslim ghetto enclaves in France, Germany, Sweden and other nations. From these have emerged multiple criminal acts.

*What acts?*

- All the crime rates went up dramatically in countries that received large numbers of Muslim migrants, sometimes by hundreds of percentage points. [For details see, 'Fake News'.]
- Rapes went through the roof. The rapes included assaults on children as young as five (some of which were subsequently murdered) and old women over 80. Even nuns have been raped. In Sweden Muslim migrants that have raped children have been sentenced to a measly three months in a youth camp (migrants claim to be under-18, even though those that have been dental-tested are much older).
- Murders and assaults have increased dramatically. Gun crime has skyrocketed.
- Drug crime increased dramatically.
- Muslim ghettos became no-go areas for civilians or even authorities; there are fifty of these in Sweden alone. In these only Sharia Law is acknowledged and not the national law. The Post Office won't enter certain areas in Sweden for fear of violence, such as Rinkeby, neither will police forces or ambulance services unless accompanied by a SWAT team. Law-enforcement officials have stated that some areas are now war-zones and unsafe for ordinary people.
- In Malmo women are afraid to walk the streets and few dare to walk at night. Swedes are saying that a civil war is approaching.
- Rapes occurring at music festivals in Sweden have rocketed by hundreds of per cent. Police reports show that the culprits are Muslim migrants, but the left-wing media will not report this. The response of the Socialist establishment was a proposal to ban all men from festivals.
- Terrorist acts in Europe have now become so commonplace that leaders have said that it is a part of normal modern life to be expected. [This alone is an insane statement.] France has seen terrorist acts on an almost weekly basis for two years. Parts of Paris are now slums that look like the worst camps in Third World countries. Muslims have even set up slum camps on railway lines.

*Are there nations that have refused Muslim migrants?* Yes, such as Poland or Japan. These countries have zero Muslim-based crimes such as gang rapes, murder and theft. Poland has even said that the threatened sanctions by the EU were better than accepting Muslim migrants.

*Are there signs of problems in the UK?* Yes there are. London has become a key global base for Muslim extremism where radical publications are printed with impunity. Saudi Arabian financed preachers and materials are spreading radical Islam in British mosques where Muslims are taught the importance of killing apostates and kafirs. There is even widespread Islamification underway within British prisons where imams can preach

radical doctrines to inmates without any supervision by prison officers due to human rights laws demanding religious privacy in meetings.

There is growing hostility in towns like Luton where there is a significant Muslim presence and where some areas have become ghettos. You can see videos of Luton Muslims shouting that they will take over the country, that they own Luton, that they will occupy Buckingham Palace and so on. Anyone doing something they don't like in their areas (such as Gospel preaching) is attacked with violence and abuse.

*What of the future?* There will be a tipping point whereby Muslims become more than half of the population due to their increased birth-rate (strongly encouraged by imams) as well as increased immigration. According to the claims of many Muslims (and the teaching of Muhammad in the Qur'an and the Hadith), at that point a violent overthrow of the nation is planned so that a caliphate can be established with Sharia Law.

*What about moderate Muslims?* These are the exception; according to the teaching of Muhammad, Muslims that have integrated into British society are apostates that are to be killed. It is not only non-Muslims that are threatened by true Islam but also secular and moderate Muslims that are not jihadis.

Insanity

What is vital is to understand the true nature of Islam and understand that the British way of life is under threat. The purpose of Islam is to destroy British civilisation and occupy the nation under Sharia Law as an Islamic state.

Unlike other religious groups, such as Hindus or Sikhs, true Muslims are not allowed to integrate into non-Muslim societies unless they are working to take them over by stealth. In this case they are allowed to lie and deceive (*Taqiyya*) in order to promote jihad secretly.

The more that Britain allows Muslim immigration without control the more it is building up a real threat to national security and complete social destabilisation.

For detailed information on this issue, statistics and sources, see my papers '*Fake News*' and '*Islam: theology and history*'.

## The predation of children

*What do you mean?* I refer to the massive global cover up of the kidnapping, trafficking, abuse, rape and murder of children on a grand scale, the perpetrators of which go to the highest echelons of society.

I can only highlight certain features of this huge problem here but some facts and sources can be found in my paper, '*Suffer the little children*'.

*Are you referring to Jimmy Savile?* No; he was just a very small part of the problem, albeit with very powerful connections to the police, charity groups, the IRA, the Freemasons, the secret services and the royal family. Society is full of Jimmy Saviles that are being protected at the highest level. There is evidence of government ministers, MPs and prime ministers that were criminal paedophiles (and worse) but the establishment has repeatedly covered this up.

*Are these people organised?* Yes, there are powerful rings of paedophiles in the top professions and security services: the police, the judiciary, magistrates, the military, the

social services, the secret services, education academics, the media (especially the BBC), actors, entertainers (especially in Hollywood), religious groups (especially Muslims and Roman Catholics) and so on. This is why all the enquiries that have been conducted into serious charges of institutional child abuse have been whitewashes that have protected the guilty and damaged the victims. No wonder many child abuse victims kill themselves.

*How big is the problem?* It is absolutely huge involving millions of kids worldwide. According to UK Home Office statistics, 140,000 children vanish every year! 250,000 people go missing each year but many of these are found. 100,000 children under-16 run away from care homes each year. A missing person appeal is posted on Twitter every 30 minutes.<sup>27</sup> According to Missing Kids UK, a child goes missing in the UK alone every 3 minutes and 306,000 reports of missing people are made to the police every year, most of which are under 18. The charity Missing People states that 140,000 children go missing in the UK every year; many return, but some do not. Home Office figures show that during 2016 there were 1,141 child abductions, a figure that has doubled since 2011. The average age of those kidnapped was 11. Even the Home Office admits that many missing children become victims of sexual abuse and trafficking. The figures in other countries are higher. Key centres of paedophilia seem to be the US, the UK, Australia, Europe (especially Belgium), and South East Asia.

*Are there actions that the government could take?* Certainly. In cases of high level child abuse the nature of the secrecy involved means that prosecutions are difficult, and in any case many are protected by the very groups that are supposed to be investigating the crime. Known paedophiles have been protected because they are aristocrats, MPs, police or judges. For example, Cyril Smith MP got away with known child abuse for decades and was only exposed after his death.

However, other forms of child abuse could be eradicated if the government got strict on the offending groups.

*What groups?* For example, the known paedophile rings run by Muslims in the north of England. The scandal at Rotherham involving hundreds of girls has now been exposed, largely by the bravery of individuals (after years of cover-ups), but locals affirm that other towns, like Blackpool are far worse.

Town after town is being revealed as the scene of rampant Muslim paedophile gangs since the 1980s: Rochdale, Telford, Blackpool, London, Rotherham, Derby, Luton, Oxford etc. The British press and TV play this down and it is up to foreign channels (e.g. RT) to report what is going on. Groups of Muslims, often several brothers, are found to have groomed, abused, gang-raped, drugged, and trafficked girls as young as 10. The many that have been prosecuted<sup>28</sup> are but the tip of the iceberg.

There is a veritable rape explosion in this country that no one in the media is bothered about identifying the causes of. CBN News<sup>29</sup> affirms that as many as one million English children have been the victim of Muslim rape gangs. Those that have stood up to expose this (such as Tommy Robinson) have been praised by Punjabi and Sikh community leaders who have said that Muslims have been doing this to their children for decades and no one was interested. Labour Home Secretary Jack Straw said that Pakistani men view white

---

<sup>27</sup> Mail Online, Mark Duell; 'Faces of Britain's lost children', 25 May 2014.

<sup>28</sup> E.g. Abid Mohammed Saddique, Mohammed Liaqat, Mohammed Sajid, Mohammed Amin, Mohammed Islam Choudhrey, Mohammed Ali Sultan, Mohammed Karrar, Mohammed Shekh.

<sup>29</sup> CBN News, Dale Hurd; 'Easy Meat. Britain's Muslim rape gang cover up', 29.10.2016.

English girls as ‘*easy meat*’.<sup>30</sup> Statistics show that a British Muslim male is 170 times more likely to be part of a sex gang than a non-Muslim. Six out of seven Muslim males either knew about, or were part of, a grooming gang.<sup>31</sup> There is no evidence of non-Muslim men targeting Muslim girls.

In sentencing some Muslim rapists, Judge Gerald Clifton stated, ‘*All of you treated them as though they were worthless and beyond any respect. One of the factors leading to that was the fact that they were not part of your community or religion*’. This is why Muslims do this; the teaching of Muhammad demands that they should treat kaffir [non-Muslim] women this way. Salafist Muslims treat women as less than cattle.

*How could this be worse?* As well as grooming and raping, offenders rape young girls with knives, bottles, or nail their tongues to a table. Young girls are not just groomed and tricked into sex-slavery and are then trafficked, but many are murdered. Known offenders are even protected by the police. Policy analyst, George Igler, says:

If you are a young English girl, particularly between the ages of nine and 14, and you find yourself subject to the perversions of Muslim men, you effectively exist in a country where the forces of law and order don’t exist at all.<sup>32</sup>

One 13-year old girl in Luton was a victim of a Muslim gang and found running naked from the area, she was picked up by town prostitutes – the police would not help her at all.<sup>33</sup>

*Surely this cannot be true.* Take the case of 14-year old Charlene Downes from Blackpool in 2003. After disappearing, two Muslims were arrested and the trial jury heard recordings that they murdered her by strangling and then ground her body up in the Kebab restaurant where they worked and served her body to customers including her parents. One of the accused admitted this and laughed. Another witness reported that the brother of one of the defendants also admitted this.<sup>34</sup>

As a result of police failings, the May 2007 trial was cancelled because the jury failed to reach a verdict and the men were granted compensation of £250,000. The police reopened the case in 2008 but senior police officers raised objections and called the trial off on technical grounds due to errors by the police regarding evidence. One of the detectives was found guilty of misconduct and forced to resign.

Multiple girls have disappeared in this area. Police have stated that they believe that Charlene was abused by up to 100 men before her death. Julie Bindel of the Guardian said that the trial showed, ‘*endemic child abuse and prostitution in the seaside town*’.

If this seems extreme consider that ISIS used an industrial blender to murder 250 children. Consider how Muslims regularly treat wives and children. A Syrian Muslim refugee in Germany named Hassan threw his three children out of a second-storey window when his wife disobeyed him; they have permanent impairments.<sup>35</sup>

The case of Rotherham shows conclusively that the police, social services and the council colluded in covering up the scale of the Muslim paedophile rings. Multiple opportunities

---

<sup>30</sup> Ibid.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid.

<sup>34</sup> The Telegraph, ‘Missing girl’s body put into kebab’, 24 May 2007.

<sup>35</sup> The Times of Israel, ‘Syrian in Germany gets 15 years for throwing his children out window’, 3 November 2016.

were lost to stop this early on and the police have admitted that they were more concerned about being called racists.

*But is this compatible with Islam?* Yes it is. It is known that imams teach Muslims that kafir sex-slaves are acceptable and that this is the teaching of Muhammad. In fact Muhammad had multiple sex-slaves, concubines (on top of multiple wives) and also raped the captives of battles. In his footsteps, Muslims raped women after all subsequent battles and took millions as sex-slaves, including one million Christian women kidnapped from the Balkans and Mediterranean coasts. Just last week an imam was prosecuted of paedophilia. The teaching of the Qur'an is that a kafir woman is worse than cattle and fit for anything a Muslim man chooses to do to her. Enslaving kaffir women and abusing them is an established aspect of Sharia law.

*What can be done?* The government could do something about this if it had the nerve. Instead it has warned the police to protect Muslims and this policy can be seen in the harassment by the police of campaigners who are abused or attacked by Muslims but get imprisoned themselves. You can see videos of the police arresting Tommy Robinson after being harassed, abused and attacked by Muslims who were left scot-free. The media has decided to ignore this massive problem on the basis of political correctness, ensuring there is a veil of silence over it.

The reason for this silence is the elite plan for multiculturalism in Britain. This meant importing a new population with no mandate to do so. Laws were created, while other laws were ignored, to enforce multiculturalism on the British people. If the gangs had been white, the rapes would have been stopped years ago but the establishment seeks to continually downplay the negative effects of multiculturalism and thus protect Muslims. Thus Muslim rapes, terror attacks or atrocities are often attributed to some other adjective instead of 'Muslim'.

The government is guilty of culpability in Islamic paedophilia and utterly failing to address the problem. It is stated by many that this is also due to commitment to Saudi Arabia to tolerate Muslim crimes in order to gain arms sales and inward investment. Nothing must be done to offend the Saudi royal family.

#### Insanity

The evidence of Muslim-based abuse and trafficking of minors is well established both in Britain and in Europe but nothing is being done.

The Home Office enquiry into institutional child abuse has been so badly run that victims have now withdrawn their support. Despite three chairmen, and a couple of years of work nothing at all has been done and victims feel worse than ever.

Despite multiple social services reports into large-scale child abuse nothing has been done other than whitewashes and low-level arrests.

Despite the huge evidence, including that by the former chief police officer involved, the Haut de la Garrene case in Jersey is also now being covered up and put to rest. Proven murders are being denied.<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> Such as one human skull found on the premises has been claimed to be a coconut, despite it having collagen in it, which proves it was human. The police OIC who stated that this was a human skull was removed from the case and retired.

Multiple former police officers have now come forward to the media claiming that they were forced to cover up known prominent paedophiles on which they had evidence. These were then gagged.

It should be realised that the government will not do anything about serious institutional paedophilia because it is endemic in top levels of power. This is insane. Politicians are prepared to sacrifice young, vulnerable children to horrific assaults, torture and murder in order to achieve political ends. Shame on them.

## **Austerity measures**

*Do austerity measures ever work to improve an economy?* No; they have never worked. They reduce productivity, they stagnate wages, they reduce tax returns and they damage the infrastructure that keeps workers healthy.

*Have they worked in recent years?* No. Greece has been virtually wrecked and raped by them.<sup>37</sup> In Britain the purpose was to reduce national debt but during the Coalition government the national debt doubled under George Osborne as Chancellor.

*What effect have these measures had?* The social infrastructure of Britain has been very nearly ruined.

*What do you mean?* I will simply give bullet points:

- The situation in mental health care is at rock bottom and has been said by authorities to be unsustainable and a disgrace to the sick.
- The NHS is now in freefall and facing oblivion because over £30 billion has been effectively cut from its budget since 2010.
- Cuts to the care system have led to care for the sick and elderly being in near terminal crisis.
- Nearly 20,000 police officers were taken off the streets and firearms officers reduced.
- Local councils faced savage cuts, which led to local cuts and closures. For example: free meals-on-wheels for the frail elderly were terminated in some towns. Libraries were closed. Local care facilities for various social and support groups were terminated. Lollipop ladies were made redundant. Rural bus services cancelled. Refurbishment of properties was not maintained according to building regulations, leading to fire risks. And so on.
- Education funding has been slashed.
- Disabled benefits have been slashed.
- Housing benefits have been reduced and terminated for the under-25s.

*Does the Tory government admit that austerity measures have failed?* No it does not; despite the obvious facts. Indeed, it is committed to continue and increase austerity measures with a further £8bn cuts.

*Why does it do this?* It does it because of a commitment to a faulty ideology not because of economic truths. It seeks to reduce the size of the state as a matter of principle, whatever the knock on effects to the poor and needy. It also hates the NHS and means to see it privatised by stealth.

---

<sup>37</sup> Austerity measures in Greece and Spain caused lower growth and lower tax revenues. With a shrinking economy, governments cannot repay bonds. In 2011 Greece had a fall of 6% GDP.

*How do the economics work?* Recession is not the time for austerity; cuts should be pursued when there is strong economic growth. There is also no evidence that cutting spending creates increased confidence. In the UK confidence collapsed after the Coalition came to power and this contributed to a double-dip recession.

### Insanity

Not only does history and economic theory demonstrate that austerity measures do not work to improve GDP, cuts to vital public services lead to a worsening of production figures and additional welfare costs.

For example, sanctions to benefit claimants lead to them having no money for food or rent for several weeks. This leads to malnutrition, which then causes a stay in hospital at a cost of several thousand pounds for every night in bed. To save £200 it may cost £20,000 in hospital costs or even more. Cutting social care leads to elderly patients staying in hospital ('bed-blocking') which is far more expensive than carers or care homes. Causing people to lose their accommodation (e.g. cutting housing benefit for private accommodation) leads to the local council's duty of care to provide Bed and Breakfast accommodation, which is often far more expensive. When the general health of a nation is damaged by austerity measures, it costs the nation more money in lost working hours and hospital costs.

A cynical person would state that this is a deliberate attack on the poor in society by people in power. It certainly does no good to the welfare of the nation.

## Western economic systems

The economic system and fiat currency that the west now operates is beyond farcical and rather frightening. It carries the potential of thrusting humanity back into the Stone Age if a global financial crisis should appear.

In the beginning banks were formed in nations to help stimulate the national economy and ran on strict principles. Today it is national economies that support banks.

All this has nothing to do with capitalism or the free market. A free market would let failing banks collapse under normal economic laws but today failing banks are propped up by national governments at enormous cost (which is Socialism). While Britain and America have no money to pay for vital needs of the populations, such as housing or health care, when a bank is in trouble governments can immediately find trillions to bolster the banks up (bailouts).

This money does no good to the economy but increases the wealth of banks and bankers. Quantitative Easing (or printing money) also goes to the banks and not to real people. Similar sums invested in real national issues, such as job creation, the NHS or building houses, would actually pay for themselves over time and improve the economy. Instead money is given to bankers and this does nothing for the real situation of the population.

In the current situation banks can borrow money at almost zero interest rates. This cheap money enables bankers to fund booms, such as the London housing market. Money is borrowed at 0.5% interest or even less and houses are purchased with the expectation of them continually growing in value forever. This leads to rising house prices, putting them out of reach for first-time buyers, and rising rents. The speculation of bankers to make money out of nothing is driving the population into ruin.

When interest rates are low then bankers get into riskier speculations. In some cases, bankers have entered into criminal activities, such as money-laundering for Mexican drug dealers. Since the financial collapse of 2008, many banks were exposed as criminal and corrupt; nobody went to jail.

Despite this cheap money being available for speculation by bankers, when a genuine small business wants to borrow money to grow their business they are charged 15% interest by banks. When poor people struggle and end up being forced to borrow from high-street lenders (such as Wonga)<sup>38</sup> they are charged 1509% interest pa. It is one rule for bankers and another for ordinary people.

The favouring of UK banks has been led by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in repeated Tory governments and some Labour governments. Their policy has been to ignore supporting manufacturing industries (which create real national wealth) and instead enable wild speculation by banks and financial institutions so that a large part of British GDP is the service industries, all dealing in money out of thin air and creating nothing of value.

### Insanity

This is usury gone mad. It creates economies based upon debt, both personal and national, whereby banks can be exposed to trillions of debt by holding worthless bonds that are propped up by governments, that are also in debt.

Deutsche Bank in Germany is currently exposed to a debt that far exceeds the total GDP of Germany. Italian government bonds amounting to a trillion dollars have negative yields. This isn't possible in a free market and it shows the corrupt nature of global central bankers and fiat money. The European Central Bank prints money to buy Italian bonds, having bought 88% of Italian government debt since 2008. If (when) the ECB stops buying Italian bonds (which is what Germany is demanding) Italy's financial system will crash. There are many similar situations all around the world. America is on the edge of financial collapse and has a gross national debt of \$20 trillion.

The whole world is teetering on the edge of a giant economic cliff and hanging on by its fingernails due to the criminal corruption of banks in collusion with national governments.

## Overseas aid (Oversees Development Assistance)

*Is this a good thing in principle?* Yes; giving from the nation's largesse as a top economy to assist the poor and needy in the world is obviously a good thing.

*Is this a good thing in practice?* Not today. When we have over a million people using foodbanks every year (including nurses in work); when we have some of the worst poverty levels in the world; when we have thousands homeless; when child poverty is at its highest historic level of several million; when children are fainting at school through malnourishment; when people cannot afford to buy a house or are charged inordinate sums to rent some squalid place – then it cannot be right to ignore our own poor to help another country's poor. The first rule of national governance is the security, safety and prosperity of its own people.

---

<sup>38</sup> A British pay-day loan company offering short-term, high-cost credit. Lending Stream charges 1325% APR.

*What is the amount spent on overseas aid?* 0.7% of Gross National Income is spent under legislation approved in 2015. In 2015 this was £12.1bn. This virtually equates to the entire spend on Wales. The provisional figure for 2017 is £13.3bn. By comparison, the USA spends less than 0.2%; France less than 0.4%.

*Where does this money go?* In 2015 37% was delivered via international organisations, the rest directly. These are the top ten countries that receive aid: Pakistan, Ethiopia, Afghanistan, Nigeria, Syria, Sierra Leone, South Sudan, Tanzania, India, and Bangladesh. £1bn is also paid to the EU to direct aid.

Of these both Pakistan and India have their own nuclear weapons programme; India is one of the top growing economies in the world. Pakistan also has its own space programme.

*What is it spent on?* Only about 16% goes on humanitarian aid. The rest is focused on strategic goals. Only 12% goes on economic infrastructure services. 13% goes to governments.

*Is it wasted?* Yes it is. According to the Tory International Development Secretary Priti Patel, too much is being stolen or wasted. She said that the money was being squandered. The Telegraph reported that Britain gave £1.3bn to the 20 most corrupt countries in the world in 2015.<sup>39</sup> These included Afghanistan and Nigeria, which David Cameron stated were, '*fantastically corrupt countries*'.<sup>40</sup> Somalia received over £120m despite concerns that this could be hijacked by Islamic terrorists. £5.2m went to an Ethiopian Feminist pop group. Executives and consultants in NGOs involved in this distribution get massive salaries.

### Insanity

At the same time as we waste billions giving money away to corrupt governments and too few humanitarian projects, Britons that paid taxes all their lives are starving, homeless, dying unnecessarily in hospitals and having a wretched quality of life. Many people suffering homelessness, mental health problems and malnourishment due to lack of money are service veterans who bled for this country and decent workers such as nurses and carers.

## Suppression of free speech

### The Lobbying Act 2014

*What is this?* This is legislation to provide a set of rules for groups that publicly campaign on issues in the run up to elections that are not standing as a political party or a candidate. It is supposedly to ensure that organisations cannot have an undue influence on the vote.

*What was the claimed intended target?* It was initially claimed to control corporate lobbying pressure groups. However, in practise it has had a disproportionate impact on charities and the corporate lobbyists were more able to get round this hurdle.

*What are the effects of it?* This legislation is preventing campaigns by charities to speak out on issues affecting the poorest and most marginalised in society during the election campaign. Essentially it is a gagging order on charities and activist groups.

---

<sup>39</sup> The Telegraph, 'Britain spends £1.3bn on foreign aid for most corrupt countries', 22 December 2016.

<sup>40</sup> In a conversation with the Queen which was overheard.

*Who benefits from it?* The Tory government since the issues that would be raised would show the government in a bad light. For example the government has gagged charities from speaking out about damaging social care plans.

*Who has complained about it?* More than 50 charities that have signed an open letter to all party leaders. This includes Age UK, Amnesty and Christian Aid who claim that democracy is being deleteriously affected. Greenpeace, which was fined under this law, called the act, ‘a democratic car crash’.

*Has any authority condemned it?* Yes. Conservative peer Lord Hodgson stated that ‘the right balance’ had not been struck in the act. A House of Lords committee said that the rules ‘threaten the vital advocacy role of charities’.

Insanity

This is plainly gerrymandering of publicity. It is contrary to democracy and is unjust. It belongs to totalitarian governments.

### **False accusations of racism to shut down just condemnation**

Over and over again anyone explaining that the Qur’an promotes hate crimes and killing non-Muslims gets shouted down or even arrested. Anyone pointing out that it is Muslims that are committing acts of terrorism is also castigated or even attacked.<sup>41</sup> Some people trying to explain the Muslim terror policy actually get arrested for ‘hate crimes’ and the Twittersphere goes ballistic in opposition to truth-tellers.

### **False reporting or omission by the BBC**

*Give an example.* In the recent case of a nursery worker in Hermon Hill, London being attacked by three women dressed in black, kicked, punched and slashed with a knife, the BBC failed to mention that they did this in the name of Allah. In the news video broadcast on TV you can see the edited cut where a witness (Ms Karrien Stevens) mentioned that they chanted ‘Allah’. This witness also reported the Allah connection in an interview with the Evening Standard.<sup>42</sup>

In the London Bridge attacks witnesses explained that the attackers shouted, ‘this is for Allah’ but the BBC report did not mention this either. It had footage of witnesses reporting this but did not broadcast it.

The BBC constantly refuses to identify terrorists as Muslims following a politically correct agenda.

The response of Theresa May to the London Bridge attacks was to promise to regulate the Internet – clamping down even further on free speech. Yet she does nothing to stop jihadist radicals from returning to the UK from Syria, or the thousands of known radicals already in the UK, which the state pays for.

Insanity

Instead of doing something sensible to prevent terror attacks, such as deporting known jihadis or properly monitoring the 23,000 Islamic radical suspects, Theresa May wants to clamp down on the Internet. This is nuts!

---

<sup>41</sup> Recently there has been one single non-Muslim terror attack, which is also to be condemned.

<sup>42</sup> Evening Standard, 7.6.17, ‘Nursery worker beaten and stabbed by three girls shouting about Allah’,

## **Hate crimes**

Laws on hate crimes are a means of silencing groups that the elite want to clamp down on; they have nothing to do with promoting equity; in fact they contradict freedom.

In a fair and democratic society everybody should be respected and everyone's basic rights should be upheld by law. Until recently this was the case under common law and good legislation. However, new acts in recent decades, brought in by modern neo-liberals under an elite agenda, have brought in laws discriminating in favour of certain minority groups. As soon as you do this you give one portion of society more rights than another and society is no longer equitable.

This is most noticeable in the case of homosexuals. Under these laws any homosexual feeling aggrieved by something you say (whether true or not, whether polite or not) can make a complaint and the penalty can be severe. In certain cases it can mean imprisonment.

It goes further than speech. If you run a business and do not wish the custom of open homosexuals because it goes against your principles, you will be prosecuted. [Aside: unless you are a Muslim. Muslim bakers and other trades constantly refuse the custom of homosexuals and even abuse them but the police will not charge Muslims for fear of accusations of racism.]

The constant victims of hate crime legislation are Christians that are trying to be true to religious convictions. Most famous recently have been bakers refusing to make a homosexual-themed cake or Bed-and-Breakfast owners refusing to book in a Gay couple.

But it is not just homosexuals, Muslims regularly use this legislation to shut down Bible-preaching and evangelism in areas of high Muslim population. Christians have gone to prison for simply preaching the Gospel.

## **Illegal to read the Bible in public**

When two street preachers were arrested and prosecuted in Bristol, they were found guilty of inciting public disorder (Crime and Disorder Act) by Bristol Magistrates Court in February 2017. Despite the fact that they were surrounded by Muslims that were hostile and abusive, no one making threats was arrested but the Christian preachers were. The preachers were robust but respectful while their attackers were swearing and abusive.

The preachers appealed to the Crown Court, which found them not guilty of religiously aggravated harassment on 30 June. The content of their preaching had been largely reading from the King James Bible. In the Magistrates Court the Crown Prosecution Service actually claimed that quoting from the Bible in modern Britain should '*be considered to be abusive and is a criminal matter*'.

Note that the CPS prosecuted the preachers for the content of their preaching not their style or volume. The CPS considers it to be illegal to quote the Bible in public. By arresting the Christians only, the police were enforcing the Islamist agenda of prohibiting any criticism of Islam. The Magistrates Court had conducted a heresy trial in favour of Islam!<sup>43</sup>

Britain is in the process of being turned upside-down by elite-driven, politically correct, criminal justice bodies. Alfred the Great is turning in his grave.

---

<sup>43</sup> Barnabas Fund, 'Christian street preachers acquitted: CPS must now answer questions over attempt to censor public Bible reading', 6 July 2017.

## Insanity

Britons fought for free speech, free association and freedom of expression over many centuries when various kings and leaders tried to terminate it; beginning with Magna Carta. Today many of the principles of Common Law, which defend the freedom of the individual, are being curtailed by government legislation (such as terminating trial by jury in some cases, denying habeas corpus for some charges and cancelling legal aid).

## HS2

If ever there was a waste of money this is it.

*What is HS2?* 'High Speed 2' is a purpose built high-speed railway line for faster trains (250 mph; current limit 125mph) between London to Birmingham and later to Leeds and Manchester. [HS1 is the line between London and Paris.]

*What will this cost?* Projected cost (which will doubtless increase) £56bn.

*What are the claimed benefits?* Travel time from London to Birmingham will be 24 minutes quicker. After phase two, travel to Manchester will supposedly be 52 minutes quicker and to Leeds 31 minutes quicker. It is claimed that HS2 will provide significant economic benefits to the north; however, no one has yet satisfactorily explained how this will be achieved. What economic benefit will accrue to Birmingham by saving 24 minutes on the journey from London?

*Are these benefits achievable or worthwhile?* Public opinion is against the project and many professionals question whether the vast expense is worthwhile even if the claimed benefits arrive. A London School of Economics study showed that far from benefiting the north, HS2 would suck jobs to London.

*What is the public opinion on this?* The consultation period revealed 90% of respondents were opposed to the plan. The manifestos of the Green Party and UKIP were opposed to it.

*What is at stake?* There are multiple issues: evictions and compulsory purchases will be necessary, homes demolished, noise pollution will increase, and areas of outstanding natural beauty are at risk; let alone massive national disruption during building. In addition there are huge technical difficulties to overcome; not least building a new railway station in the centre of Birmingham.

## Insanity

The insanity of all this is hard to believe. This project is a complete waste of time, which will not achieve any significant economic national benefit. Indeed, the LSE suggests that it will actually make the north worse.

The huge budget for this could be better spent on the NHS.

## The constant demonisation of Russia

*List some of the absurd attacks on Russia.*

- It hacked into US DNC<sup>44</sup> servers and other computers to influence the American presidential election.
- It caused the Brexit decision (allegation by Ben Bradshaw).<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup> Democratic National Committee.

- It has a significant influence over Donald Trump.
- It engineered the downfall of Hillary Clinton.
- It interfered in the UK election.
- It interfered with the French election (allegation by Macron).<sup>46</sup>
- Russia is aggressively expanding its territory westwards.
- It is actively seeking war with America.

*Is any of this true?* No it is not. There has not been a shred of evidence produced to substantiate any of this after months of investigation. In addition, some of the claimed sources (such as an ex-MI5 agent) have been proved to be false.<sup>47</sup> As Vladimir Putin said, how does anyone think that Russia could have altered the process of the US election? Even if Russia had hacked a few computers, it could not affect the election. [All western national secret services are hacking each other all the time. America is hacking everyone and this has been proven.]<sup>48</sup>

### **The American hacking**

*What are the definite facts?* 1) There is no declassified evidence that Russia tampered with the election. 2) There is no declassified evidence that Trump colluded with Russia. 3) There is no declassified evidence that Russia was behind the Clinton email leaks. 4) There is no declassified evidence that Russian influence resulted in Trump's win.

*Is trying to influence an election illegal?* It depends on what is done. If Russia tried to influence the US election with propaganda tools, (trolling etc.), then this is not illegal.

*What documents did affect the election campaign of Clinton?* There were several types: DNC emails, emails from Clinton's own private home server (which was illegal for her to have state documents in), and from her staff and colleagues (John Podesta etc.). It should be noted that the content of these leaks were true; the documents were verified and genuine. The information released was vital to democracy, such as proving that Bernie Sanders was fraudulently denied the primary or revealing the transcripts of Clinton's paid speeches to Wall Street banks.

*What are the technicalities of the DNC leaks?* The hacking software (malware) used to target the DNC and John Podesta is publicly available and was created by Ukrainian sources not Russian. Anyone could have used it. This is old and unsophisticated software that is incompatible with the high-level techniques of government agencies. The FBI released a list of 876 IP addresses involved but these are not conclusive indicators of identity as they can be faked ('spoofing'). It is significant that they cannot connect it to the Russian government. The IPs mostly came from the US ('Tor nodes') from a communications technology developed by the US Navy, which are untraceable. Most of the

---

<sup>45</sup> Business Insider, Jade Kanter & Adam Bienkov; 'Labour MPs think the government is hiding info about Russia interfering with Brexit', 23 February 2017.

<sup>46</sup> Macron's emails were leaked.

<sup>47</sup> A former British intelligence officer produced a document containing lurid claims about Trump with the suggestion that Russia used this information to blackmail him. Multiple news organisations studied this for weeks and could not substantiate any of its claims. Despite this, BuzzFeed, published it.

<sup>48</sup> The US spying programme was revealed by Edward Snowden. It includes internet and phone surveillance by American intelligence agencies and covers virtually everyone, including political allies. See, for example, BBC News, 'Edward Snowden: leaks that exposed US spy programme', 17 January 2014. Snowden also revealed that Britain's GCHQ also gathers information on web and phone customers which it shares with the US NSA (Operation Tempora). The NSA has bugged China, Italy, and the EU among others, including Angela Merkel's phone calls.

leaked DNC information was not from hacking but leaking by Seth Rich. In fact the DNC denies that it was hacked.

*What was the cause of the Podesta leaks?* Podesta fell for a ‘phishing’ attack. That is, he gave out his password to someone who asked for it. Thus Podesta is responsible for his own leaks.

*Did Clinton’s team have close ties to Russia?* Yes they did; in fact, Podetsa was in business with state-run Russian businesses.

*Do we know where the American email leaks came from?* Not for sure. However, WikiLeaks affirmed that their source was NOT Russia. A former British ambassador (Craig Murray) said that he knew where one of the leaks came from and it was not Russia. Secret Service whistleblowers have affirmed that the leaks were internal: from within the DNC itself and also from other secret service agency staff who opposed Clinton. It is widely suggested that the DNC source was DNC Data Analyst Seth Rich,<sup>49</sup> who was subsequently murdered before he could testify. Furthermore, access to the DNC computer (which could have identified the source) was denied to the FBI. Why?

*What else is involved?* Some of the ‘fake news’ stories that are connected by the media to this attack on Russia have been traced to young entrepreneurs in Macedonia, Georgia and elsewhere that made money by creating outlandish ‘click-bait’ stories about Trump or Clinton.

*Has America interfered with a sovereign nation’s election?* Yes it has on many occasions and in various ways. It has, many times, staged a CIA-led coup to topple a democratically elected government and promoted another one. It has interfered in world democracies over fifty times.

*Give an example.* When a leak from a Panamanian law firm exposed the personal finances of political clients, including Yanukovich in Ukraine, the west applauded this as good journalism. America then used this evidence of corruption as an excuse to destabilise the elected Ukrainian government of President Yanukovich and sponsored a violent coup that drove him from office on 22 February 2014, which sparked a civil war and a new Cold War with Russia. The US thought that this leak was a good thing. Yet, hypocritically, John McCain says that it is a potential ‘act of war’ (by Russia) to expose the fraud of the DNC.

Putin has commented on the ongoing American policy of using NGOs, funded and instructed by the CIA, to undermine governments that are on Washington’s hit list.

*What motive is there to suggest that Russia influenced the US election?* It is part of a left-wing plan to try to oust Trump from power because the left cannot accept Trump as President. However, some believe it is a distraction planned by Trump himself to cover up more sinister actions.

*What else has resulted from this Russia-phobia?* Recently the US Senate has introduced further sanctions on Russia, with no empirical reason. This, in turn, has led to EU countries, such as Germany complaining bitterly that this will badly affect their economy as it stops companies from continuing in investment projects, such as laying down oil pipelines. Germany has even stated that this threatens EU-US relations. The stupidity of all this is beyond belief.

---

<sup>49</sup> Rich was angry that the DNC illegally ruined Berni Sanders chance to win the primary elections.

## Insanity

All this attack on Putin is down to the global elite's hatred of Russia and of Putin for his Christian anti-elite policies that threaten their chances of gaining world domination.

The hypocrisy is chilling. For example, while attacking Putin for potentially starting a world war, the elite are actually trying to start this war themselves in multiple ways. The US is forming a ring of military bases to surround Russia from the top of Eastern Europe to North Australia, which is a direct threat to Russian sovereignty [See 'NATO expansion']. Missile bases have been erected, with tanks and troops, right on the Russian border. American fleets are also poised on the edge of Russian territorial waters and in the South China Sea. Missile bases have been deployed in South Korea.

In contrast Putin has proved to be a statesman without peer, and one of the greatest national rulers in decades. He continues to outwit western attempts to trip him up and defeats strategy after strategy. He is also a devout Christian (which also enrages the elite) and is building a church at least every week in Russia as well as maintaining traditional Christian values in the nation. For these reasons he is a very popular president.

Putin himself has explained that Russia only spends less than 10% on military matters compared to the USA and could not win a war with America. Thus Russia has nothing to gain for sparking off a war. Indeed, Putin is trying to avoid one.

The more the west threatens Russia, the more Putin comes up with unexpected solutions. Thus Putin has responded to economic sanctions by developing the national agricultural economy for the better. He has helped to develop the BRICS banking cartel side-stepping the US and now has set up an international money transfer system with China based on gold, also side-stepping the Petro-Dollar. All this angers the elite even more.

Regarding Ukraine and Crimea, the cause of this problem was US interference in Crimea, causing a coup of a democratically elected president. This was part of an aggressive eastern encroachment by the EU and NATO contrary to previous agreements between the US and the Russian Federation. Russia's security was directly compromised and so Putin acted by annexing Crimea to safeguard the majority Russian speaking population and secure the naval base. In Ukraine the violence is being perpetrated by US-backed Ukraine mobs / military against Russian speaking people. The whole picture in the Ukraine is the opposite of what is being spun by the western mainstream media.

The real insanity in all of this is that the west is provoking war with Russia (and also China) which would definitely lead to a world war and would probably go nuclear since Russia could not win a conventional war. For the US to do this is totally insane.

## **Sustainability-driven measures**

The sustainability strategies, such as illustrated by the UN's Agenda 21, are not really about protecting the environment at all, that is a smokescreen. They are an elite project to help keep human populations in subjection and under constant pressure. If the UN were truly interested in the environment it would immediately outlaw geo-engineering, which is the biggest threat to the planet that all Green groups utterly ignore (see later).

The constant pressure from the Green lobby, which is actually an elite-driven strategy, is leading to many policies that are not only stupid but downright harmful and dangerous. Some of these include the following.

### **Cavity insulation**

This is when the gap between a house's exterior and interior wall is filled with insulating foam. This is done to reduce energy costs in heating the home and also claims to make homes cooler in summer.

This nonsense should never have been allowed from the get-go. The gap between walls is there for a reason; it is to prevent damp that has penetrated exterior brickwork from travelling to the interior wall and causing problems to residents.

Predictably, many homes that have been insulated in this way have now developed internal damp walls. In some cases it is so severe as to cause a health hazard. It also increased resident's costs to continually try to remove mould from walls. All these efforts increase unnecessary energy costs and CO<sub>2</sub>, the very things they were supposed to prevent.

However, globalist companies that were part of the elite scam in the first place are making millions from homeowners to produce the foam and to apply it to homes. They care nothing that homeowners now face a much bigger costs and a difficult task of trying to remove the foam once it is in place because it sticks like glue.

### **External cladding insulation**

This has been in operation for some time on the basis that it is saving energy costs. In fact, many suspect that the real purpose in cladding high-rise tower blocks is to beautify them where they are in expensive boroughs. That is certainly what the residents of Kensington-Chelsea believe.

Tower blocks made from concrete are actually quite a safe design regarding fire risks. Concrete doesn't burn very easily and separation of floors and units make it comparatively easy to isolate a fire. If there are also smoke alarms for early warning, coupled with sprinkler systems for hindering fire development, it is unlikely to have a serious fire. Historically there have been very few large fires in high-rise buildings.

This has recently all changed.

There have been very serious fires in tower blocks in England, Australia and elsewhere where they have been cladded with external insulating material under pressure from Green policies.

What you are doing in this is to make something well-designed in terms of fire-safety into something that has an increased risk of fire. All that is necessary is for the external cladding to catch fire and then there is nothing stopping it raging straight up the entire tower.

Added to this is the incredibly stupid fact that some cladding products are not inflammable. There are more expensive products that have a much lower fire risk, but many that are used are very flammable indeed.

People have been raging about this for years and especially since a fire in Lakanal House, Camberwell, London in 2009 which killed six people after renovations had been made. The coroner, in 2013, advised the government to introduce sprinklers and consider cladding methods. Nothing was done. Like Grenfell Tower, victims had been told to stay put in their flats while those who escaped survived. In this case it was supposedly insulated windows that were inflammable.

It has taken an appalling, and predicted, tragedy in Kensington with the terrible fire at Grenfell Tower to raise awareness of this and social anger. This unfolding drama is even threatening the already weak government of Theresa May. Residents repeatedly warned the council and the social housing trust that the cladding was not safe and that sprinklers were necessary, as well as other safety issues. Despite being the richest borough, in the richest city, in the 5<sup>th</sup> largest economy of the world, nothing was done.

Currently the police are saying that at least 71 people are dead but eyewitnesses have reported at least 200 bodies in the building which housed over 600 people. No one above the 20<sup>th</sup> floor survived and this alone accounts for scores if not hundreds of people. The borough council will not release figures of registered tenants; meanwhile locals are trying to locate missing loved ones that are probably dead.

This terrible tragedy, one of the worst ever in Britain, and one of the worst home fires in history, was completely avoidable and (on first impressions) was caused by applying flammable cladding to a tower.

[ASIDE: note that despite the ferocious flames, which continued for over a day, the concrete structure did not collapse. Yet we are supposed to believe during 9/11 that a much more localised fire that burned for minutes was sufficient to bring down three steel and concrete structures; one of which was not even struck by an aircraft.]

### **Road restrictions**

All over Britain various types of road restrictions have been implemented on the basis of Green policies. These are to slow cars down or open up spaces for cycles and buses.

#### *Speed bumps*

One method is speed bumps. There are roads in some towns that are now a hazard with dozens of these humps that force cars to slow down but then speed up again. This deceleration followed by acceleration causes the very opposite of what the Greens want – much increased exhaust pollution. Thus a Green policy, not for the first time, actually achieves the opposite of what it claims to desire.

However, this is not the worst feature. These bumps cause terrible pain to sick people with back problems, neck problems and other medical conditions. If you have one of these conditions, going over these bumps, however slowly, jars the body and causes pain. Now imagine if you are in chronic pain and you live in a road where these things are introduced. This is a disgrace. In the name of some foolish environmental hubris these things cause terrible pain to sick people.

Furthermore, where the humps have gaps to allow buses to pass through, there is a much increased hazard to drivers who steer their cars through the gaps to avoid the bumps (which can damage car suspension) and this puts the car directly in the path of oncoming cars doing the same thing. I have seen many very near misses but nobody is collating accident figures on this basis.

For these and other reasons several countries, such as Austria and Australia, have removed speed humps from roads. Britain is full of them.

#### *Lane closures*

Where Greens have been in local power (such as Brighton) they have introduced arbitrary lane closures to busy arterial roads. Thus a main artery into the city that had two lanes now only has one; the other lane is restricted to cycles and buses.

Again this defeats the object. In plain predictability, what happens is that there are large traffic jams at peak times going back miles out of the town. These lines of cars travelling very slowly in second gear or less results in a massive increase in exhaust pollution – the very thing Greens hate. It also make drivers very irate and stressed.

A further problem is that ambulances and fire engines can have great difficulty in getting past this logjam. Cars are nose to tail on the main lane but buses are also lined up on the inner lane resulting in nowhere for emergency vehicles to manoeuvre. It is possible that people have died en route to hospital because of this policy but the lane closures are not recorded as a factor.

None of this makes any sense at all.

## Climate change / Global warming

I will keep this brief and simple. For detailed information see my papers: ‘*Synopsis against global warming*’ and ‘*The fabrications behind climate change*’.

*What is the basis of the climate change /global warming position?* It is that the last hundred years or so has seen a massive increase in global temperatures that threaten human society and nature. This increase has been caused by human activity since the Industrial Revolution (anthropogenic climate change); mostly though excessive generation of CO<sub>2</sub> (a greenhouse gas).

*What has been the result of this policy?* It has had massive effects around the world. It has led to global taxes on nations and individuals, such as over £100pa on UK citizen’s power bills. It has resulted in layer upon layer of bureaucracy and regulations affecting almost everything: from car engines to vacuum cleaners. It has resulted in the development of new industries to develop power that are ineffective and worthless but get government subsidies, such as wind farms (each turbine has attracted up to £1m in subsidies but on an windless day wind farms produce 0.4% of national power).<sup>50</sup> Wind-farms would need to fully cover all of Wales in order to supply one sixth of the nation’s energy needs. The largest ever built (Rampion) will only produce a third of the claimed 700 megawatts of power. E.on will earn £325 million a year from this farm but of that, £220 million a year is paid by the taxpayer. One of the largest green energy companies shows that wind-farms only produce enough energy to boil two or three kettles at a time.<sup>51</sup> In 2013 it was estimated that climate change policies were costing the UK £85 billion.<sup>52</sup> Gas-fired power stations cost half of the Rampion wind farm and generate ten times as much electricity without fail; the cost is £50 per megawatt hour. Rampion is £135 per megawatt hour (if any is produced at all).

*Who suffers from this policy?*

- **Animals:** wind-farms kill large numbers of birds and bats (the hum affects bat sonar resulting in them crashing). Environmentalists are supposed to be in favour of nature but ignore these effects on wildlife. At the same time that the government prosecutes people killing bats that are protected, it allows wind farms to slaughter hundreds of

---

<sup>50</sup> The recent claim that it provided over half of the power supply was based on measurements taken on an exceptionally windy day. Immediately afterwards the ratio dramatically fell to 0.4% when there was no wind. Wind power is claimed to have provided 11.5% of generation in 2016.

<sup>51</sup> The Telegraph, ‘The wind farms that generate enough power to make a few cups of tea’, Robert Mendick; 24 August 2013.

<sup>52</sup> The Telegraph, ‘Britain’s £85 billion bill for climate policies’, Robert Mendick; 1 December 2013.

them. A turbine erected next to a school in Portland had to be switched off because it was killing so many seagulls that the headmaster had to remove the corpses every morning to avoid upsetting the children.<sup>53</sup> Yet if you move a seagull from your own roof you will be prosecuted.

- People: people living near wind-farms are affected by the hum, which makes them sick and sleepless. One turbine blade flew off in a mere 40mph wind next to the playground of 16 schools in Scotland.<sup>54</sup>
- Land: huge swathes of land have to be churned up to provide channels for transported generated power from wind-farms which are mostly situated in remote locations. The new Rampion wind farm off the south coast near Worthing<sup>55</sup> has fenced-off land and dug up channels for cables running all the way through the South Downs going north towards Bolney. This crosses farmland, historic sites (including a Bronze-Age site) and large areas of natural beauty but avoids the wealthy golf courses nearby.
- Landscape: wind-farms are an ugly eyesore that ruins the panorama of people nearby.
- Taxpayers: setting up wind-farms costs the taxpayer billions of pounds in subsidies. Without such government subsidies no one would build them. This makes wind-farms non-competitive with coal-based power stations, which are being run down due to Green concerns about CO<sub>2</sub>.

*Who generated this policy about wind farms?* In our case it was the EU who demanded in 2007 that the UK would produce 15% of its energy from renewables by 2020. Because much of domestic use is by gas products and cannot be sourced from renewables, Tony Blair committed Britain to producing 32% of our electricity from renewables. Hence the rush to build wind farms. We cannot meet this objective.

*Are there knock-on effects from wind farms?* Yes. Due to their failure to produce any electricity on windless days, back up gas-powered power stations have to be built to take up the slack. This increases the cost of producing power in this country. It also increases our CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, which are much more than the CO<sub>2</sub> saved by wind farms. The whole thing is nonsense.

*Who has benefited from this Green policy in general?* A number of elite groups and individuals, such as corporations involved in the manufacture of Green products. It has been a bonanza for corporations.

*Is the basis of this climate change policy sound?* No it is not; in fact it is absolute nonsense. It has been developed largely by corrupt politicians using false information, flawed computer projections and downright lies. Scores of its predictions of decades ago have been proved to be false; for example according to the UN the Maldives should now be under water and uninhabited. In fact its population has increased.

*Identify some reasons why it is unsound?* I will simply list a few salient points:

- History shows that the climate constantly changes in cycles, first a warm period followed by a cold period. This follows nuclear reaction activity cycles in the sun.
- During history there were warm periods that were hotter than experienced in recent decades, such as the Medieval Warm Period, or the time during the Roman occupation of Britain whereby Romans were able to grow grapes in Yorkshire. The mini ice-age in the post medieval period is also notable when fairs were conducted upon the frozen

---

<sup>53</sup> Mail Online, Christopher Booker; 2 August 2014.

<sup>54</sup> Ibid.

<sup>55</sup> Covering 60 square miles of the Channel.

River Thames. Warm periods were always times of great prosperity and increased populations.<sup>56</sup>

- The trend is now declining global temperatures. Since 1990 the average global temperature has been steadily going down. Studies of local high and lows around the world reveal that record low temperatures outweigh record highs by 18 to 1. A Google study showed 7,910,000 record high temperatures but 148,000,000 record low temperatures in 2013.<sup>57</sup> In 2017 in the Tropics band there were 4.2 million record high temperatures but there were 120 million record lows. All the areas of the world, including the Middle East show a higher proportion of record lows by at least 4 to 1. There is year on year cooling of the planet with the Tropics cooling the most. These facts support the claim of sane climatologists that a mini ice-age is approaching, which would follow the historic pattern over centuries.
- Many 'facts' stated by climate-change apologists are simply lies. For example, the claim that polar bears are under threat due to global warming is nonsense as their population has never been higher. In fact, global temperatures have been declining since 1990 and some professional climatologists are predicting a mini ice-age.
- It is an established scientific fact that a rise in CO<sub>2</sub> levels follows increased global temperatures and does not cause a rise in temperature. Ice-core samples from the arctic and Antarctica prove this as well as sediment samples from the ocean depths.
- The gap in the ozone layer (another cyclical matter) is now closing despite human activity.
- During the period of increased CO<sub>2</sub> levels in the 20<sup>th</sup> century the earth was made much greener to the equivalent of an entire continent of plant material. CO<sub>2</sub> is good for plants not bad.

*Are not the majority of scientists supporters of climate-change policies?* No; the vast majority of climatologists (i.e. those who really know what they are talking about) do not support it and are actively combating it but get shut down by the media.

*Name an esteemed climatologist who denies climate-change policies.* Ian Plimer of Australia, one of the top climate specialists.

*Give the reasons why this policy is being pushed if it is wrong.*

- To help keep the population in fear about the future (an elite trick to foster trust in the government). This is why many political presentations, especially by the UN, produced doomsday scenarios that were supposed to have happened by now.
- To tax people and steal their money.
- To keep working class people poor.
- To provide enterprise opportunities for elite firms to make huge amounts of money.
- Keep developing nations, especially Africa, from having their own industrial revolution and harnessing their natural resources, which would make them a powerful international player in global politics. This is why there is a plan to keep sub-Saharan Africa poor. This is the main strategic reason.

### Insanity

The idea that puny man can change something as enormous as the earth's weather patterns and average temperature is, frankly, laughable and hubristic. Just one powerful volcanic eruption gives out more CO<sub>2</sub> in a few days that all of mankind's history. If

<sup>56</sup> Excepting events such as plagues caused by other forces.

<sup>57</sup> Robert Felix; IceAgeNow.info.

mankind stopped producing CO<sub>2</sub> completely, just one volcanic eruption would ruin that work.

Even the flatulence of domestic herds and ungulate ruminants gives off approximately 2bn metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent methane, another greenhouse gas. (The negative effect of methane is 23 times higher than the effect of CO<sub>2</sub>.) This doesn't take into account the agricultural release of CO<sub>2</sub> to provide grazing, fertiliser and feed for livestock or ammonia. (Agriculture is responsible for 18% of greenhouse gases, which is more than the whole transportation sector.) According to the UN, cows are more damaging to the environment than cars.<sup>58</sup> A Japanese study found that one kilogram of beef produces 36.4 kilograms of CO<sub>2</sub>, i.e. about 250 kilometres of driving a car. Do we now start culling cows?

You see how stupid all this is?

Mankind should stop polluting the earth full stop. Ignore climate-change nonsense and stop the corporate pollution that causes immense damage worldwide, to say nothing of military destruction pursued by the elite in their terrible strategies, such as using uranium depleted shells, phosphorous bombs, chemtrails, nuclear tests and such-like.

## Green Party Manifesto

*Why is this included?* Because the policies affirmed in the 2015 Green party manifesto include some of the most insane things ever postulated.

*Give some examples.*

- Parents will be entitled to two years paid leave from work.
- £280bn will be allotted to enable people to choose their own type and pattern of work (this is double the health budget).
- Inheritance tax will affect the living as well as the dead, raising levies on gifts such as cars, jewellery and items given by parents to their children.
- Resource taxes would be raised on wood, metal and minerals.
- Tariffs would be introduced ending free trade.
- All aspects of the sex industry would be decriminalised.
- Prisoners will be given the vote.
- Independent schools would lose charitable status and pay corporation tax.
- Religious instruction will be banned in schools.
- State funding for universities to be increased.
- Sports teams will be prevented from playing certain nations.
- New taxes on airlines.
- Euthanasia will be legalised.
- Decriminalisation of being a member of al-Qaeda.
- Eradication of the standing army, navy and airforce. The arms industry converted to producing wind-farms.
- Border controls will be reduced.
- Access to benefits and the right to vote given to any resident, regardless of passport.
- The monarchy will be abolished.

---

<sup>58</sup> The Independent, Geoffrey Lean; 'Cow emissions more damaging to planet than CO<sub>2</sub> from cars', 10 December 2006. This cites the Food and Agricultural Organisation report, 'Livestock's Long Shadow'.

I need not comment on any of this; it speaks for itself. *The Spectator* called this, ‘Communism ... designed by middle-class women’.<sup>59</sup> Douglas Murray said, ‘What’s more disturbing than a group of discredited old Nazis? The Green party’.<sup>60</sup>

## Geo-Engineering

*What is this?* It is the attempt by the global elite to control the earth’s weather by spraying certain compounds from specialised aircraft to achieve certain ends. This has been commonly termed, ‘Chemtrails’ (chemical-trails) since the plane leaves a criss-cross grid system trail in the sky over sprayed areas. It is known as:

- Geo-engineering: modifying the earth’s weather by human interventions.
- Climate engineering (as above).
- Chemtrails (see above): trails in the sky caused by spraying chemicals into the stratosphere. This is a popular but non-scientific term. However, the term is formally used in the US Space Preservation Act of 2001 (HR 2977 IH) in Section 7 (Definitions) 2Bii.
- Solar radiation management. Controlling global warming by reflecting solar energy through aircraft scattering light reflective particles. 25-30% of the sun’s rays no longer reach the earth.
- Stratospheric Aerosol Injection: injecting fine particles into the stratosphere for the purposes of solar radiation management.
- Ocean fertilisation: climate engineering based on spraying iron or sulphur into the upper ocean to remove carbon dioxide from the atmosphere.

*Are these trails not a normal consequence of flight?* No, they are not; condensation (vapour) trails (‘contrails’) from commercial flights are high level and dissipate quickly. Chemtrails are at lower level (sub-20,000ft) and leave a grid pattern observable for a much longer time. Often the humidity levels means that it is impossible to form low-level water vapour contrails; these chemtrails have to be something else.

*What proof is there of this?* There is documentary evidence (see later). There is observed experience: why are there grid patterns of trails in the sky effected by aircraft? Why only certain aircraft at certain times? What compounds are being used that would create such trails when water vapour could not form naturally? Why are some planes observed leaving a grid trail when other commercial planes fly above them leaving no trail? Most modern turbofan jet engines<sup>61</sup> (commercial cargo and military) do not leave vapour trails. Trails appear where there is no commercial traffic.

*What planes are used?* Military and commercial converted aircraft, such as: KC10, KC135, and C17 Globemasters.

*What is the US government position on this?* It is claimed to be fighting global warming. It is expressed in multiple documents (see later) that, ‘*geoengineering technologies are categorised as either carbon dioxide removal (CDR) method or a solar radiation management (SRM) method. CDR methods address the warming effects of greenhouse gases by removing carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) from the atmosphere. CDR methods include ocean fertilisation, and carbon*

---

<sup>59</sup> The Spectator, Ed West; ‘Welcome to the completely bonkers world of the Green party manifesto’, 21 January 2015.

<sup>60</sup> The Spectator, 20 April 2015.

<sup>61</sup> 2-spool, high-bypass turbofan where the air is non-combusted.

*capture and sequestration. SRM methods address climate change by increasing the reflectivity of the earth's atmosphere or surface. Aerosol injection and space-based reflectors are examples of SRM methods.*<sup>62</sup>

*What chemicals are sprayed?* Heavy metal particulates are sprayed from aircraft in an attempt to control climate – often solar radiation management by reflecting sunlight. Scientists have measured deposits on the ground after spraying and documented very high levels of aluminium oxide, barium, strontium and other compounds. Some particulates are sprayed over the oceans with the additional intent of ocean fertilisation by dropping iron or sulphur into the upper ocean to remove carbon dioxide from the atmosphere. They try to force the ocean to soak up more CO<sub>2</sub> but the result is damage to the oceans such as algae blooms. High levels of toxic aluminium have been found on pristine mountain snow. Aluminium does not occur freely in nature; it is bound up as aluminium silicate in clay and minerals.

*Are these dangerous compounds?* Yes, they are a threat to human health and the ecosystem.

*Why would anyone do this?* There are various claims but no government spokesman has admitted anything malevolent. It is speculated that: 1) they are developing some kind of weaponised weather capability (*'owning the weather as a force multiplier'*).<sup>63</sup> 2) It is to damage human fertility. 3) It is to make certain populations weak and sick. 4) It is in combination with some other strategy. 5) US government apologists have said that this policy is fighting global warming by scattering light reflecting particles to disrupt solar gain and reduce global warming (global dimming). 6) The particles enhance radio transmission, radar and EDF radiation that have military uses.

*Is there evidence of its use in warfare?* Yes. Project Popeye was a highly classified weather modification programme used during the Vietnam War in an attempt to extend the monsoon season over the Ho Chi Minh Trail. Project Storm Fury was a hurricane modification programme involving artificial stimulation of convection by adding silver iodide particles to the eye of a hurricane.

*Is this illegal considering it is poisoning nature and people?* A 1976 UN Treaty,<sup>64</sup> article III states, *'the provisions of this convention shall not hinder the use of environmental modification techniques for peaceful purposes'*. Thus international treaties forbid its use in warfare but not for peaceful purposes.

*What diminishing effect has this had?* It is known that 25-30% of solar rays have been reflected and now do not reach the earth compared to before 70 years ago.

*Where do these aircraft emanate from?* They have been observed and filmed operating out of US military bases in America and on certain oceanic islands.

*Who is behind all this?* Researchers have traced its origins to the same elite global bankers that control national governments and the military. It is supra elected officials.

---

<sup>62</sup> [US] Congressional Research Service, 'Geoengineering: governance and technology policy', Kelsi Bracmort & Richard K Lattanzio, 2 January 2013 (7-5700, R41371).

<sup>63</sup> 'Weather as a force Multiplier: Owning the Weather in 2025', A research paper presented to the US Air Force.

<sup>64</sup> The UN Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environment Modification Techniques.

*Why do environmental regulatory bodies not cover this issue?* There are two prime reasons. The first is that the particulates used in Geo-engineering are so small that they do not flag up in atmospheric tests. Air quality testing is usually limited to about 10 microns or occasionally 2.5 microns but the particulates used in chemtrails are smaller than 0.01 microns. Thus the particulates cannot be detected. To illustrate by analogy: if the normal tests search for particles the size of a boulder, Geo-engineering particulates are the size of a grain of sand. You could fit 50,000 nano-particulates across one strand of human hair.

The second reason is that the global elite have shut down all attention on this. Professionals trying to publicise this insanity have been fired. Regulatory government bodies have been told to ignore any evidence. For example in California, state water quality reps were told to stop testing the water supplies for aluminium in 2002. Samples are only tested for combustible particulates (from cars) and nothing else. The environmental lobby is not interested and is hypocritical, as this is the biggest danger to the planet.

*Has anyone tried to bring this to light?* Apart from activists, there have been pilots that have flown geo-engineering planes testify in court. There have been regulators that have discovered aluminium contamination that speak out.<sup>65</sup> There have been high level military officers speak out (and then are mysteriously killed). Whistleblowers that try to speak out are served with a federal gag order.<sup>66</sup>

*What are the effects on the planet?* It is having a proven catastrophic effect on the planet and every aspect of ecology. It completely distorts the hydrological cycle; for example it migrates rain from one place to another. It diminishes direct light (global dimming), which decreases evaporation. Convection is decreased. There is a decrease in relative atmospheric humidity (from 0.64 g/kg in 1948 to 0.54 in 2012). The chemtrail particulates absorb moisture.

UVB radiation is at it highest level in recorded history (ten times higher). This damages DNA. It damages trees: the bark of many trees starts falling off due to UVB damage. Poisoned forests are now producing CO<sub>2</sub> instead of oxygen, they are not feeding on carbon, and then die. Many trees simply die from toxic shock; when they sense aluminium in the soil they shut down nutrient uptake. Every type of plant is demonstrating holes and burns in plant leaves caused by atmospheric toxins.<sup>67</sup> It is destroying plankton in the sea, which produces half of the world's oxygen. Plankton populations have plummeted 50-60%. Altogether this causes multiple problems. It accounts, for example, for the massive increase and ferocity of forest fires from Siberia to Canada. Siberia is losing 100 million acres to fire every year. This is due to less rain, intense UVB radiation, more dry lightning, incendiary dust on plant foliage (aluminium particulates are incendiary).

There is no longer any organic plant life at all. All plants are absorbing these heavy metal materials from the sky through rain. There is horizontal gene mutation in all types of plant life.

*What are the effects on animals?* Essentially, aluminium and other toxins are being absorbed by every living thing on the planet and suffering accordingly. Whales are dying

---

<sup>65</sup> For example, Dr Michael Davis a US EPA environmental engineer for 16 years was fired for speaking out in 2016 for, '*raising the issues of anthropogenic deposition of aluminium due to atmospheric geoengineering*'.

<sup>66</sup> Bill Hopkins, Executive Vice President of the National Weather Service Employees Organisation, '*As a taxpayer, I find it highly disturbing that a government agency continues to push gag orders to hide how they operate*'.

<sup>67</sup> Ryan Hannigan; Research and Perspectives, '*Environmental Investigations of Plants Exhibiting Disease*', 5 August 2014.

and examination of their bodies show a huge amount of aluminium. Although Glyphosate kills bees, the biggest threat to bees is now aluminium. Bees are effectively dying of Alzheimer's disease. Tests on dead bees show the presence of aluminium thousands of times higher than normal level. All sorts of animals are dying off: bats, fish, birds etc. You can see videos of thousands of dead fish washed up on beaches as well as entire pods of cetaceans.

*What is the health effect on humans?* There is a huge and unquantifiable effect because it does so much damage, beginning with endocrine disruption. Aluminium dust enters the bloodstream through the lung lining and then cause all sorts of damage to organs.<sup>68</sup> Known harmful effects of aluminium include: Alzheimer's, Autism, dementia, Diabetes, obesity, cognitive impairment, digestive failure, liver failure, neurological diseases, immune system disorders, death.

Everyone on earth is breathing this in and the effects coalesce, as the body cannot remove heavy metals. One effect is autism; the rates of occurrence of this have gone through the roof in recent decades going from 1 in 5,000 in 1975 to 1 in 47 in 2014. In less than 9 years, at this rate, 50% of all children will be autistic, according to an MIT report by a senior scientist. Another effect is Alzheimer's disease, which has also massively increased. In short, all the body's organs are damaged by this, especially the liver. Mankind is facing a fight for life.

*Give some technical details.*

- Sugar Pine Canyon Creek, Redding, CA, USA has 4,600,000 ppb of aluminium in upper and lower stream. The normal level is 15,000 ppb.
- Sisson Meadow pond sludge water at Mt Shasta has 12,000 mg/lg of aluminium. The park spring water had 1540 ug/l of aluminium in 2009. Aquatic and terra insects are about 20% of numbers since 2007.
- Fish and insects died in Cold Creek, Mt Shasta from aluminium, lead and arsenic poisoning. Trout are starving.
- Snowdrift near McCoud on Mt Shasta at 8,000 feet (which should be pristine) has 61,100 ug/l aluminium, 83 of barium and 383 of strontium – over four times that of protected soil.
- The 2013 rain report in Mt Shasta is 13,100 ug/l aluminium, 130 barium, 138 strontium which is undrinkable and 13 times the allowable limit.
- In the measurements taken by a professional, the samples show a direct relationship to chemtrail density. More chemtrails, the higher aluminium, barium, strontium, boron, titanate and arsenic.

*But why would the elite do this to themselves?* They are insane and evil. Consider, why would the established powers detonate over 2,000 nuclear warheads all around the world, even near populated areas? In the 1950s housewives would watch, from kitchen windows, atom bombs being tested in Nevada. Britain exploded nuclear bombs in Australia. Even after knowing the dangers of fallout and radiating everyone on the planet, explosions continued until 1998. Hundreds of nuclear weapons were detonated for no good reason harming the whole globe. Despite the Fukushima catastrophe that cannot be fixed, governments continue to build nuclear power stations; 60 are currently in train. Why would governments clad public buildings in combustible material? It is not just tower blocks for the poor, but also schools, colleges, military buildings, public social buildings,

---

<sup>68</sup> Current Inorganic Chemistry, Russell L Blaylock; 'Aluminium induced immunoexcitotoxicity in neurodevelopmental and neurodegenerative disorders', 2012, 000-000.

and many more have this cladding. The establishment has continually demonstrated that it is insane.

*Is there any hard evidence of this activity?* Yes. There are US Congressional documents, Presidential documents, NASA documents, military documents and patents, showing that experimentation with spraying compounds from military aircraft into the atmosphere began after 1945 and developed continually after that. Note:

The Federal Government has been involved for over 30 years in a number of aspects of weather modification, through the activities of both the Congress and the executive branch.<sup>69</sup>

*Give examples of / NGO documents proving geo-engineering.*

- Federal Council for Science and Technology, (Executive Office of the [US] President), Homer E Newell, 'A Recommended National Program in Weather Modification', Interdepartmental Committee for Atmospheric Sciences, Report No10a, November 1966.
- Council on Foreign Relations document: 'The Geoengineering Option', David G Victor, M Granger Morgan, Jay Apt, John Steinbruner & Katherine Ricke; Foreign Affairs, March/April 2009. This proposes Geo-engineering to cool the planet to combat climate change. Methods proposed include placing sulphur, aluminium oxide and other particles into the stratosphere.

See the list of following documents.

*Give a summary of the official history of Geo-engineering.*

- Late 1940s: America and the Soviet Union explored strategies for modifying the weather to gain battlefield advantages. Many of these were cloud-seeding to produce more localised rain.
- 1962: US Project Stormfury tried to make tropical hurricanes less intense through cloud-seeding.
- 1962: Military scientists considered using nuclear explosions to create a more advantageous climate.
- 1965: The first Presidential briefing to Lyndon Johnson on the dangers of climate change with the proposed remedy of geo-engineering.
- 1966: Newell's, 'A recommended national Program in Weather Modification' (see above). This explains the US weather modification programme going back to 1956.
- 1968: Pennsylvania Natural Weather Association versus Blue Ridge Weather Modification (44D. & C. 2d 749 [1968]). The court heard a report which stated that the artificial nucleants used in cloud-seeding are to varying extents poisonous. However, the court held that there was no more than a possibility of harm and did not issue an injunction!!!
- 1971: ICAS report<sup>70</sup> No. 15a proposed a programme for accelerating national progress in the modification of weather through several projects. Despite this the document admits that during a dry season, cloud seeding aggravates conditions to produce drought, and during a wet cycle, it triggers even more rain and probably floods.
- 1976: the UN convention to prohibit use of geo-engineering for warfare.

---

<sup>69</sup> Robert E Morrison, Specialist in Earth Sciences, Science Policy Research Division, Congressional Research Service; Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, Unites States Senate, May 1978, Chapter five, 'Federal Activities in weather modification'.

<sup>70</sup> Interdepartmental Committee for Atmospheric Sciences, a US presidential department.

- 1976: The (US) National Weather Modification Act. (Public Law 94-490, 13 Oct 1976.)
- 1992: United Nations Sustainable Development Conference, Rio de Janeiro, 3-14 June 1992, Agenda 21.
- 2005: Weather Modification Research and Technology Transfer Authorisation Act of 2005.
- 2009: Council on Foreign Relations document: 'The Geoengineering Option'.
- 2009: Energy & Climate Change, UK government, 'Geoengineering options for mitigating climate change', April 2009.
- 2009: The Royal Society, 'Geoengineering the climate: Science, governance and uncertainty, September 2009.
- 2009-2010: House of Commons Science and Technology Committee, 'The regulation of Geoengineering', Fifth Report of Session 2009-2010, 10 March 2010, HC 221.
- 2010: US House of Representatives, Committee on Science and Technology, 'Engineering the climate: research needs and strategies for international co-ordination', report by Bart Gordon, October 2010.
- 2012: UN Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, CBD Technical Series No. 66, 'Geoengineering in relation to the convention on biological diversity: technical and regulatory matters', September 2012.
- 2013: [US] Congressional Research Service, 'Geoengineering: governance and technology policy', Kelsi Bracmort & Richard K Lattanzio, 2 January 2013 (7-5700, R41371).

*Give official US summaries of complaints to the federal government of the problems caused by Geo-engineering. [Taken from ICAS report No. 15a (1971).]*

- It caused a five-year drought in the Northeast USA. Localised areas had an 18-year drought.
- Rainfall was reduced by 30% in the East Coast, damaging agriculture.
- Dairy framers suffered loss.
- Certain counties suffered crop production losses costing billions.
- Seeding had caused cloudbursts destroying crops, building, livestock and drowning people.
- Air pollution.
- It has caused mental retardation and insanity due to the chemicals released.
- It has poisoned living matter.
- Emphysema is three times higher in areas of heavy cloud-seeding.
- It has caused cancer.
- Forests are dying off.

*What is the reaction to this?* There are many scientists devoted to studying, documenting and pressuring governments about this matter. Many claim that terrible and possible uncontrollable damage is being done to global weather systems as a result of this insanity.

One example is Dane Wigington of Geo-Engineering Watch whose website has had over 27 million visits. This organisation has enough legal, patents, Congressional, military and Presidential documents to prove the US governments policies of geo-engineering since 1945. It has launched two court cases in Canada and America against this activity.

Insanity

The appalling nature of this activity is beyond explanation. It literally has the potential of destroying the earth by ruining the ecology of the planet. Just eliminating bees alone would kill of a third of all plant life on earth, which relies on bee pollination. Agriculture would be devastated and many people would starve.

Drinking water is threatened already and some areas have severe contamination. People are already getting sick from heavy metal toxicity and multiple diseases may be rooted in aerosol heavy metals; there is already evidence to suggest that the rise in Autism and Alzheimer's is down to chemtrails.

The global elite have already polluted our water supplies (fluoridation and industrial pollution); poisoned our food (transfats pretending to be healthy, GM food and additives, pesticides, herbicides, steroids, hormones etc.) now they are poisoning the very air that we breathe. The iniquity and insanity of this is off the scale.

## **Animal mutilation**

*What is this?* It is the global phenomenon of animal mutilation whereby livestock (and some wild animals, such as seals in Britain), in countries all over the world, are clinically and surgically operated on and then left for dead.

*In what way?* Typically soft tissues are taken as samples: tongue, face tissues down to the bone (usually the left side), eyes, ears, squares of tissue from the neck, the genitals and coring of the rectum (removing the sphincter and tract).<sup>71</sup>

*How long has this been going on?* It has been recorded by investigators since around 1960 in the US but occurrences probably existed before this time that were put down to predation.

*What is claimed to be the cause?* Government departments and media sources affirm that it is predatory behaviour.

*Is this possible?* No, not at all. The damage to the animal is clinical and carefully performed by experts. In fact, veterinary surgeons that have examined the carcasses have said that some of the work performed would be difficult to do even in a surgery, let alone in fields in the dark. Not even the largest British predators could kill a cow and then perform careful surgery on it.

*What else?* Some claim that it is the action of poachers – but there is no evidence of shot in the animals and the fleshly parts (meat) are not taken but left behind.

The Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (MAFF) refuse to comment and in some cases have confiscated evidence.

*What do alternative media commentators think is the cause?* Aliens.

*Why?* Strange lights in the sky are observed around the time of the killings. Flying objects are also observed. The precision work requires profound skills and specialised equipment. Odd markings on the ground are observed in some cases. Also there is evidence of a cover up going to the very top of national power. Police investigating the deaths have been warned off and threatened by senior civil servants.

---

<sup>71</sup> For information see the video at Rich Planet (Richard Hall) on 'Animal mutilation'.

*Do you accept that aliens are the cause?* No, not at all.

*Why?* I have explained in other papers that there are no extraterrestrial aliens. The only sentient, moral life in the universe is mankind on earth to serve the purpose of the God who created the whole universe. The Genesis creation narrative gives no evidence of any other sentient life and this would ruin the decree of God in creating life and giving salvation to mankind only. Other sentient life forms (angels) are immaterial and have no physical body. Aliens are a useful cover story.

*What could be the cause of this?* Clearly the animal parts that are taken are samples to test the effects of toxins as a result of food and environmental effects on the animal. That much is certain. It is possible that high-level forensic teams are testing animals all around the world to test the effects of Geo-engineering. Geo-engineering follows a similar time-frame and it is logical that tests would be required.

Insanity

This is further evidence of a global, very high-level, cover up regarding a certain plan; the details of which can only be speculated.

## Fracking

*What is fracking?* It is a shorthand term for ‘Hydraulic Fracturing’. This is a means of releasing natural gas (mostly methane) through digging wells and injecting pressurised liquids (water, sand and thickening agents) to create cracks in rock formations (usually shale).

*Is this economically sound?* No it is not. It is only continued due to government subsidies. In the US the gas produced does not equal the amount of capital expenditure of production.

*Is it safe?* No it is not. The environmental risks are enormous: ground and surface water contamination, air and noise pollution and even triggering earthquakes. No sane person would even consider doing this. For these reasons it is banned in some countries (e.g. France and Germany) and some counties / states (e.g. New York State).

*Have any of these things actually occurred?* Yes they have. A trial fracking enterprise near Blackpool in 2010 caused minor earthquakes. In North Dakota 2.9 million gallons of water spilled from a broken pipeline that polluted surface and groundwater. In Bainbridge, Ohio natural gas polluted water aquifers. Since 2006 in the US 18m gallons of oil and toxic wastewater have been spilled up to October 2014.<sup>72</sup>

*Is it being performed in Britain?* Yes it is.

*Have people been affected by it?* Yes they have. In America people have become sick and complainants that made a fuss were given a lifelong gagging order. In Barnhart, Texas the town ran out of water.<sup>73</sup> A UK government report showed that house prices would fall and insurance prices would rise near shale wells.<sup>74</sup>

*But isn't it regulated.* Yes but the regulator fails, as proved in America. In the trial enterprise in Britain the firm Cuadrilla failed to report a deformed well in Lancashire for

---

<sup>72</sup> New York Times investigation, ‘The Downside of the Boom’ Deborah Sontag and Robert Gebeloff.

<sup>73</sup> The Guardian, Adam Vaughan; ‘Why is fracking bad’, 19 August 2015.

<sup>74</sup> The Guardian, Adam Vaughan and Rowena Mason, ‘Fracking could hurt house prices’, 1 July 2015.

six months. This company also breached planning permissions. A critical official Environmental Department report was held back by the government under David Cameron.

### Insanity

Any project that has so many environmental risks, particularly the risk to drinking water supplies in an age where water is the most important global commodity, is insane.

The history of this industry is a disgrace. It shows government support and subsidy of a flawed, unproven product, that has not been economically viable and which has damaged the environment, animals and people.

## Britain's parks and gardens

*Explain the background?* Britain has been known as a nation of gardeners and some of the greatest gardeners have been British. With this strong tradition, the development of Britain's urban spaces has been straddled with parks, gardens, open spaces, recreational grounds and wild areas. These have been vital to the life and health of society and have inspired poetry, music, novels and even social movements. The benefits we have today are the result of decades of careful planning and maintenance. Victorian campaigners fought hard for the green spaces we now take for granted.<sup>75</sup>

*Do they have any real value?* Yes they do. They contribute to the physical health of the nation as spaces where people can relax and exercise. Poor people that cannot afford vacations use local parks as places of recreation. Parks are essential for children to develop skills, understanding of wildlife and to have safe areas to play in. The benefit the mental health of locals from parks is the opposite of the appalling claustrophobic tower block campuses, which are known to cause depression. Parks act as lungs in cities; tree-filled parks clean out the carbon dioxide and fill the air with oxygen. They are things of beauty and grace which aid our sense of aesthetics. They help biodiversity. They even lower city temperatures in the summer.

As more people struggle to own a house with a garden, parks are essential. 57% of the population visit a park at least once a month.

*Are they cost effective?* Absolutely. In comparative terms they cost little for the benefits that accrue long term. The hard work was done by previous generations who planted trees, designed the areas, moved the earth, dug out lakes and so on. To fail to maintain this huge effort would be a disgrace.

According to a study by the city council of Edinburgh they return £12 in social, environmental and economic benefits for every £1 invested.

*What is the actual cost?* Total local expenditure for England Scotland and Wales is £1.2bn pa. (0.15% of total public expenditure).

*What is the problem?* Tory austerity measures have put such pressure on councils that they have cut budgets for parks more than anything else. Even worse, pressure for housing has meant that some green spaces are being invaded by developers.

---

<sup>75</sup> I am indebted for some facts here from The Observer, Rowan Moore; 'The end of parklife as we know it', 9 July 2017.

Maintenance budgets have been halved in many areas or even worse. Some councils are reducing their budgets to zero (e.g. Bristol). Others have cut the budget by 90% (e.g. Newcastle). Liverpool is considering selling its parks off. The result is that parks become shabby, badly maintained and even dangerous. The maintenance that is done is bad due to ridiculous cheap contracts, which damage the horticulture. Herbicides are introduced to save costs. Toilets and cafes are closed and replaced by mobile units.

When parks get run down, antisocial behaviour creeps in and a cycle of destruction begins. As this happens, families abandon them, as they become dangerous. The House of Commons communities committee said that our parks were at a tipping point and that the consequences of ignoring the problem were severe for communities.

There is no longer a minister with responsibility for parks, this job was axed in June 2017. So much for Theresa May's concern for poor families. After questions were raised, Marcus Jones MP was said to be the new parks minister (actually he is the minister for local government) but it is not one of the ten responsibilities listed in his official website. When questioned he shrugged off the issue as a local council problem. However, councils have no money for this on top of their statutory duties.

*What about development?* Some councils are raiding parks in order to raise cash for other projects. Bexley borough is developing some of its open spaces. Stockport is building 70 homes on a country park. Others allow development of amusements and sports facilities (like zip-wires), which ruin the local ecology, cause trash and create local traffic jams.

*What about children's playgrounds?* These are usually found in a corner of a park in order to provide benefit and exercise for very young children. Reports show that 214 of these are currently threatened with closure.<sup>76</sup> Government cuts to council budgets mean that they can no longer be safely maintained. 112 playgrounds were closed in 2014-15 and 102 in 2015-16. This is a national disgrace. A mere £100m is required to reverse these trends when the government is spending many billions on HS2.

*What benefits are there?* Multiple benefits. Today childhood obesity is becoming one of the most alarming health trends in society. Closing playgrounds at this time is the worst possible thing to do. Playgrounds provide social communities for both children and mothers. They get children out of the house and into fresh air. They provide for strenuous exercise of all sorts. Even the government has stated that it intends to get children to be more active. This is insane.

### Insanity

Tory governments get fixated by fiscal matters and ignore everything else. As a result they fail to realise that a small investment in a certain area actually works out cheaper in the long run.

Parks, gardens, playgrounds and recreation grounds are part of such issues. When these are run down there are multiple problems that all cost the government money. Such as:

- Ignoring the value of helping to avoid kids becoming obese leads to great costs when they need health treatment in their teenage years as obese children.
- When parks get run down they become centres for antisocial behaviour. This leads to increased police call outs and local disgruntlement.

---

<sup>76</sup> The Guardian, Richard Adams; 'Hundreds children's playgrounds in England to close due to cuts', 13 April 2017.

- When very run down, parks become havens for criminal activity and especially a place for illicit drug use, violence and rapes. All of this has on-costs. It also leads to the degrading of property prices as locals move away from centres of criminal behaviour.
- Run down parks add to the impression that society is in freefall. Run down areas do not attract inward investment.

The cost of maintaining green spaces is very small compared to the big picture but has massive benefits that far outweigh even this cost. It is insane to ignore the value of parks and to enable them to collapse.

## Drugs and governments

*What is wrong with government policies on drugs?* Just about everything.

*Explain.* The UK government's drug policies are a shambles and completely ineffective. Drugs are authorised for treatment by doctors which are dangerous and harmful while drugs that are natural and beneficial are outlawed. Policies to tackle illicit drug abuse are a joke.

*Why are laws regarding drug abuse flawed?* If you examine the history and scope of strategies to tackle drug abuse you will find that there is not a genuine desire to end the drug abuse problem. All the policies are a smokescreen.

*Why is this?* It is because both America and Britain make huge amounts of money from the illicit drug trade and have done so for over a hundred years going back to the Opium Wars where Britain paid China for goods like silk with opium from India, getting millions of Chinese people addicted (the proverbial opium den). The CIA and British secret services are agents for the facilitation of the illicit drug trade and use the billions made from this trade to finance operations without getting parliamentary scrutiny (so-called 'Black Ops').

*Surely this can't be true?* Sadly it is true and any serious research on the subject shows that this is proven in multiple ways and accepted even by scholars. For example, it explains why America went to war with Afghanistan after the Taliban burned all the poppy fields and the heroin production evaporated. After the CIA dominated invasion the heroin production began again. It partly explains why America is still present (there are also geo-political and oil pipeline reasons). The US puppet president's brother, Ahmed Wali Karzai, was on the payroll of the CIA and was also involved in opium trafficking. The CIA was trafficking opium during the secret war in Laos from 1961 to 1975. The CIA's front company ('Air America') transported opium and heroin (see the movie 'Air America'). A US Senate committee in 1986 found that the CIA was involved in drug trafficking from Central and South America and the Caribbean to the US ('the Kerry Committee Report') in order to support the Contras in Nicaragua. We could go on and on and on.

*Surely drug bans prove that the authorities are serious about drug crime?* All of this is a smokescreen. Just consider this: smoking tobacco and nicotine is exceptionally dangerous and has killed far more people than class A drugs. No sane government would allow such stuff to be on sale at all if it cared about the health of its people. Cannabis is a drug for sure and smoking it habitually is harmful, but probably less dangerous than tobacco/nicotine. However, it is also a medicinal plant and was used medicinally in Britain in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, even by Queen Victoria. It has multiple beneficial uses, being very good at relieving the symptoms of MS and it also has cancer-curing properties. Yet this drug is banned and anyone growing it is put in prison. Why is this? It is because corporations can make billions from the sale of cigarettes, which require an industry to produce, but

Cannabis (Aka Marijuana) is a weed that grows easily in the right conditions and the elite cannot make money from it if allowed for use. Also, its cancer-curing properties would threaten the pharmaceutical companies who make billions from chemotherapy.

*Give an example of Cannabis curing someone.* A young boy named Landon Riddle was diagnosed with Leukaemia in 2012 aged only two. Having been given chemotherapy and little chance to live, he suffered terribly under this harsh treatment. Eventually, given two weeks to live, his mother relocated to Colorado where treatment with Cannabis oil was legal. Within two days Landon showed signs of improving. The authorities threatened to take custody of Landon if his mother refused to give him three years of chemotherapy (long story here). However he is now in remission thanks to Cannabis oil, having used it for five years (he is now seven). He was cured at the age of three.

Stories like this where naturopath treatments cure terminal cancers can be found in many places. Perhaps the commonest treatment is intense doses of vitamin C. Someone in my own family saw two 'incurable' brain tumours disappear, after 20 years of suffering, once intense doses of vitamin C were taken for three months. Vitamin C is especially beneficial in curing breast cancer. There are several natural sources of anti-cancer cures which are all banned by governments while chemotherapy, which is essentially poison, is utilised even though it only has a less than 30% success rate. Many people have been failed by chemotherapy and told they have weeks to live only for them to be cured completely by a natural element, such as B6, Vitamin D, Essiac, IAA<sup>77</sup> and other treatments.

*What you are saying is that western governments collude with criminal drug traffickers in order to profit from drug abuse? Correct.*

*This is just too horrific to believe.* But it is true. It is widely documented, even in US congressional records. There are multiple movies that describe the collusion between the CIA and Colombian drug cartels for example. The film 'Kill the Messenger' explains how the CIA colluded with drug cartels selling cocaine to kids in Los Angeles and San Francisco in order to fund a Latin American guerrilla army. It transported tons of cocaine by airplane to enable the cartels that had no such transport. The initiation of the crack cocaine problems, centred in LA gangs, was promoted by the CIA. Thus the CIA ruined the lives of kids and entire neighbourhoods, and provoked the rise in drug-associated crime rates, in order to give guns to an illegal army to kill civilians. In what world could this not be iniquitous? The award-winning journalist, Gary Webb, who exposed this in the late 1990s was discredited by the elite-owned mainstream media and then mysteriously killed himself. Meanwhile the local law-enforcement teams were supposedly fighting the drug dealers in collusion with the CIA.

*Why would governments encourage drug abuse on their own citizens?* Because it serves multiple purposes and makes the deep state tons of money. For example, in the 1960s the Beatnik/CND protesting generation and the subsequent Hippie flower power movement meant that teenage power was becoming absolutely huge and threatened ending the illegal Vietnam War, which was of huge profit to Lyndon Johnson and other elite figures, not least, the military corporations. As the Hippies were becoming more political (note the Berkley student killings and the Yippies) they became an even bigger threat to the establishment. The CIA came up with a plan to focus Hippies on hallucinogenic drugs to distract them and make them passive. Thus Lysergic Acid (LSD) was promoted through shills like Timothy Leary. It worked. Hippies gradually ceased being revolutionary, intent on changing society, and became self-obsessed in LSD oblivion. Also, large numbers of

---

<sup>77</sup> Intravenous ascorbic acid (vitamin C).

people were forever damaged by LSD trips.<sup>78</sup> The CIA plan was a huge success and this led to further drug developments to foist on young people to divert them from becoming political activists: cocaine, crack-cocaine, heroin, ecstasy etc. Today the target group is largely the young Black and Hispanic US populations. When kids take powerful drugs they are unable to engage in political movements, or do very much at all. Note the few protest movements today compared with the 1960s.

*But local police are constantly attacking drug dens and traffickers are they not?* There are enough well publicised drug arrests to make it look like there is a war on drugs but this is superficial. There are no joined up local systems to actually deal with drug abuse, drug crime, rehabilitation programmes, drug prevention schemes and other matters.

*Give an example?* I was once in a police-community liaison group dealing with local crime in a large south coast city where drug crime is through the roof. In fact, due to the terrible disorganisation of this meeting I took the lead, chaired the meeting and demanded someone took minutes – none of this was even organised. Present were members of the police force, who seemed utterly bored and disinterested, council officers, council staff, social workers and local residents. There were no strategies in place, no education programmes for schools, no preventative strategies, no emergency plans – in fact, it was a mere talking shop to tick a government box. I was appalled. We heard from one social worker how a drug addict was desperate to get off drugs. He went to the police who turned him away as a nuisance. He went to the council and the hospital who also turned him away. He went everywhere he could and received no help from any authority. In final desperation, he stole a car and drove it through a large shop window in the high street and waited to get arrested because he knew he would then get help. All this collateral damage (to the car owner, to the shop where windows are not insured and this would cost over £1,000, to the community where insurance costs go up for every reported crime etc.) because one drug addict could get no governmental assistance to get off drugs. There is no proper plan.

*So, the illicit drug scene is completely controlled by the deep state to profit the elite and further elite plans for the domination of society.* Correct. The US and UK government, through their secret services, are directly involved in international drug trafficking and are culpable for the damage illicit drugs do to society.

## **America, Britain and NATO allies killing millions of people**

*What on earth do you mean; we are the good guys are we not?* Sadly you are mistaken, we are the very bad guys. America and its allies have illegally intervened in over 100 countries in the last hundred years to bring about regime change and war. Millions have died as a result.

*Give some examples.* Since 1890 the US has been involved in military interventions in the following countries: Argentine 1890, Chile 1891, Haiti 1891, Hawaii 1893 (which it annexed), Nicaragua 1894, China 1894-5, Korea 1894-6, Panama 1895, Nicaragua 1896, China 1898-1900, Philippines 1898-1910, Cuba 1898-1902, Puerto Rico 1898, Guam 1898, Nicaragua 1898, Samoa 1899, Nicaragua 1899, Panama 1901-14, Honduras 1903, Dominican Rep. 1903-4, Korea 1904-5, Cuba 1906-9, Nicaragua 1907, Honduras 1907, Panama 1908, Honduras 1911, China 1911-41, Cuba 1912, Panama 1912, Nicaragua 1912-33, Mexico 1913, Dominican Rep. 1914, Mexico 1914-18, Haiti 1914-34, Dominican Rep, 1916-

---

<sup>78</sup> The tragic demise of Blues guitarist Peter Green is a classic case of one 'acid' trip ruining a person's entire life.

24, Cuba 1917-33, Russia 1918-22, Yugoslavia 1919, Honduras 1919, Guatemala 1920, Turkey 1922, China 1922-27, Honduras 1924-25, Panama 1925, China 1927-34, El Salvador 1932, Iran 1946, Yugoslavia 1946, Uruguay 1947, Greece 1947-49, China 1948-9, Germany 1948, Philippines 1948-54, Puerto Rico 1950, Korea 1950-53, Iran 1953, Vietnam 1954, Guatemala 1954, Egypt 1956, Lebanon 1958, Iraq 1958, China 1958, Panama 1958, Vietnam 1960-75, Cuba 1961, Germany 1961, Cuba 1962, Laos 1962, Panama 1964m Indonesia 1965, Dominican Rep. 1965-66, Guatemala 1966-7, Cambodia 1969-75, Oman 1970, Laos 1971-73, Chile 1973, Cambodia 1975, Angola 1976-92, Iran 1980, Libya 1981, El Salvador 1981-92, Nicaragua 1981-90, Lebanon 1982-84, Honduras 1983-89, Grenada 1983-84, Iran 1984, Libya 1986, Bolivia 1986, Iran 1987-88, Libya 1989, Virgin Islands 1989, Philippines 1989, Panama 1989-90, Liberia 1990, Saudi Arabia 1990-1, Iraq 1990 ff, Kuwait 1991, Somalia 1992-4, Yugoslavia 1992-4, Bosnia 1993-5, Haiti 1994-6, Croatia 1995, Zaire (Congo) 1996-7 Liberia 1997, Albania 1997, Sudan 1998, Afghanistan 1998, Iraq, Yugoslavia 1999 ff, Yemen 2000, Macedonia 2001. I presume readers are familiar with events after 9/11.

In these cases democracies have been overthrown and puppet leaders installed (e.g. the Shah of Iran), leaders assassinated, coups supported by the CIA (in Indonesia alone this resulted in a million deaths), insurgents trained and supplied by the CIA, sovereign nations threatened, naval blockades, terrorist actions sponsored, bombing sprees (in Cambodia this resulted in 2 million dead) pre-emptive illegal wars conducted, minor military actions engaged in etc.

*How could such a thing be covered up?* By complete control of the mainstream media; by politicians constantly telling lies; by news reports covering up massacres or omitting any mention of war crimes.

*But war crimes and genocidal strategies cannot go unnoticed in today's world?* Tell that to the Yemenis who are being slaughtered by British and American guided missiles and cluster bombs dropped by an ally (Saudi Arabia) which is intent on destroying a developing Shi'ite population next door. There are daily war crimes, deaths, slaughter of entire families and nothing makes the news and no one cares.

Tell that to the parents of dead children in Somalia which America is currently bombing with drones (most Americans do not even know that this is happening). Tell that to the families of hundreds of dead civilians which America has killed with drone strikes in Pakistan.

*There's always collateral damage in any military conflict but you are exaggerating the number.* No I am not. In the Iraq War alone there were over one million civilian casualties confirmed by independent sources. Statistics admitted in western media were much lower and were lies. Even the *Lancet* medical journal did a detailed study on the ground and showed that the NATO press figures were woefully short of the truth. Not only did the US conduct an illegal war, it used illegal weapons such as depleted uranium shells. Though denied at the time, investigators later found hard evidence of this on the ground.

Before this illegal war took place, a war we should not have been involved in at all, NATO had already killed thousands of Iraqis as a result of sanctions on the country and airstrikes. There are records of NATO airstrikes killing shepherds in open country. Many children died under the sanctions where medicine could have saved them if Iraq had any. Add the sanctions victims to the war victims and the casualties are well over 1.5 million, and this is just one country in recent years without even including the Gulf War.

*Surely this is not going on now?* Yes it is. The dead victims of NATO airstrikes in Iraq, especially on Mosul, are already in the many thousands over the last two years and there are fresh victims every day. I have outlined elsewhere how RAF bombers have killed hundreds of innocent people in one strike alone. This has happened multiple times.

Even the US Dept. of Defence admits 4,424 total deaths in Operation Iraqi Freedom. Independent sources document 197,591 civilian deaths from violence.<sup>79</sup> The insanity of US policy is, for example, an airstrike using a 500-pound bomb, on 17 March 2017, targeting two supposed ISIS fighters on a roof which killed 200 civilians and is documented by Human Rights Watch.

The western coalition has killed many hundreds, if not thousands, in Syria by direct airstrikes. As in Mosul, many of these are Christians. America not only bombs civilians, it also uses illegal chemical weapons. US forces have used internationally-banned weaponised white phosphorus against civilians in Mosul and Raqqa. When this phosphorous hits civilians it ignites the flesh, burning it to the bone. The gases released suffocate and burn from the inside out. While Trump bewails a false Syrian chemical attack on Khan Sheikhoun (which military intelligence and soldiers on the ground knew did not happen),<sup>80</sup> the US is constantly killing Iraqi and Syrian children with phosphorus and other weapons. These include MGM-140B rockets which detonate in mid-air and scatter 274 anti-personnel grenades, each of which kill anyone within a 15 metre radius.<sup>81</sup>

The US/UK resourcing and support of terrorist jihadis in Syria have also killed many thousands and this is the responsibility of the west which created these terrorists, trained and supplied them. Estimated total deaths in the current Syrian conflict are about 470,000 between March 2011 and February 2016.<sup>82</sup>

*What about other examples before this?* Vietnam was another illegal war that the west had no business in. America even took this war into adjacent nations (e.g. Laos) completely illegally. America murdered 2 million Cambodian peasants with bombs dropped illegally and secretly, thus paving the way for the regime of Pol Pot. Many hundreds of thousands of civilians were killed in Vietnam and Laos. Accurate statistics were never compiled but the estimates run as high as: North Vietnamese civilian deaths, 1,489,000; Laotian civilian deaths, 115,000. There were 282,000 allied deaths. This war was mainly conducted for military-industrial profit and was a no-win situation for America.<sup>83</sup> Indeed, it not only lost but was humiliated.

*What other actions have resulted in deaths of civilians?* The list is very long. CIA planned and sponsored coups and uprisings (of which there have been many) have led to thousands of civilians dying, whether this is in Ukraine, Libya, Nicaragua, Argentina, Panama, Honduras, Haiti, Dominican Republic, Indonesia, the Philippines, Syria, Iran, Guatemala etc. Added together the deaths from US interference runs into many millions.

*What else is involved?* America is the only nation that has dropped two atom bombs on civilian populations when it was completely unnecessary to do so (a treaty with Japan was

---

<sup>79</sup> IraqBodyCount.org

<sup>80</sup> Award-winning journalist Seymour Hersh has exposed the actual intelligence reports showing that the Pentagon knew Assad had not used chemical weapons before Trump fired the Tomahawks.

<sup>81</sup> World Socialist Web Site, Bill Van Auken; 'Washington's war crimes in Syria', 15 June 2017. Multiple sources have exposed this on independent media including uploaded photos of victims.

<sup>82</sup> Syrian Centre for Policy Research. The UN and Arab League envoy to Syria has a similar figure.

<sup>83</sup> President Lyndon B Johnson personally made millions from this.

in train). Hundreds of thousands died instantly while hundreds of thousands more died slowly.<sup>84</sup> No nation that could do this can be considered sane or humane.

We could also consider the two world wars that were both completely unnecessary and both set up by western elite interests for globalist plans. Many millions died in these.<sup>85</sup>

### Insanity

While the US-elite dominated media attacks various nations for imaginary threats (such as Iran or Russia), the sheer facts of history show that it is America, with close support from Britain and NATO nations, that have continually devastated independent sovereign nations as part of a global plan to establish a world hegemony.

In the process of this destabilisation, regime-changes and coups the American dominated west has killed millions of innocent people. There will be a reckoning on the Day of Judgment.

## Nuggets of insanity

### Peace prize for warmongers

Barack Obama was the most warmongering of all US presidents, being at war throughout his entire presidency.<sup>86</sup> Yet Obama is the fourth president<sup>87</sup> to have been awarded a Nobel Peace Prize.

### Depravity unleashed

Germany has become the first nation to have bestiality brothels, or 'Erotic Zoos'. Animals such as dogs, goats, sheep and llamas are muzzled and bound and then raped by iniquitous lunatics on payment of a fee. Although animal pornography is illegal in Germany, sex with animals has been legal since 1969. The animal brothels are stated to be a 'lifestyle choice'.<sup>88</sup> Farmers are also finding that livestock are being raped at night.

## Other Issues

There is so much insanity in this world today that we cannot delve into all the relevant issues, indeed, I have already written papers on several of these. Such as:

### Genetically Modified crops and food

The key issue here is the Glyphosate that is present in this food which has now been found present in the tissues of over 90% of American citizens. Glyphosate is a highly toxic chemical that is known to cause a number of virulent diseases, including cancer.

### Agricultural pollution

This is now off the scale. We have learned nothing since Rachel Carson's book 'Silent Spring'. The use of herbicides, pesticides and fertilisers is now endemic. These transfer

---

<sup>84</sup> Within two months the atom bombs had killed 146,000 civilians in Hiroshima and 80,000 in Nagasaki. About half of those figures died on the day of the bombing.

<sup>85</sup> This is a huge subject that cannot be detailed here. Figures vary but about over 80 million died in WW2, with civilians being 55 million. Over 38 million died in WW1 including about 7 million civilians.

<sup>86</sup> Obama launched airstrikes in at least seven countries: Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, Libya, Yemen, Somalia and Pakistan. The boots on the ground war in Afghanistan continued throughout his presidencies despite campaigning to end it.

<sup>87</sup> The others are: Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, and Jimmy Carter. Only Carter was not involved in a major war that killed millions.

<sup>88</sup> Mail Online, Matt Blake; 'Bestiality brothels are spreading through Germany', 1 July 2013.

toxic chemicals to food products that consumers think are healthy. For example, apples store large amounts of the pesticides sprayed on them; washing them will not remove the internal toxins.

Fertilisers and pesticides travel beyond fields into neighbouring homes and cause multiple types of diseases and neurological conditions. Often, waste and fertilisers have found their way into the water table, poisoning drinking water.

Intensive farming methods means that no one today uses the traditional fallow field crop rotation system, and complementary planting, which avoid the use of fertilisers.

### **Big Pharma**

The allopathic medical system only began in 1901 by John Rockefeller whereby all forms of traditional and naturopathic medical systems were scandalised and gradually made illegal, being stigmatised as 'quackery'. In fact the aim of Rockefeller was to make money for utilising by-products of the oil industry to maximise profits. Synthetic chemicals would thus be the prime means of addressing sickness from this point.

While some drugs are beneficial to sick people, very many are not and a large number have caused damage and death. The biggest fines in the world have been imposed on pharmaceutical companies to the tune of billions.

Sadly, the medical profession (trained by allopathic teachers) sees drugs as the first line of prescription, even when it is not the best remedy. Thus for back pain drugs like Tramadol are prescribed and opiates which cease to be effective after three months. Yet such patients have been completely relieved of pain entirely after seeing a chiropractor or osteopath without using any drugs at all.

Vaccinations are a huge cause for concern but such a large subject cannot be discussed here. It cannot be right that the average American kid has had over 90 vaccinations by the time they are 20. Injecting harmful substances, like Mercury (thimerosal) or pig faeces, into people cannot be a good thing, but these have been common in vaccines. Side-effects such as fatality or paralysis have been far more common than you would think, but these are covered up. Many vaccines (such as flu vaccines) do hardly any good whatsoever, but regularly cause harm (even death), and yet are avidly pushed by the NHS. In some cases vaccines are directly linked to serious diseases, such as Ebola in Sierra Leone. It is now proven that the MMR vaccine is linked to Autism, but this is also covered up. The list of doctors that are now saying that the vaccination programmes are a means of controlling the population and do harm is growing.

### **Fluoridation of water supplies**

This is forcibly medicating people without their consent. Worse still the chemicals put in the water are not medicinal but are the product of the aluminium smelting process and are highly toxic, causing brain damage, bone damage and other effects; neither do they stop tooth decay.

### **Food additives and processing**

Most people are blissfully ignorant about what is contained in the processed food that they eat. This is made to make a big profit for corporations even if it slowly kills the consumer. This is a huge subject that cannot be detailed here. For example, supposedly healthy foods contain massive amounts of transfats and sugar (usually High Fructose Corn Syrup) which cause cancer and heart disease. Meanwhile, healthy foods (such as butter, eggs, healthy saturated fat, and unprocessed milk) are demonised.

### **The lie of dietary cholesterol**

A massive industry has grown up based on the lie that dietary cholesterol causes heart disease; both in terms of food products and statins. This has now been categorically proven to be false. In fact, the reverse is true. 75% of Americans, two years ago, that died of heart disease had low or even very low cholesterol rates.

The rise of cholesterol in the bloodstream is a reaction to another problem, usually inflammation of some sort caused by bad diet (processed food and high carbohydrates) or disease. The scandal was a shooting of the messenger.

In fact your brain is made up of water, saturated fat and cholesterol.

Statins are terrible drugs that are useless to control heart disease for 99.9% of people. Instead they cause massive debility, liver disease, kidney disease, muscle wastage, neurological damage and a host of other problems. But they make over \$12.5 billion for elite corporations.

All the foods that are supposed to be healthy by lowering cholesterol are bad for you in various ways. The ones that claim to be fat free (e.g. 'health' bars) replace natural fat with sugar, which is far worse for you. The products that claim to remove saturated fat from spreads replace it with hydrogenated processes and trans fats, which are far worse for you.

### **Microwave ovens**

In short, these are lethal. The radiation cooks food from the inside by vibrating the molecules. However, this process changes the composition of food. Healthy food put into a microwave oven becomes unhealthy and dangerous. For example, the process turns proteins into prions, which are free radicals that cause internal harm and can cause cancer. This change is noticeable in that microwaved food does not taste as good as traditionally cooked food.

### **Gender deviation**

This is an attack on the traditional concepts of male and female with a view to destabilising and confusing society to make it more docile and governable. Young children are growing up completely confused about their gender as a result of the constant programming about gender choices and misandry.

### **University expansion and tuition fees**

The expansion of universities has been huge since the 1960s, both in terms of numbers and accommodation. Birmingham university used to be restricted to the actual campus site in Selly Oak but now owns huge numbers of properties around south Birmingham, including countryside sites and most of the old stately homes along the Bristol Road between Selly Oak and Northfield, as well as some mansions and land in Edgbaston. It is a huge enterprise.

This rapid expansion has seen the proliferation of subjects that are more and more vacuous and of no use to employers. The recent addition of a professor of 'play' at Oxford is just one example. There has never been a time when so many kids with degrees are working zero-hours contracts or stacking shelves. The idea that a degree automatically gains you a prestigious job is a thing of the past. In fact outside of educational staff jobs, science, engineering and medicine, most enterprises don't want people with degrees but want people who are effective, honest, resourceful and quick to learn. On many occasions interviewees with no degree successfully got a job in competition with graduates who failed. Vocational training and qualifications now count for far more with employers. Far

too many university graduates have proven to employers that they can't write letters, can't add up, cannot conduct a proper telephone conversation and have poor English skills. It is time to diminish universities and increase vocational and apprenticeship training.

However, the monolith of the university drags on demanding more and more money, which is why the government introduced tuition fees. However, this is now proving of immense damage to graduates. The poorest kids, who get the biggest loans, are leaving university with a debt of £57,000, with interest rates going up this September to 6%. Often kids have accrued interest while at university of £5,000 on top of the fees. If successful (many are not) they pay an extra 9% income tax on earnings above £21,000pa.

This is at a time when they are already struggling due to getting married, having kids and trying to buy a house. There are already reports of graduates suffering from extreme mental health problems as a result of the debt hanging over them, a debt the government ministers responsible for (who are mostly millionaires) did not have because they got free education.

The tuition fees are a scandal because they are more expensive than the previous system. Paying up-front (in the past by the government) meant that there was one initial capital cost. The present fee system is payment in arrears that accrues 6% interest (one has to ask why the government set this at 6% when the bank rate is less than 1%). This arrears system means that the cost of education is considerably more than an up-front system.

The widespread additional cost is due to far more teenagers going to university than in previous decades. This figure is now approaching 40% (depending on your source data). As already explained, this is far too high and results in a weak, low-grade education but for many more people.

Another issue is the maintenance grant system, which is also paid back and is set far too low so that students cannot effectively live on it and are forced to get jobs on top of their studies.

This treadmill of insanity needs to stop. School leavers need to be encouraged into in-work training programmes, apprenticeships and vocational courses. Universities need to be scaled down and all the nonsense subjects will die of starvation over time. Universities then need to give a proper education concentrating on core subjects, (which includes art subjects). If fiscally possible, tuition fees need to be abolished.<sup>89</sup>

### **Relentless persecution of Christianity**

In the west this is a subtle but continual process. Every perversion is now becoming legally and socially acceptable but Christians are constantly vilified. The gods of non-Christian religions are treated with respect, and even fear, while the name of Christ is blasphemed constantly every day without any retribution from Christians. Anti-discrimination and hate laws are used to stop Christians preaching the Gospel or expressing their faith in their profession.

All of this is despite the simple fact that it was Post-Reformation Christianity that enabled Europe and America to prosper. All of the vital factors of modern western civilisation were

---

<sup>89</sup> The argument that working people are subsidising graduates who get paid more later in life is fallacious; this is a national investment in future infrastructure. If universities are scaled down to what they used to be – producing our scientists, teachers, doctors, engineers, architects and so on, then all society benefits from these skills, which is worth subsidising.

developed by Christians<sup>90</sup> and set the west apart from the primitive degeneration that characterised the rest of the world until Christianity had an effect there also.<sup>91</sup>

## Conclusion

The more I study what is going on in the world today, I have to come to the conclusion that leaders of government are either completely stupid or they are culpable in deliberate criminal and inhumane policies; on balance it is the latter. Over and over again we see strategies and actions that are completely opposed to the safety and security of national populations, let alone the world. It is hard not to come to the conclusion that the leaders of the world are driven by satanically inspired projects.

We see government actions to deforest land to allow Big Agro to come in and cultivate huge areas of farmland, only for a monsoon to be delayed and terrible drought appears that causes ruin and devastation to peasant farmers. With the removal of trees and forests the land is unable to cope with drought and turns to dust. Farmers that were forced to use Genetically Modified grain, only to find reduced harvests and dead livestock, have committed suicide in the hundreds of thousands. For a period an Indian farmer was killing himself every 30 seconds.

We see large swathes of the Amazon rainforest being cut down and hardwood trees felled to produce pellets for combustion in European power stations (including Britain) instead of using the coal that is plentiful underground locally due to Green political pressure.

We see the US trying to initiate world war in multiple ways that is utterly insane. How can the US justify having military bases in Syria to protect ISIS and other al-Qaeda terrorists (which was not invited by the sovereign government) and threatening Russia in Syria (which was invited there and which is killing terrorists).

We could go on and on and on; the policies of national leaders, following the globalist elite directions, are plainly insane.

Scripture quotations are from The New King James Version  
© Thomas Nelson 1982

**Paul Fahy Copyright © 2017**  
**Understanding Ministries**  
<http://www.understanding-ministries.com>

<sup>90</sup> For example, it was Christians that developed Europe's hospitals, orphanages, schools, universities, hospices, prison reforms, social reforms, child work reforms, ending the slave trade etc. Most of the early pioneer scientists, discoverers and inventors were either Biblical Christians or god-fearing men. England's greatest monarchs and leaders were devoted Christians (Alfred the Great, Edward the Confessor, Edward VI, Cromwell, William III, Victoria) or nominally Christian (Elizabeth I, Elizabeth II, Henry V, George V).

<sup>91</sup> Such as: cannibal tribes that became civilised after hearing the Gospel from Christian missionaries; warring tribes that became peaceful after the influence of missionaries like Mary Slessor in Calabar (Nigeria); the ending of Suttee in India; the development of improved nation states out of primitive African tribes that had engaged in inter-tribal warfare for centuries keeping them poor. Older Indian people look back to the time of British occupation as a golden age in comparison with today's venal politicians. The infrastructure built by the British is still in operation (railway lines, bridges, cuttings, steam engines, roads, reservoirs, beam engines etc.).