

RUNNYMEDE GAZETTE

A Journal of the Democratic Resistance

JUNE 2014

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL

PLUS ÇA CHANGE, PLUS C'EST LA MÊME CHOSE

THE PRESENCE OF OUR ANCESTORS

Robin Smith

THE FUTURIST MANIFESTO

F. T. Marinetti, 1909

THE RIGHT OF JURORS TO JUDGE ON THE JUSTICE OF LAW

Kenn D'Oudney; Democracy Defined

**BILDERBERG AGENDA REVEALED: ELITE DESPERATE TO RESCUE
UNIPOLAR WORLD**

Paul Joseph Watson; The Seeker; via Critical Thinking

THE SOLUTION TO EVERYTHING: SLAVERY TO THE STATE

Jon Rappoport; Activist Post

MORE POWERS TRANSFERRED 2014

Dave Barnby

**CRACKING THE "CONSPIRACY THEORIES" PSYCHOLINGUISTIC CODE:
THE WITCH HUNT AGAINST INDEPENDENT RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS**

James F. Tracy; Global Research,

ARE YOU TALKING TO A PROVOCATEUR?

David Hathaway; LewRockwell.com.

BIG BROTHER WATCH

Emma Carr

FACEBOOK IS LISTENING TO YOU. LITERALLY.

Kaytee Riek, SumOfUs.org

ANTI-SURVEILLANCE MASK LETS YOU PASS AS SOMEONE ELSE

Leslie Katz; @lesatnews

WHEN THE INTERNET DIES, MEET THE MESHNET THAT SURVIVES

Hal Hodson; New Scientist

ENCRYPTION FOR BEGINNERS IN AN ERA OF TOTAL SURVEILLANCE

@AnonyOdinn; Cyberguerrilla

THIS COMPANY WANTS TO MAKE YOUR DNA UNTRACEABLE

Kwame Opamon; The Verge

WIRELESS MICROCHIP IMPLANT SET FOR HUMAN TRIALS

Nicholas West; Activist Post

DARKCOIN: THE CRYPTOCURRENCY PUTTING PRIVACY FIRST

Guy Bentley; via Activist Post

TAFTA/TTIP: WHAT ARE THE BENEFITS? WHAT ARE THE COSTS?

Glyn Moody; Techdirt; via Critical Thinking

**CONTRARY TO POPULAR AND ACADEMIC BELIEF, ADAM SMITH DID NOT
ACCEPT INEQUALITY AS A NECESSARY TRADE-OFF FOR A MORE
PROSPEROUS ECONOMY**

Deborah Boucoyannis; London School of Economics; via Obi; Occupy

POSITIVE MONEY BULLETIN

Positive Money Team

EDITORIAL

PLUS ÇA CHANGE, PLUS C'EST LA MÊME CHOSE

Not for the first time in these pages, items have been deliberately contraposed. Such its the case with Marinetti's demented exaltation of material progress from 1909, and Robin Smith's sober and thoughtful contribution on the illusory nature of much material and technical progress.

In apportioning blame for our current malaise, fingers get pointed in various directions ... 'communism', 'capitalism', 'fascism', 'nationalism', 'globalism', and so

forth. Much of it is the vague, loose terminology of the gun turret, which can be swivelled to fire in any direction at will.

As always the truth is elusive of simple slogans. Ideas and ideologies do not exist in hermetically sealed containers. They tend to cross fertilise. Thus in the years from the turn of the twentieth century a number of radical influences came together very rapidly ... Marxism and varieties of post Marxism, Dada, Fordism, psychoanalysis, differing strands of Fascism, eugenics and so forth. In all this the influence of Marinetti's Futurist ravings is often overlooked. It is no co-incidence that Lenin's *What is to be Done*, *The Futurist Manifesto*, and the first of the modern dystopic novels, Yevgeny Zemyatin's *We*, all appeared within about twenty months of one another.

The emergent themes were that man is but a machine made of flesh rather than metal; that it was human destiny to be dominated and controlled by machines; that all progress lies in ... and is measured exclusively by ... technological development, that the future is to be engineered in newness and on a grand scale, that there is no future other than an endless and relentless drive towards ever more novelty. Machines would rule the earth.

Perhaps the most vivid portrayal of this era is Fritz Lang's *Metropolis*, with its depiction of ant-like humans scurrying helplessly through the gigantic towering, marvels of the Great New Age. Corbusier's idea of cities was as 'machines for living in'. We might also think of Adolf Hitler's obsession with giantism, with his visions for the new post-war Germania, to be the capital of a country where trains ran on 15 foot gauge tracks. All of these talismans of the era.

An era so devoid of beneficence produced forms of materialistic nihilism which led us through the trenches of the First World War to Hitler and Stalin and the even greater horrors of the Second, and yet onwards to the nuclear age.

The point of all this is that the legacy of that era is still very much with us, except that panzers have been replaced by mass media and consumerism.

Varieties of Fascism, Communism, Fordism, Futurism, and Modernism have indeed cross pollinated. The resulting witches' brew has now metastasised throughout our political and economic life as corporatism. So well metastasised indeed, that most people can still scarcely see it.

We live amidst a pandemic of compulsive-addictive disorder. ... in a world of shopaholics, workaholics, alcoholics, of bulimia, drug addiction, and some disorders so bizarre as to beggar belief. Some compulsions, such as the addictive power of the internet, are only just being recognised and researched.

Possibly the greatest addictions of all, although little acknowledged, is to novelty and gadgetry. As that is required, is not that an item might be useful but that it is 'new' and an 'innovation'. The world crawls with overpaid smart-asses full of bright ideas, and their temperamental, often malfunctioning, and usually endlessly complicated creations. Robin Smith provides a timely antidote to such vanities.

Much could be said here of attempts to re-engineer humanity itself. As a political project that can perhaps be traced to the French Revolution. Quite a number of revolutionary 'year zeros' have been trumpeted since. Perhaps an apt epitaph for such efforts, was the speed with which the Russian Orthodox Church re-established itself as a force in the land after the fall of the Soviet Empire. More sinister projects to use technology to re-engineer the human mind, psyche and body have surfaced in more recent times.

Despite Marinetti's desire to 'demolish museums and libraries' it will only be such technical innovation that will turn us away from being stubbornly human. Unfortunately for the medical materialists we still perform our bodily functions, tell our little fibs, like our privacy, feel most secure with what is most familiar, preen ourselves and strut our ridiculous vanities on our little stages before we depart our brief candles.

The current struggle is for the soul of humanity itself. Those who stand on the right side, should be constantly beware of siren voices from the wrong side, offering technical marvels and a Brave New World.

Frank Taylor

THE PRESENCE OF OUR ANCESTORS

Robin Smith

Our souls as well as our bodies are composed of individual elements which were all already present in the ranks of our ancestors. The "newness" in the individual psyche is an endlessly varied recombination of age-old components. Body and soul therefore have an intensely historical character and find no proper place in what is new, in things that have just come into being. That is to say, our ancestral components are only partly at home in such things. We are very far from having finished completely with the Middle Ages, classical antiquity, and primitivity, as our modern psyches pretend. Nevertheless, we have plunged down a cataract of progress which sweeps us on into the future with ever wilder violence the farther it takes us from our roots. Once the past has been breached, it is usually annihilated, and there is no stopping the forward motion. But it is precisely the loss of connection with the past, our up-rootedness, which has given rise to the "discontents" of civilization and to such a flurry and haste that we live more in the future and its chimerical promises of a golden age than in the present, with which our whole evolutionary background has not yet caught up. We rush impetuously into novelty, driven by a mounting sense of insufficiency, dissatisfaction, and restlessness. We no longer live on what we have, but on promises, no longer in the light of the present day, but in the darkness of the future, which, we expect, will at last bring the proper sunrise. We refuse to recognize that everything better is purchased at the price of something worse; that, for example, the hope of greater freedom is cancelled out by increased enslavement to the state, not to speak of the terrible perils to which the most brilliant discoveries of science expose us. The less we understand of what our fathers and forefathers sought, the less we understand ourselves, and thus we help with all our might to rob the individual of his roots and his guiding instincts, so that he becomes a particle in the mass, ruled only by what Nietzsche called the spirit of gravity.

Reforms by advances, that is, by new methods or gadgets, are of course impressive at first, but in the long run they are dubious and in any case dearly paid for. They by no means increase the contentment or happiness of people on the whole. Mostly, they are deceptive sweetenings of existence, like speedier communications which unpleasantly accelerate the tempo of life and leave us with less time than ever before. *Omnis festinatio ex parte diaboli est* all haste is of the devil, as the old masters used to say.

Reforms by retrogressions, on the other hand, are as a rule less expensive and in addition more lasting, for they return to the simpler, tried and tested ways of the past and make the sparsest use of newspapers, radio, television, and all supposedly timesaving innovations.

In this book I have devoted considerable space to my subjective view of the world, which, however, is, not a product of rational thinking. It is rather a vision such as will come to one who undertakes, deliberately, with half-closed eyes and somewhat closed ears, to see and hear the form and voice of being. If our impressions are too distinct, we are held to the hour and minute of the present and have no way of knowing how our ancestral psyches listen to and understand the present

in other words, how our unconscious is responding to it. Thus we remain ignorant of whether our ancestral components find an elementary gratification in our lives, or whether they are repelled. Inner peace and contentment depend in large measure upon whether or not the historical family which is inherent in the individual can be harmonized with the ephemeral conditions of the present.

In the Tower at Bollingen it is as if one lived in many centuries simultaneously. The place will outlive me, and in its location and style it points backward to things of long ago. There is very little about it to suggest the present. If a man of the sixteenth century were to move into the house, only the kerosene lamp and the matches would be new to him; otherwise, he would know his way about without difficulty. There is nothing to disturb the dead, neither electric light nor telephone. Moreover, my ancestors' souls are sustained by the atmosphere of the house, since I answer for them the questions that their lives once left behind. I carve out rough answers as best I can. I have even drawn them on the walls. It is as if a silent, greater family, stretching down the centuries, were peopling the house. There I live in my second personality and see life in the round, as something forever coming into being and passing on.

+44 (0)7786 078836; <http://www.linkedin.com/in/robinsmith3>

THE FUTURIST MANIFESTO

F. T. Marinetti, 1909

We have been up all night, my friends and I, beneath mosque lamps whose brass cupolas are bright as our souls, because like them they were illuminated by the internal glow of electric hearts. And trampling underfoot our native sloth on opulent Persian carpets, we have been discussing right up to the limits of logic and scrawling the paper with demented writing.

Our hearts were filled with an immense pride at feeling ourselves standing quite alone, like lighthouses or like the sentinels in an outpost, facing the army of enemy stars encamped in their celestial bivouacs. Alone with the engineers in the infernal stokeholes of great ships, alone with the black spirits which rage in the belly of rogue locomotives, alone with the drunkards beating their wings against the walls.

Then we were suddenly distracted by the rumbling of huge double decker trams that went leaping by, streaked with light like the villages celebrating their festivals, which the Po in flood suddenly knocks down and uproots, and, in the rapids and eddies of a deluge, drags down to the sea.

Then the silence increased. As we listened to the last faint prayer of the old canal and the crumbling of the bones of the moribund palaces with their green growth of beard, suddenly the hungry automobiles roared beneath our windows.

"Come, my friends!" I said. "Let us go! At last Mythology and the mystic cult of the ideal have been left behind. We are going to be present at the birth of the centaur and we shall soon see the first angels fly! We must break down the gates of life to test the bolts and the padlocks! Let us go! Here is their very first sunrise on earth! Nothing equals the splendour of its red sword which strikes for the first time in our millennial darkness."

We went up to the three snorting machines to caress their breasts. I lay along mine like a corpse on its bier, but I suddenly revived again beneath the steering wheel — a guillotine knife — which threatened my stomach. A great sweep of madness brought us sharply back to ourselves and drove us through the streets, steep and deep, like dried up torrents. Here and there unhappy lamps in the windows taught us to despise our mathematical eyes. "Smell," I exclaimed, "smell is good enough for wild beasts!"

And we hunted, like young lions, death with its black fur dappled with pale crosses, who ran before us in the vast violet sky, palpable and living.

And yet we had no ideal Mistress stretching her form up to the clouds, nor yet a cruel Queen to whom to offer our corpses twisted into the shape of Byzantine rings! No reason to die unless it is the desire to be rid of the too great weight of our courage!

We drove on, crushing beneath our burning wheels, like shirt-collars under the iron, the watch dogs on the steps of the houses.

Death, tamed, went in front of me at each corner offering me his hand nicely, and sometimes lay on the ground with a noise of creaking jaws giving me velvet glances from the bottom of puddles. "Let us leave good sense behind like a hideous husk and let us hurl ourselves, like fruit spiced with

pride, into the immense mouth and breast of the world! Let us feed the unknown, not from despair, but simply to enrich the unfathomable reservoirs of the Absurd!"

As soon as I had said these words, I turned sharply back on my tracks with the mad intoxication of puppies biting their tails, and suddenly there were two cyclists disapproving of me and tottering in front of me like two persuasive but contradictory reasons. Their stupid swaying got in my way. What a bore! Pouah! I stopped short, and in disgust hurled myself — vlan! — head over heels in a ditch.

Oh, maternal ditch, half full of muddy water! A factory gutter! I savoured a mouthful of strengthening muck which recalled the black teat of my Sudanese nurse!

As I raised my body, mud-spattered and smelly, I felt the red hot poker of joy deliciously pierce my heart. A crowd of fishermen and gouty naturalists crowded terrified around this marvel. With patient and tentative care they raised high enormous grappling irons to fish up my car, like a vast shark that had run aground. It rose slowly leaving in the ditch, like scales, its heavy coachwork of good sense and its upholstery of comfort.

We thought it was dead, my good shark, but I woke it with a single caress of its powerful back, and it was revived running as fast as it could on its fins.

Then with my face covered in good factory mud, covered with metal scratches, useless sweat and celestial grime, amidst the complaint of staid fishermen and angry naturalists, we dictated our first will and testament to all the living men on earth.

MANIFESTO OF FUTURISM

We want to sing the love of danger, the habit of energy and rashness.

The essential elements of our poetry will be courage, audacity and revolt.

Literature has up to now magnified pensive immobility, ecstasy and slumber. We want to exalt movements of aggression, feverish sleeplessness, the double march, the perilous leap, the slap and the blow with the fist.

We declare that the splendour of the world has been enriched by a new beauty: the beauty of speed. A racing automobile with its bonnet adorned with great tubes like serpents with explosive breath ... a roaring motor car which seems to run on machine-gun fire, is more beautiful than the Victory of Samothrace.

We want to sing the man at the wheel, the ideal axis of which crosses the earth, itself hurled along its orbit.

The poet must spend himself with warmth, glamour and prodigality to increase the enthusiastic fervour of the primordial elements.

Beauty exists only in struggle. There is no masterpiece that has not an aggressive character. Poetry must be a violent assault on the forces of the unknown, to force them to bow before man.

We are on the extreme promontory of the centuries! What is the use of looking behind at the moment when we must open the mysterious shutters of the impossible? Time and Space died yesterday. We are already living in the absolute, since we have already created eternal, omnipresent speed.

We want to glorify war — the only cure for the world — militarism, patriotism, the destructive gesture of the anarchists, the beautiful ideas which kill, and contempt for woman.

We want to demolish museums and libraries, fight morality, feminism and all opportunist and utilitarian cowardice.

We will sing of the great crowds agitated by work, pleasure and revolt; the multi-coloured and polyphonic surf of revolutions in modern capitals: the nocturnal vibration of the arsenals and the workshops beneath their violent electric moons: the gluttonous railway stations devouring smoking serpents; factories suspended from the clouds by the thread of their smoke; bridges with the leap of gymnasts flung across the diabolic cutlery of sunny rivers: adventurous steamers sniffing the horizon; great-breasted locomotives, puffing on the rails like enormous steel horses with long tubes for bridle, and the gliding flight of aeroplanes whose propeller sounds like the flapping of a flag and the applause of enthusiastic crowds.

It is in Italy that we are issuing this manifesto of ruinous and incendiary violence, by which we today are founding Futurism, because we want to deliver Italy from its gangrene of professors, archaeologists, tourist guides and antiquaries.

Italy has been too long the great second-hand market. We want to get rid of the innumerable museums which cover it with innumerable cemeteries.

Museums, cemeteries! Truly identical in their sinister juxtaposition of bodies that do not know each other. Public dormitories where you sleep side by side for ever with beings you hate or do not know. Reciprocal ferocity of the painters and sculptors who murder each other in the same museum with blows of line and colour. To make a visit once a year, as one goes to see the graves of our dead once a

year, that we could allow! We can even imagine placing flowers once a year at the feet of the Gioconda! But to take our sadness, our fragile courage and our anxiety to the museum every day, that we cannot admit! Do you want to poison yourselves? Do you want to rot?

What can you find in an old picture except the painful contortions of the artist trying to break uncrossable barriers which obstruct the full expression of his dream?

To admire an old picture is to pour our sensibility into a funeral urn instead of casting it forward with violent spurts of creation and action. Do you want to waste the best part of your strength in a useless admiration of the past, from which you will emerge exhausted, diminished, trampled on?

Indeed daily visits to museums, libraries and academies (those cemeteries of wasted effort, calvaries of crucified dreams, registers of false starts!) is for artists what prolonged supervision by the parents is for intelligent young men, drunk with their own talent and ambition.

For the dying, for invalids and for prisoners it may be all right. It is, perhaps, some sort of balm for their wounds, the admirable past, at a moment when the future is denied them. But we will have none of it, we, the young, strong and living Futurists!

Let the good incendiaries with charred fingers come! Here they are! Heap up the fire to the shelves of the libraries! Divert the canals to flood the cellars of the museums! Let the glorious canvases swim ashore! Take the picks and hammers! Undermine the foundation of venerable towns!

The oldest among us are not yet thirty years old: we have therefore at least ten years to accomplish our task. When we are forty let younger and stronger men than we throw us in the waste paper basket like useless manuscripts! They will come against us from afar, leaping on the light cadence of their first poems, clutching the air with their predatory fingers and sniffing at the gates of the academies the good scent of our decaying spirits, already promised to the catacombs of the libraries.

But we shall not be there. They will find us at last one winter's night in the depths of the country in a sad hangar echoing with the notes of the monotonous rain, crouched near our trembling aeroplanes, warming our hands at the wretched fire which our books of today will make when they flame gaily beneath the glittering flight of their pictures.

They will crowd around us, panting with anguish and disappointment, and exasperated by our proud indefatigable courage, will hurl themselves forward to kill us, with all the more hatred as their hearts will be drunk with love and admiration for us. And strong healthy Injustice will shine radiantly from their eyes. For art can only be violence, cruelty, injustice.

The oldest among us are not yet thirty, and yet we have already wasted treasures, treasures of strength, love, courage and keen will, hastily, deliriously, without thinking, with all our might, till we are out of breath.

Look at us! We are not out of breath, our hearts are not in the least tired. For they are nourished by fire, hatred and speed! Does this surprise you? it is because you do not even remember being alive! Standing on the world's summit, we launch once more our challenge to the stars!

Your objections? All right! I know them! Of course! We know just what our beautiful false intelligence affirms: "We are only the sum and the prolongation of our ancestors," it says. Perhaps! All right! What does it matter? But we will not listen! Take care not to repeat those infamous words! Instead, lift up your head!

Standing on the world's summit we launch once again our insolent challenge to the stars!

(Text of translation taken from James Joll, Three Intellectuals in Politics)

THE RIGHT OF JURORS TO JUDGE ON THE JUSTICE OF LAW

Kenn D'Oudney; Democracy Defined

(This eloquent excerpt from Kenn's correspondence again underscores the sovereignty of the jury, the ability of the jury to strike down statute in the interests of justice, and the supremacy of that natural justice over statute, and the universality of that justice. Such is the way the Common Law system ought to operate, - Ed)

The Commemorative Plaque, Old Bailey Law Courts, London (reads):-

"Near this site William Penn and William Mead were tried in 1670 for preaching to an unlawful assembly in

Grace Church Street. This tablet commemorates the courage and endurance of the Jury, Thos (Thomas) Vere, Edward Bushell and ten others who refused to give a verdict against them although locked up without food for two nights and were fined for their final Verdict of Not Guilty. The case of these Jurymen was reviewed on a writ of Habeas Corpus and Chief Justice Vaughan delivered the opinion of the Court which established The Right of Juries to give their Verdict according to their Conviction."

Penn was later Founder of Pennsylvania. Jurors do not decide the Verdict simply on whether evidence indicates a person "broke the law."

Rather than "establishing" the duty and right of Jurors to decide the verdict according to their convictions (as the wording goes on the Old Bailey Commemorative Plaque), in fact, Chief Justice Vaughan's ruling merely recognised this perpetually requisite citizen's duty to judge the law, definitive of Trial by Jury.

Quakers Penn and Mead broke the law in letter and spirit in front of very numerous witnesses. The Penn and Mead infraction was knowing and intentional. The facts of the case were known to all: judge, jury and the public. Furthermore, there was no desire in the defendants to deny their brave stand. Their outspoken behaviour at trial indicated the converse. The evidence against them was incontrovertible.

What the defendants disputed was 'guilt': that is to say, they were Not Guilty because crime is the committing of an act of injustice with malice aforethought. It is not simply the act of breaking the law, for the unjust law is itself the embodiment of crime, and, the upholding or enforcing of any unjust law is a criminal act per se; and recognised as such by domestic and international law; ref. Campaign info. p, 2.

Chief Justice Vaughan upheld the jury's Duty to acquit regardless of the law or the instructions of the judge, if the finding of a verdict of 'guilty' would be unjust to the accused.

Regarding the Common Law on Secularity, and why *legem terræ* Trial by Jury is the universal Justice System.

The legal and societal term Natural Law is a sense of right and wrong which arises inevitably from the constitution of the mind of man. The people's *legem terræ* common law of the land is derived from natural law and justice and Equity, the natural Sense of Fairness and conscience by which disinterested, randomly-selected people in a jury situation judge. Natural law and justice are eternal and universal; not geographically or culturally constrained, nor limited to a set time.

Natural law does NOT refer to the laws of nature, the laws which science aims to describe. Nor is it to be confused with the opposite phenomenon, "the law of the jungle," which is the rule for surviving by the use of force to succeed in a hostile or competitive environment. This latter is quite the reverse of natural law and justice.

The supreme secular morality of natural law pre-dates all the great religions: it is timeless, permanent and applicable to judicature in a universal context. It is antecedent to the invention of writing, the Epic of Gilgamesh; the hieroglyphic, hieratic and demotic scripts of Ancient Egypt; the Torah; The Pharmacopoeia of Emperor Shen Nung; the Bhagavad Gita; the Old and New Testaments; the Histories of Herodotus and Thucydides, and other texts.

It is from natural law that all the universal, eternal commandments (i.e., rules of action) of common law derive, such as:

"Thou shalt do no murder,"

"Thou shalt not steal,"

"Thou shalt not bear false witness "

The Paradigm of Judicature: "Do unto others as you would they do unto you."

This secular commandment stands in perpetual judgement over all the acts and motives of humans as individuals and in groups or collectively. It provides the Universal Juror at all times and in all places with the means for ascertaining whether the act of the accused was malicious, benign or neutral; whether it was definitively innocent or criminal: an act of injustice committed with malice aforethought; i.e., guilty.

The good news is that the controversies of theism, religions and spiritualism, which do divide humans, do not belong in the secular courtroom of Equal Justice for they are of no relevance whatsoever in consideration of The Universal Secular Paradigm of Judicature, "Do unto others as you would they do unto you."

The natural or universal law and its constitutionally-emplaced common law derivative (*viz.* *Legem Terræ* inscribed as Articles into the 1215 Great Charter Constitution, of which the sole justice system is the judgement of peers: the Trial by Jury), govern government, and inclusively and impartially judge all the acts and motives of men and women everywhere, in all times and places,

BILDERBERG AGENDA REVEALED: ELITE DESPERATE TO RESCUE UNIPOLAR WORLD

Paul Joseph Watson; The Seeker; via Critical Thinking

The 2014 Bilderberg meeting in Copenhagen, Denmark is taking place amidst a climate of panic for many of the 120 globalists set to attend the secretive confab, with Russia's intransigence on the crisis in Ukraine and the anti-EU revolution sweeping Europe posing a serious threat to the unipolar world order Bilderberg spent over 60 years helping to build.

Inside sources confirm to Infowars that the elite conference, which will take place from Thursday onwards at the five star Marriott Hotel, will center around how to derail a global political awakening that threatens to hinder Bilderberg's long standing agenda to centralize power into a one world political federation, a goal set to be advanced with the passage of the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP), which will undoubtedly be a central topic of discussion at this year's meeting.

The TTIP represents an integral component of Bilderberg's attempt to rescue the unipolar world by creating a "world company," initially a free trade area, which would connect the United States with Europe. Just as the European Union started as a mere free trade area and was eventually transformed into a political federation which controls upwards of 50 per cent of its member states' laws and regulations with total contempt for national sovereignty and democracy, TTIP is designed to accomplish the same goal, only on a bigger scale.

The deal is being spearheaded by Obama's U.S. Trade Representative Michael Froman, a Wall Street insider and a CFR member, Bilderberg's sister organization. Froman is simultaneously helping to build another block of this global government, the Trans-Pacific Partnership, which is a similar project involving Asian countries.

Given that Bilderberg schemed to create the Euro single currency as far back as 1955 (Bilderberg chairman Étienne Davignon bragged about how the Euro single currency was a brainchild of the Bilderberg in 2009 interview), the results of the European elections are sure to have stirred outright alarm amongst Bilderberg globalists who are aghast that their planned EU superstate is being eroded as a result of a populist resistance mainly centred around animosity towards uncontrolled immigration policies.

In Denmark itself, the buzz is centred around Morten Messerschmidt and the Danish People's party, which won 27% of the vote in the Euro elections and doubled its number of MEPs. Although some are wary of Messerschmidt's far right inclinations, his success reflects a general resentment not only in Denmark but across Europe towards immigration and the welfare state, concerns that the EU has only exasperated.

Meanwhile in France, Marine Le Pen is carving out a role as the face of a conservative movement that threatens "to break up one united Europe," with her European election win being described as an "earthquake" that has rattled the political heart of Europe.

Voters in the United Kingdom also delivered a thumping rejection of the EU and in turn Bilderberg with the success of Nigel Farage and UKIP, a Euroskeptic triumph some are labeling the "most extraordinary" election result for 100 years.

As well as TTIP and the fallout from the European election disaster, Bilderberg will be tackling a number of other key issues, most of which will revolve around the continued effort to centralize economic power under several different guises, including a carbon tax paid directly to the United Nations, with the financial hit being taken by individuals as big companies are granted special "waivers" that will allow them to continue to pollute.

The rumbling crisis in Ukraine and the relationship between Russia and NATO will also be a focal point of Bilderberg 2014. Globalists now consider Vladimir Putin to have ostracised Russia

from the new world order because he dared to “challenge the international system,” as John Kerry put it.

Bilderberg will discuss fears that Putin is intent on constructing an alternative world order based around the BRICS countries, a “multi-polar” system that would devastate the dollar as the world reserve currency and also heavily dilute the current US-EU-NATO power axis. Infowars reporters will be on the ground all this week to cover the 2014 Bilderberg Group conference in Copenhagen, Denmark.

THE SOLUTION TO EVERYTHING: SLAVERY TO THE STATE

Jon Rappoport; Activist Post

Let me clarify that. Slavery to the corporate State. Government and mega-corporations work hand in hand. The incurably naïve believe the State is beneficent. The government is kind. The government knows what to do. The government will solve society’s ills if we let it. Of course, the government, in the form of NSA, is spying on everybody all the time—but you see, that’s not really the government. It’s a rogue element.

Sure it is. And rainbows will appear at any moment and the people of Earth will experience a galactic frequency that eradicates all impulses toward conflict. To put it another way, people see what they want to see.

“Ahem, when I say ‘government,’ I don’t mean the CIA or the Pentagon or the FDA or the President’s national security team, or fraudulent federal scientists, or the whole lot of venal people in Congress, or corrupt prosecutors and judges or invasive bureaucrats or paper-pushing money-sucking desk jockeys.”

Of course not. Government is an idea in the mind of God.

And when you think about it, the NSA watches over us to make sure we stay on the path of righteousness. It’s absurd to be suspicious of the State. The authors of the Constitution, who tried to limit central authority, were a bunch of paranoids.

We need more government, not less. Here are quotes from George Orwell. In case there is any doubt, he is describing aspects of the State:

“As I write, highly civilized human beings are flying overhead, trying to kill me. They do not feel any enmity against me as an individual, nor I against them. They are ‘only doing their duty’, as the saying goes. Most of them, I have no doubt, are kind-hearted law-abiding men who would never dream of committing murder in private life.” (The Lion and the Unicorn, 1941)

“Actions are held to be good or bad, not on their own merits, but according to who does them, and there is almost no kind of outrage — torture, the use of hostages, forced labour, mass deportations, imprisonment without trial, forgery, assassination, the bombing of civilians — which does not change its moral colour when it is committed by ‘our’ side.” (Notes on Nationalism, 1945)

“A totalitarian state is in effect a theocracy, and its ruling caste, in order to keep its position, has to be thought of as infallible. But since, in practice, no one is infallible, it is frequently necessary to rearrange past events in order to show that this or that mistake was not made, or that this or that imaginary triumph actually happened. Then, again, every major change in policy demands a corresponding change of doctrine and a revaluation of prominent historical figures.” (The Prevention of Literature, 1946)

“But actually, he thought as he re-adjusted the Ministry of Plenty’s figures, it was not even forgery. It was merely the substitution of one piece of nonsense for another. Most of the material that you were dealing with had no connexion with anything in the real world, not even the kind of connexion that is contained in a direct lie. Statistics were just as much a fantasy in their original version as in their rectified version.” (1984, chapter 4)

“Don’t you see that the whole aim of Newspeak is to narrow the range of thought? In the end we shall make thoughtcrime literally impossible, because there will be no words in which to express it. Every concept that can ever be needed, will be expressed by exactly one word, with its meaning rigidly defined and all its subsidiary meanings rubbed out and forgotten.” (1984, chapter 5)

But you see, these are all old Orwell remarks. Now we have a different kind of State. It’s...

government. Yes. The State isn't government. Aha. The State exists in places other than America. In America, we have government. Yes, that's right. Two different animals. One is repressive, and the other is earnest. (More rainbows for the sentimentalists.)

Here are quotes about the State from Aldous Huxley's 1932 novel, *Brave New World*:

"Till at last the child's mind is these suggestions, and the sum of the suggestions is the child's mind.

And not the child's mind only. The adult's mind too—all his life long. The mind that judges and desires and decides—made up of these suggestions. But all these suggestions are our suggestions!" (Ch. 2)

"Every one belongs to every one else." (Chapter 3)

"Mother, monogamy, romance. High spurts the fountain; fierce and foamy the wild jet. The urge has but a single outlet. My love, my baby. No wonder these poor pre-moderns were mad and wicked and miserable." (Chapter 3)

"Everyone works for every one else." (Chapter 5)

"Don't you wish you were free, Lenina?"

"I don't know what you mean. I am free. Free to have the most wonderful time. Everybody's happy nowadays."

He laughed, "Yes, 'Everybody's happy nowadays.' We begin giving the children that at five. But wouldn't you like to be free to be happy in some other way, Lenina? In your own way, for example; not in everybody else's way."

"I don't know what you mean," she repeated. (Chapter 6)

But again, Huxley's remarks are about the aspirations and victories of the State, which doesn't exist in America. Never has.

Jon Rappoport is the author of two explosive collections, The Matrix Revealed and Exit From the Matrix, Jon was a candidate for a US Congressional seat in the 29th District of California. Nominated for a Pulitzer Prize, he has worked as an investigative reporter for 30 years, writing articles on politics, medicine, and health for CBS Healthwatch, LA Weekly, Spin Magazine, Stern, and other newspapers and magazines in the US and Europe. Jon has delivered lectures and seminars on global politics, health, logic, and creative power to audiences around the world. You can sign up for his free emails at www.nomorefakenews.com

MORE POWERS TRANSFERRED 2014

Dave Barnby

(The EU's aim of creating a single European superstate, is often described as 'federal'. The list below, itself an appendage of a much larger list which has accumulated over three decades or more, gives lie to that notion. Even before Lisbon, the EU's ability to micromanage the affairs of its constituent states went far beyond anything Washington is permitted to impose on the constituent states of the USA, and the same applies to most other federal entities around the world. The scheme is for a unitary rather than a federal state. In all but name that already exists.

The other idea disabused by this item is that a 'referendum' will be needed only in the event 'of a further transfer of powers. In reality the 'transfer of powers' is a continuous process which has been in train for decades - Ed)

<http://ironiestoo.blogspot.co.uk/2013/10/why-feron-wants-to-push-eu-referendum.html>

No wonder Westminster has nothing to do!

On the 1st November 2014 the right of Parliament to legislate over us in 43 areas, the important ones, will be removed and be made subject to approval, by majority vote of the lying undemocratic and unelected bastards fronting the EU. They call it QMV, Quality Majority Voting, which translates in English to: You'll do what we tell you, or else.

Heath - Thatcher - Major - Blair - Brown, are all, by allowing this, acting in High Treason, but as every important Government post is now held by an EU Common Purpose trained thug, waiting to take over from elected local government officials from 1st November 2014, there seems to be little we can do about it. Below, are the 43 areas of 'competence', areas we British have been declared incompetent to decide for

ourselves.

On 1st November 2014 the following areas of competence will switch from requiring unanimous approval of all member states to qualified majority voting only:

Initiatives of the High Representative for Foreign Affairs – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV
Administrative co-operation – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV
Asylum – Nice: QMV; Lisbon: QMV
Border controls – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV
Citizens' initiative regulations – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV
Civil protection – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV
Committee of the Regions – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV
Common defence policy – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV
Crime prevention incentives – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV
Criminal judicial co-operation – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV
Criminal law – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV
Culture – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV
Diplomatic & Consular protection – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV
Economic & Social Committee – Nice: QMV; Lisbon: QMV
Emergency international aid – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV
Energy – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV
EU budget – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV
Eurojust – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV
European Central Bank – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV
European Court of Justice – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV
Europol – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV
Eurozone external representation – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV
Foreign Affairs High Representative election – Lisbon: QMV
Freedom of movement for workers – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV
Freedom to establish a business – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV
Freedom, security, justice, co-operation & evaluation – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV
Funding the Common Foreign & Security Policy – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV
General economic interest services – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV
Humanitarian aid – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV
Immigration – Nice: QMV; Lisbon: QMV
Intellectual property – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV
Organisation of the Council of the EU – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV
Police co-operation – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV
President of the European Council election – Lisbon: QMV
Response to natural disasters & terrorism – Lisbon: QMV
Rules concerning the Armaments Agency – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV
Self-employment access rights – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV
Social Security Unanimity – Nice: QMV; Lisbon: QMV
Space – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV
Sport – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV
Structural & Cohesion Funds – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV
Tourism – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV
Transport – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV
Withdrawal of a member state – Lisbon: QMV

A brief review of the Treaties confirms the substance of the above. Transitional arrangements allow, only on specific votes, for the Nice Treaty Provisions to apply from 1st November 2014 until March 2017, hence I imagine PM David Cameron's determination to delay our referendum beyond that date, tying Britain for ever within the non-democratic, totalitarian and now clearly despotic EU.

CRACKING THE “CONSPIRACY THEORIES” PSYCHOLINGUISTIC CODE: THE WITCH HUNT AGAINST INDEPENDENT RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

James F. Tracy; Global Research,

Url of this article: <http://www.globalresearch.ca/cracking-conspiracy-theorys-psycholinguistic-code-the-witch-hunt-against-independent-research-and-analysis/5383108>

A new crusade appears to be underway to target independent research and analysis available via alternative news media. This March saw the release of “cognitive infiltration” advocate Cass Sunstein’s new book, *Conspiracy Theories and Other Dangerous Ideas*. In April, the confirmed federal intelligence-gathering arm, Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC), released a new report, “Agenda 21: The UN, Sustainability, and Right Wing Conspiracy Theory.” Most recently, *Newsweek* magazine carried a cover story, titled, “The Plots to Destroy America: Conspiracy Theories Are a Clear and Present Danger.”

As its discourse suggests, this propaganda campaign is using the now familiar “conspiracy theory” label, as outlined in Central Intelligence Agency Document 1035-960, the 1967 memo laying out a strategy for CIA “media assets” to counter criticism of the Warren Commission and attack independent investigators of President John F. Kennedy’s assassination. At that time the targets included attorney Mark Lane and New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison, who were routinely defamed and lampooned in major US news outlets.

Declassified government documents have proven Lane and Garrison’s allegations of CIA-involvement in the assassination largely accurate. Nevertheless, the prospect of being subject to the conspiracy theorist smear remains a potent weapon for intimidating authors, journalists, and scholars from interrogating complex events, policies, and other potentially controversial subject matter.

As the title of *Newsweek*’s feature story indicates, a primary element of contemporary propaganda campaigns using the conspiracy theory/ist label is to suggest that citizens’ distrust of government imperatives and activities tends toward violent action. The “conspiracy theorist” term is intentionally conflated with “conspiracist,” thus linking the two in the mass mind. Images of Lee Harvey Oswald, Timothy McVeigh, and Osama bin Laden are subtly invoked when the magic terms are referenced. In reality, it is typically Western governments using their police or military who prove the foremost purveyors of violence and the threat of violence—both domestically and abroad.

In his *Newsweek* article, author and journalist Kurt Eichenwald selectively employs the assertions of the SPLC, Sunstein, and a handful of social scientists to postulate in Orwellian fashion that independent research and analysis of the United Nations’ Agenda 21, the anti-educational thrust of “Common Core,” the dangers of vaccine injury and water fluoridation, and September 11—all important policies and issues worthy of serious study and concern—are a “contagion” to the body politic.

In a functioning public, honest academics and journalists would uninhibitedly delve into these and similar problems—GMOs, state-sponsored terrorism, the dangers of non-ionizing radiation— particularly since such phenomena pose grave threats to both popular sovereignty and self determination. Such intellectuals would then provide important findings to foster vigorous public debate.

Absent this, segments of the populace still capable of critical thought are inclined to access and probe information that leads them to question bureaucratic edicts and, in some cases, suggest a potentially broader political agenda. In today’s world, however, such research projects carried out by the hoi polloi that are expressly reserved for government or foundation-funded technocrats “distort the debate that is crucial to democracy,” says Dartmouth political scientist Brendan Nyhan.

With the above in mind, a simple yet instructive exercise in illustrating the psycholinguistic feature of the conspiracy theory propaganda technique is to replace “conspiracy theories/ists” with the phrase, “independent research and analysis,” or “independent researchers.” Let us apply this to some passages from Eichenwald’s recent *Newsweek* piece.

For example, “Psychological research has shown that the only trait that consistently indicates the

probability someone will believe in conspiracy theories independent research and analysis is if that person believes in other conspiracy theories independent research and analysis,” Eichenwald sagely concludes.

“One of the most common ways of introducing conspiracy theories independent research and analysis is to ‘just ask questions’ about an official account,” says Karen Douglas, co-editor of the British Journal of Social Psychology and a senior academic ... at Britain’s University of Kent.”

In fact, substituting the phrases accordingly throughout the article significantly neutralizes its overall propagandistic effect.

Researchers agree; independent research and analysis are espoused by people at every level of society seeking ways of calming the chaos of life, sometimes by simply reinforcing convictions.

While the growth in the number of news outlets has helped spread independent research and analysis, it doesn’t compare to the impact of social media and the Internet, experts say.

9/11 conspiracy theorists independent researchers protest outside the World Trade Center in 2011

“If you have social networks of people who are talking with one another, you can have independent research and analysis spread in a hurry,” says Cass Sunstein, a professor at Harvard Law School ... “It literally is as if it was contagious.”

While some may dismiss independent researchers as ignorant or unstable, research has shown that to be false. “The idea that only dumb people believe this stuff is wrong,” says Dartmouth’s Nyhan.

People who more strongly believed in independent research and analysis were significantly less likely to use sunscreen or have an annual medical checkup.

According to a just-released report from the Southern Poverty Law Center, the independent research and analysis flowed in April at a hearing before Alabama’s Senate Education Committee about legislation to allow school districts to reject Common Core.

It’s true. Since September 11, 2001 the internet has increasingly allowed for everyday people to retrieve, study, and share information on important events and phenomena as never before. And as a recent study published in the prominent journal *Frontiers of Psychology* suggests, tendering “alternative conspiracy theories” to the government-endorsed explanations of September 11, 2001 is a sign of “individuation,” or psychological well being and contentment.

Such a condition is a clear danger to those who wish to wield uncontested political authority. Indeed, the capacity to freely disseminate and discuss knowledge of government malfeasance is the foremost counterbalance to tyranny. Since this ability cannot be readily confiscated or suppressed, it must be ridiculed, marginalized, even diagnosed as a psychiatric condition.

The recent abandonment of network neutrality may eventually further subdue the nuisance of independent research, thought, and analysis. Until then, the corporate media’s attempts to bamboozle and terrify the American public with the well-worn conspiracy theory meme will be a prevalent feature of what passes for news and commentary today.

ARE YOU TALKING TO A PROVOCATEUR?

David Hathaway; LewRockwell.com.

The imagined look and persona of an agent provocateur in most people’s minds probably couldn’t be further from the truth. Most would probably picture the obscure, silent individual lurking in the back of the room while doing his best to conceal his identity and his movements. If you accept that image, you have also accepted the notion that the provocateur is really just peeking in on, documenting, and recording pre-existing criminal activities and shady plans going on around him. You haven’t faced the reality that the whole show is the production of the provocateur.

Once you realize that the momentum, the force, the ideas, and the infrastructure of an event are suggested, put in motion, paid for, forcefully or charismatically insisted upon, managed, and facilitated by the provocateur, then you look to very different individuals when considering who is the state’s agent provocateur. Looking for those individuals causes you to look for those displaying the characteristics of a leader, a financial sponsor, an employer, a boss, an orchestrator, or a charismatic friend to a lonely person. Following are 11 characteristics that may be displayed by a provocateur.

1. Is at the front of the room. He is the most visible person in the activity. He is the center of everything; the lynchpin.
2. Is the biggest talker. He talks endlessly about illegal activity with no attempts to conceal his intended activity. The provocateur doesn't, as some must think, randomly stumble into a lot of evil debate societies where he is welcomed warmly into an open discussion of criminal conspiracies. On its face, that notion should be counter intuitive to most people based on their life experiences. Even private criminals rarely, if ever, speak specifically to anyone, even to their family or inner circle, about the details of criminal acts they plan to carry out. Talk is at a minimum and objectives are not openly stated but, understood. The provocateur, on the other hand, rants incessantly about criminal ventures and seeks head nodding, mumbling, smiling, or something that he can describe to prosecutors as assent to, or participation in, the planning of a conspiracy or the execution of a criminal act in furtherance of a conspiracy. Real criminals will quickly decide to get out of Dodge when confronted with a showy loud-mouth nut job that is either a cop or will get everyone thrown in the slammer. That leads us to the third characteristic.
3. Is fearless of the consequences. Most people fear financial harm, harm to their reputations, and physical harm like imprisonment or being shot. Not the provocateur. He has all of that covered. He has his get out of jail free card.
4. Pays more than things are worth. The provocateur often is not concerned about getting good value for his money. He often buys and pays for things or gives them away for free to his targets with no sense of quid pro quo. After all, it is not his money. It is taxpayer money. The government is never good at getting good value for the funds it spends. The same goes when provocateurs spend taxpayer money. They pay their targets too much for drugs, too much for bomb-making supplies, too much to rent a warehouse to store illegal material, and too much for their time. There is no sense of value for value. The over-spending is also an inducement to get targets to do things they wouldn't otherwise do. This is a strong signal that a provocateur is involved with something. Is somebody offering to rent a hotel room or a warehouse out of the blue for a venture that cannot be cost effective at the exorbitant rates being paid by the provocateur? This is not how the mafia or other private criminals think or act. It is a sign of state action.
5. Prefers to talk in his car or a hotel room. Cars and hotel rooms are often wired with audio and video before scheduled meetings. The provocateur tries to discourage discussions with the target in the target's private controlled surroundings or outdoors where stray noises like traffic or wind will overwhelm a recording. He tries to draw the target to his car or another choreographed location (hotel room, warehouse, garage, etc.) in the theater production controlled by the provocateur.
6. May be very friendly. The provocateur may be very kind and overly interested in the target even though the target is an unlikely candidate for his friendship.
7. Often looks and acts like a member of a demonized group. Sometimes, the provocateur overtly displays the characteristics or talks the talk of a group that is being demonized by the state and the state supporting media. Say for example that gun owners, white supremacists, motorcycle clubs, militia members, devout religious practitioners, or persons of middle-eastern origin are in the crosshairs of state fear-mongering. Well then, it could be anticipated that the provocateur may be flaunting grossly exaggerated characteristics of those groups in conjunction with wild rhetoric that would make him a target of the feds; if he weren't already in cahoots with them. The more he fits the stereotypical image of that particular mythical dragon the government wants to slay, the more likely that he is putting on a costume to fit an adopted persona.
8. Isn't usually a government employee. You may think, "I know this guy. I know he's scum, so I know he wouldn't be hired as a law enforcement officer because of his criminal history or other baggage." This sociopathic petty criminal ne'er-do-well is actually the type that is most often approached to be a provocateur. He is often approached by the government and offered an escape from the consequences of other activity he has been involved in. This, ironically, is also the type who has the most to gain, and the least to lose, by lying and distorting. A provocateur is often recruited on-the-fly and is told, sometimes with only moments of instruction from a government employee he just met, to arrange and carry out an event to bring in more defendants in order to save

his skin. After he works his way out of a jam, he often keeps working for money since he now knows how to produce the desired results. Others are motivated only by the money they receive from the government.

Many provocateurs are “unwitting” lower tier provocateurs that are paid for their actions by another private provocateur who is receiving the funds directly from an actual government employee. This “unwitting” provocateur doesn’t know he is working for the government. He will be paid by the primary provocateur to do things that the main provocateur doesn’t want to do (like light a fuse and then run away from a truck) without knowing that the government is paying the bills. Often the most damaging evidence at a trial is characterizations of individuals’ motivations, statements, and actions. At that point, a government employee is usually called in as an “expert witness” to analyze, describe, and translate what it means when someone nods their head in sync with the person paying for the beer.

9. Persistence followed by silence. He may exhibit periods of aggressive non-stop interest followed by days of silence. He disappears. He can’t be contacted. He doesn’t answer phone or email. He was seemingly in a mad rush and anxious to conclude a suggested and planned-out transaction or event, despite any consideration of the cost but, then makes last minute lengthy delays while being incommunicado. That happens because he is conferring with overlords to arrange the final arrest details during the moments, or after the moments, when he provides illegal material or facilitates an immoral event that will become the “overt act in the conspiracy” needed by prosecutors. As law enforcement surveillance or arrest teams are put into place during various phases of the developing “conspiracy,” with all the delays of a bureaucracy, the provocateur drops all contact with targeted victims during crucial times after a deal has been paid for and set up by him. The underlings have been told what to do and when to do it but, can’t find their boss during that crucial phase because he is lying low while pestering law enforcement teams who want more time to get ready. “Stall and delay” is the message to the provocateur from his paymaster. When the provocateur has used up all his excuses and the eleventh hour has arrived, he often goes underground and waits for the arrest team to do their thing. After all, he doesn’t want to get beat up and shot in the final H-hour bedlam when he is confused with the targets. Sometimes the underlings do what they were paid to do and initiate the act, light the fuse, pull the trigger, deliver the drugs, or complete the transaction anyway, as paid employees tend to do, after losing contact with their boss in the final hours leading up to an important crucial time-sensitive scheduled event.

10. Lies convincingly in a Captain America “truth test.” There is folklore floating around amongst regular folk to the effect that undercover agents of the government must always tell the truth. After all, they will swear to tell the truth at trial. They probably took some sort of oath to tell the truth, didn’t they? If you catch them in a lie, won’t that impeach their credibility on the witness stand and cause the case to be thrown out? This belief often leads the provocateur’s victims to inquire, “Are you a cop?” Or, “Are you working for the government in any way?” The provocateur’s answer of “no” is often accepted as the correct answer to the G-Man “truth test.” The belief that cops, like Vulcans, will always tell the truth is surprisingly still out there but, losing adherents.

11. Wears a hat. OK, funny right? There is a not-so-funny joke that floats around amongst undercover personnel that goes as follows: “If I ever think I’m getting set up, I’m going to ask the guy to take his hat off and then look around and see if the cavalry rushes in.” Taking off the hat, or cap, or other headgear, has been a long-standing visual “bust signal” between provocateurs and surveillance teams. Not always but, more often than you would think. You might want to ask your new found generous friend to take off his hat and let you look at it because you would love one just like it.

So, in conclusion, if you look at postings on a forum and consider if someone in the discussion may be an undercover cop, then instead of considering who is the silent lurker avoiding the discussion, think more about the one who talks the most and makes brash inflammatory statements like “kill” or “smash” or “blood in the streets;” the one who tries to set up meetings and intimidate those who are peaceful telling them that they aren’t “true patriots;” the one who tries to discuss, provide, or email you disturbing images or questionable links so that they can be retrieved later

from your computer via a “computer forensics examination” to prove your deviance. If you receive emails or Facebook messages after writing an article or making a posting, are some of them aggressive or pushing for violence and seeking your involvement, your input, or your reaction to their odd suggestions? This is a sign of someone who has no fear of instigating and carrying out criminal activity because of his connections to those who would prosecute.

They aren't always bullying high pressure operators suggesting violence though. They also use the “I'm your friend” tactic to get a lonely or impoverished person or substance addicted person to nod his head or parrot the provocateur's statements or to at least get the target to mumble something like “uh-huh” during an uncomfortable silence in a beer-drinking session after the provocateur has verbally mapped out a dastardly plan. That minimal recorded “uh-huh” has been the tool used against many, supposedly proving the defendant's “buy-in” to the conspiracy.

As a final comment, most countries in the world do not allow agent provocateur activity. It is expressly prohibited. Rather, it is an established legal principle that a lying government agent involved in criminal activity misrepresenting himself to the other parties cannot be excluded as a defendant in any criminal conspiracy that is charged as a result of his action. Otherwise, the validity of the assent of the private parties to the conspiracy, or the existence of the conspiracy itself, would be in question. Being a lying provocateur is not an acceptable court defense in those places for state actors who arrange to ship drugs, blow people up, shoot people, etc. The U.S. is not one of those places.

David Hathaway [send him mail] is a former supervisory DEA Agent. He is a cowboy and aficionado of Latin America where he has lived and traveled extensively. He is a homeschooling father of nine children and maintains the website charityendureth.com."

BIG BROTHER WATCH

Emma Carr

The Intelligence Services Commissioner's Oversight Is Weak and Unaccountable

The Intelligence Services Commissioner has released his annual report (pdf) which highlights a high number of times individuals' privacy was breached due to a series of errors. However, with only 17% of warrants being checked by the Commissioner, serious questions have also been raised about how thorough his investigations can actually be.

It is not unfair to suggest that at present the oversight by the Commissioner is weak and his accountability to Parliament and the public is almost none existent. A part time Commissioner with only one member of staff cannot reasonably provide adequate oversight of the use of intrusive surveillance powers. As the Home Affairs Select Committee recently pointed out, the Commissioner should be aiming to check at least 50% of warrants if the investigations are to be thorough. It is clear that the Government must urgently address the fact that the Commissioner clearly does not have enough resources to thoroughly carry out his investigations into the intelligence and security services.

Big Brother Watch Gives Evidence To Parliament

On Monday our acting director, Emma Carr, gave oral evidence to the Science and Technology Select Committee in Parliament on the topic of social media and real time analytics.

The remit of the inquiry was to look into the differences between traditional data storage systems, which were not designed for real-time analysis, and new technologies which can now provide live information and data analysis. The focus of our session was on the privacy implications that may arise from real time analytics and big data generally.

An Open Letter To The Home Secretary On The Powers Of Entry Review

We have written to the Home Secretary and her Home Office Ministers to ask why the third progress report on the review of Powers of Entry has not yet been published.

The Protection of Freedoms Act 2012 places a duty on secretaries of state to review the powers of entry they are responsible for and report back to Parliament within 2 years following Royal Assent. The

Home Office is required to provide updates on progress must be sent to Parliament every 6 months. The second progress report was published in July 2013 and the first progress report was published in January 2013, meaning the publication of the third report is now 6 months late.

Eight Out of Ten Internet Users Believe Browsing History Should Be Kept Private

New research has shown that 85% of the British public believe it is "fairly important", "very important" or "essential" to keep browsing records private. Only 12% believe it is not important.

The survey was commissioned by the Joseph Rowntree Reform Trust to mark the one year anniversary of Edward Snowden revealing the activities of UK and US intelligence agencies.

Notably, the participants of the survey also supported a recommendation made by the Don't Spy On US coalition; that senior judges rather than ministers to sign off on warrants for data collection of electronic communications, when asked where oversight of the intelligence agencies should lie.

School CCTV Footage Can Be Accessed By Smartphones and Tablets

CCTV in schools could be about to take an even creepier turn, with some systems allowing the footage to be remotely accessed from any number of smartphones, tablets and desktop computers by individuals outside of the school.

It has been reported that the Government has given the go ahead for schools to install state of the art surveillance equipment which will allow parents to be able to watch live feeds across dozens of cameras set up in classrooms, corridors and playgrounds. The move is a result of a crackdown on drug dealing and the consumption of drugs in schools.

We have long warned about the continued growth of the use of CCTV cameras, whether that be in Care Homes or in schools.

FACEBOOK IS LISTENING TO YOU. LITERALLY.

Kaytee Riek, SumOfUs.org

Facebook just announced a new feature to its app, which will let it listen to our conversations through our own phones' microphone. Talk about a Big Brother move.

Facebook says the feature will be used for harmless things, like identifying the song or TV show playing in the background, but it actually has the ability to listen to everything -- including your private conversations -- and store it indefinitely.

Not only is this move just downright creepy, it's also a massive threat to our privacy. This isn't the first time Facebook has been criticized for breaching our right to privacy, and it's hoping this feature will fly under the radar. No such luck for Facebook. If we act now, we can stop Facebook in its tracks before it has a chance to release the feature.

Tell Facebook not to release its creepy and dangerous new app feature that listens to users' conversations.

Facebook says it'll be responsible with this feature, but we know we can't trust it. After all, just a few months ago Facebook came under fire for receiving millions of dollars for working with the National Security Agency's PRISM, a wide-scale and highly controversial public electronic data surveillance program -- something its CEO Mark Zuckerberg initially denied. This is also the company that lied about its now-scuppered Beacon program -- an advertisement system that sent our "private" data from external websites to Facebook.

It seems like every few months, there's another big Facebook privacy scandal, and yet the social media giant is pushing this new app anyway. Why? The information it gathers by listening to its 1.2 billion users worldwide can be sold for huge profits to advertisers and corporations looking for better information on consumer tastes and preferences.

Facebook is acting in the best interests of its bank account, not its users. This has gone too far -- we have to stop it now.

Facebook: This is an extreme invasion of your users' privacy. Do not release this new feature, and do not listen to us through our phones' microphones.

Thanks for standing up for our right to privacy,

ANTI-SURVEILLANCE MASK LETS YOU PASS AS SOMEONE ELSE

Leslie Katz;@lesatnews

Uncomfortable with surveillance cameras? "Identity replacement tech" in the form of the Personal Surveillance Identity Prosthetic gives you a whole new face."

They're like Guy Fawkes masks that look like real people: A group wears the paper URME masks. URME Surveillance If the world starts looking like a scene from "Matrix 3" where everyone has Agent Smith's face, you can thank Leo Selvaggio. His rubber mask aimed at foiling surveillance cameras features his visage, and if he has his way, plenty of people will be sporting the Personal Surveillance Identity Prosthetic in public. It's one of three products made by the Chicago-based artist's URME Anti-surveillance mask lets you pass as someone else

"Our world is becoming increasingly surveilled. For example, Chicago has over 25,000 cameras networked to a single facial recognition hub," reads the URME (pronounced U R Me) site. "We don't believe you should be tracked just because you want to walk outside and you shouldn't have to hide either. Instead, use one of our products to present an alternative identity when in public."

The 3D-printed resin mask, made from a 3D scan of Selvaggio's face and manufactured by ThatsMyFace.com, renders his features and skin tone with surprising realism, though the eyes peeping out from the eye holes do lend a certain creepiness to the look. Creepiness is, of course, part of the point here, as the interdisciplinary artist takes a his-face-in-everyone's-face approach to exploring the impact of an increasingly networked world on personal identity.

"When you wear these devices the cameras will track me instead of you and your actions in public space will be attributed as mine because it will be me the cameras see," the artist, who's working toward his MFA at Chicago's Columbia College, says on a recently launched Indiegogo page for the products. "All URME devices have been tested for facial recognition and each properly identifies the wearer of me on Facebook, which has some of the most sophisticated facial recognition software around."

It turns out some states have anti-mask laws. And Selvaggio -- whose earlier project You Are Me let others use his social-media profiles -- says he's considered the possibility that anyone wearing his face in public could engage in illegal activity.

"I would of course like to believe that others will use these devices responsibly and I can't be clearer that I do not condone criminal activity," he told Crave. "However it is possible, and I have weighed out the possibility that a crime may become associated with me. That being said, I have come to the conclusion that it is worth the risk if it creates public discourse around surveillance practices and how it affects us all."

URME's Indiegogo campaign has so far raised a little over \$500 of its \$1,000 goal, with 36 days left. Products include a \$1 paper mask for those unable to afford the \$200 prosthetic, as well as community development hacktivist kits of 12-24 paper masks meant to be worn by groups, presumably of protesters (or anyone into clone armies).

Open-source facial-encryption software that replaces faces in video with Selvaggio's is currently in the prototype stage and will most likely go through several iterations, Selvaggio says, before eventually becoming available as a free download from the URME website. URME insists all products will be sold at cost, with no profit made and all proceeds going to sustain URME's efforts to keep surveillance in the public discourse.

"To be clear, I am not anti-surveillance," the artist told Crave. "What I am pushing for is increasing the amount of public discourse about surveillance and how it affects our behaviour in public space. When we are watched we are fundamentally changed. We perform rather than be."

Leslie Katz, Crave's senior editor, heads up a team that covers the most crushworthy (and wackiest) tech, science, and culture around. As a co-host of the now-retired CNET News Daily Podcast, she was sometimes

known to channel Terry Gross and still uses her trained "podcast voice" to bully the speech recognition software on automated customer service lines.

WHEN THE INTERNET DIES, MEET THE MESHNET THAT SURVIVES

Hal Hodson; New Scientist

If a crisis throws everyone offline, getting reconnected can be tougher than it looks, finds Hal Hodson during a test scenario in the heart of New York. In the heart of one of the most connected cities in the world, the internet has gone down. Amid the blackout, a group of New Yorkers scrambles to set up a local network and get vital information as the situation unfolds.

The scenario is part of a drill staged on 5 April in Manhattan by art and technology non-profit centre Eyebeam, and it mimics on a small scale the outage that affected New Yorkers after superstorm Sandy hit in 2012. The idea is to test whether communication networks built mostly on meagre battery power and mobile devices can be created rapidly when disaster strikes.

I'm a volunteer node in the network, and an ethernet cable runs over my shoulders into a wireless router in my left hand. It is powered by a battery in my jacket pocket.

Other routers link up with mine from a few hundred metres away. Soon I'm at the centre of a web of seven or eight nodes, connected through my smartphone. This meshnet, as it is called, is my only link to the others. The messages start coming in on my phone, flowing through an app called ChatSecure, built by the Guardian Project, a group of developers who design software for private communication. The app enables peer-to-peer communication between devices that are networked, but that don't necessarily have an internet connection.

Building a mesh is fiddly and slow – even downloading ChatSecure involved using near field communication to establish a radio connection between nearby smartphones. I got my app from Hans-Christoph Steiner of the Guardian Project. In the absence of app stores like Google Play and the Apple store, other useful apps were made available through a hacked version of the app market software F-Droid, which let each person's phone act as a server so others could connect and download what they need.

One of the network engineers running the drill hurries up and down West 21st Street with a laptop, monitoring the signal strength between each router, adjusting our positions to optimise the network. As the mesh gets larger and people start sending chat messages and pictures back to base through the network, the router in my hand heats up. It's a cool feeling, though, to be exchanging data without the help of Comcast, Verizon or Google.

The Wi-Fi routers we are using and the software that binds them into a mesh are part of a networking toolkit called Commotion, developed by the Open Technology Institute (OTI) in Washington DC. This drill is not their first mesh though.

When superstorm Sandy hit the Brooklyn neighbourhood of Red Hook and the power went down, the OTI already had an experimental meshnet in place. The US Federal Emergency Management Agency managed to plug its high-bandwidth satellite uplink into it and instantly provided connectivity to the community and the Red Cross relief organisation.

"Immediately after the storm, people came to the Red Hook Initiative because they knew it was a place where they could get online and reach out to their families," says Georgia Bullen of the OTI. The institute added more routers to the network to boost its range over the following three weeks while the power was out.

Without as much time to work out the kinks, the Manhattan meshnet isn't as stable as Red Hook's – the tall buildings interfere with the Wi-Fi signal, making connectivity sketchy. But the situation mirrors the challenges a meshnet might face as people struggle to get it up and running in a crisis.

The experiment also shows that digital communication is possible without big technology

companies and governments – something that could be handy if a regime decided to shut down the internet to quell dissent, as happened in Egypt in 2011. "Why do we need to go through the centralised, expensive communications system?" asks Ryan Gerety of the OTI. "Maybe we should go back to the state of the internet when a lot of the work was more local."

ENCRYPTION FOR BEGINNERS IN AN ERA OF TOTAL SURVEILLANCE

@AnonyOdinn; Cyberguerrilla

(If you are actually going to try some of this, it is best going through to the item on the Cyberguerilla site, which has additional advice and instructions which cannot be sensibly reproduced here - Ed)

Disney, NSA, Madison Avenue, DARPA, Pentagon...all the same folks at a certain level synthesizing surveillance and social engineering.

If you've read the news lately, you've pretty much caught the drift of what's going on. Surveillance is fast spreading to become a universal problem, governments are becoming the largest sponsors and purchasers of intrusive malware, and for all intents and purposes, all so-called "secure" systems are, simply put, not secure – at least not from governmental intrusion, and certainly not from the steady increase of corporate intrusion – a growing problem in a world where the concept of an open and free net is more at risk than ever.

The purpose of this simple tutorial is to provide some encryption for beginners. No lies here, the process of setting up software that helps protect your privacy, is not as easy as just using facebook or installing an ordinary browser. It takes a little (but not much) work. Fortunately, you don't need to have any technical skill at all in order to set up and use these tools. The guidance is here for you. The purpose of programs which provide good encryption, with off-the-record communication, is to provide you with privacy you deserve. This is needed for ordinary people. Even the people at NASA, should consider using these tools: They are two examples of people who have been taken offline by copyright robots that auto-detected "violations" of a NASA Mars Curiosity Rover youtube stream and took them offline. Does having gmail help you? It wasn't enough for General Petraeus to hide his intimate affairs with Broadwell: If it can happen to them, It can happen to you too. But – not if you are using good encryption tools and software that hides your "address" online. To do this: You need simple tools that facilitate privacy, security, and a certain level of anonymity to help avoid problems from happening to you. This will help you do that.

This is not a tutorial on hacking. This is simply about maintaining your privacy.

A couple of points before you proceed. No system is perfect — the following recommendations are good, but are not guaranteed to protect you perfectly in every circumstance. The level of encryption and protection of your privacy provided below is designed to protect you from most corporations and governments most of the time. It is said, "most of the time," because security is never guaranteed – you yourself must determine your appropriate level of security and ensure that your communication (and by extension, yourself) are kept safe.

If you are a journalist, or if you have special reason to believe you may be the subject of an active investigation due to your being named in a pending case or other similar matter, you should take other precautions, including reducing your online exposure when you are active in the field. If you fall into one of those categories, consider seeking a professional consultation with a computer security firm that can provide you with services tailored to protect you in a way that is particular to your needs and situation. Shop around. None will be specifically recommended for you here. For general recommendations and thoughts on various subjects, see the school of privacy.

Let's Begin

Grab a pen and paper (or just open up a pad on your screen. Now go to the IP check of School of Privacy and make a note of what you see, save the result. This will be important for later.

The Tor Project

Perhaps you've heard of this. The TOR project, simply put, will be a new browser for you to install which will help anonymize your online activity. Basically it helps hide the address where you reside online while you are active online. There's not much to it. Just install the browser.

However, if you are installing TOR in Ubuntu, please read [Installing Tor on Ubuntu \(Tutorial for N00bs\)](#) all the way through. It is recommended to leave general entry/exit up to the Tor anonymizing network. If you ever have to troubleshoot TOR or deal with a problem you encounter with TOR on the fly, this is an excellent resource. Do not wait until you have problems to read this. Read it now, it may save you trouble already. Firefox users and those using proxies in particular.

The Tor Project: Tor Tails

This is a part of the TOR project you can use on a computer if you don't want to install TOR but if you do want to run TOR to partially anonymize your online activity. This is helpful if you need to run TOR on a workstation you are not normally doing your thing on. TOR tails runs from a USB stick or a DVD or CD. That's right, you don't have to install it on your computer.

Tails is a complete operating system (it does not just include TOR). You can do everything in Tails based on the USB you have it on, and it won't 'remember' anything. If attempting to use it in tandem with Pidgin/OTR check your settings (see rest of tutorial below) to ensure they are in place.

Start Fresh

Make sure you have TOR running before doing this step.

Check your IP again at that link you visited in the first step "Let's Begin".

Does it still show your IP address? It should not anymore.

Also check if your TOR is working.

Check your TOR settings.

Recheck until you are no longer revealing your IP address to that site.

Once that's done, Obtain (create) an e-mail address that is not connected to your name or any of your social profiles. Do not use the password that you use for anything else and do not use your name or any part of your name when creating the e-mail address. If using this e-mail address to create a social profile, ensure that the new social profile name does not have anything to do with your real name. Come up with something different. If you don't want to use an e-mail address for very long, Google the search term: temporary e-mails

Find a site on the list of results. Create e-mail address(es) for yourself as needed.

Install Pidgin or Adium

To communicate off the record in an encrypted way, you should utilize either Pidgin (OTR) if on Windows / PC or Adium, if on Mac. While it's good to use this Pidgin or Adium alone, if you are using one of these while also running TOR, even better – you are working to hide your IP address while also communicating in an encrypted, off the record fashion. (Do not utilize Skype or similar software for private communication, as the communications from that software are logged through central servers. Consider limiting to a minimum (or stop) any communication you are doing through facebook, as this is not a secure way to communicate ~ "private messages" are not private in that system. Twitter is considered reasonably secure for communication as the company has a good record of protecting user privacy, however, its 'private' direct messages are increasingly viewed by government due to surveillance techniques including National Security Letters, administrative subpoenas, and warrantless surveillance. Minimize your direct messaging or delete those direct messages that you have sent once the conversation is complete. This is not a method of avoiding surveillance, it is simply a recommendation.)

Pidgin and Adium work in a true peer to peer manner in which the encrypted communication does not involve any intermediary service pulling (logging) your data in order to complete the process of communication.

Currently it is recommended that of the many servers you could utilize, that you avoid the following until further notice:

jabber.ccc.de

xmpp.jp

When you create your username, create a name that has nothing to do with your e-mail address or any of your social media accounts nor should it be anything at all like your actual name.

It is important you follow the instruction and select the XMPP option in order to maximize privacy and ensure proper setup.

It is not recommended that you use jabber.org for the setup, instead use servers which are known not to log your activity, for example, dukgo.com

To ensure that the server you use does not log your activity, after setup is complete, go into options, and make sure you go into Preferences (in Pidgin), similar in menu in Adium, and uncheck everything under the Logging tab, so that there will never be any logging based on your preferences from the program's activity.

Then, go to the Proxy tab and configure for TOR/Privacy (SOCKS5) selection. It's a dropdown menu item.

Enter 127.0.0.1 for the host

Enter 9050 for the port

Leave user/pass blank

Go to Accounts, Manage Accounts, click on your account, click Modify

Check under the advanced tab and see if it is set up properly in the Connect Server area. (ignore the riseup stuff in the File Transfer Proxies area unless you are using a riseup account with it)

If you are using TOR with Adium and a Riseup account you need to read this. In fact, if you are using TOR with Adium, even if you are not a Riseup user, read that. If you are an Adium user you will find your way through this process in the Proxy area with the SOCKS5 setting.

If you've installed Pidgin you want to make sure you get the OTR extension. This is critical to your security. Your communications will not be private in Pidgin without it. You can get it here. Once you've downloaded it, go into the Tools menu, then Plugins, find Off-The-Record messaging, and make sure it's checked. You are good now.

This isn't necessary for Adium users as the OTR (off the record) feature is already incorporated into Adium. However, if you are an Adium user (on Macs), it is important you turn off your Growl. Your Growl being on will cause information leakage and compromise your privacy.

More info on Pidgin, etc., is available here. However, it is recommended that the instructions above be followed for best security.

Once you've added a buddy you want to start a private conversation with a buddy using the OTR tab if in Pidgin or just start a conversation with a buddy if in Adium. If you are in Adium, make sure your menu settings are set to Initiate Encrypted OTR Chat every time. (There is a "lock" that should show as locked closed that confirms this.)

If you are in Pidgin, IMPORTANT, you must take the additional step of following these instructions.

Ask the person you are connecting with to authenticate so that you and that person share information back and forth. If it is the fingerprint of each other you share, or if you ask each other questions that only each of you could answer, make sure that those answers are shared between you only outside of the Pidgin / Adium environment (in person, or via twitter DM, etc). This ensures that you know the person actually is who they say they are.

At this point with TOR and Pidgin or Adium configured all together you are able to communicate with encryption, off the record, and without disclosing your "IP" – your computer's address – to the network. This is the level that most people should be at to protect their private communication.

The Final Layer

VPNs (Virtual Private Networks) are another option, another layer you can add (if you choose). This will likely require that you tweak settings in your Pidgin or Adium, but try it just the way it is already set up and see how it works once you add a VPN. (You may need to adjust your Pidgin / Adium settings based on the VPN setup.) Here are some examples of recommended VPNs. (You'll want to stick with ones that don't log and that allow for you to pay in bitcoin should you so choose, for best anonymity)

Due to laws and extraordinary surveillance going on from the United States we recommend when you set up your VPN once the service is up, select from the list of servers and pick ones that are outside the United States. Servers in Czech Republic or alternately in Romania are recommended due to their minimal to zero data retention laws and their Constitutional decisions which have struck down attempts at data retention.

Java Anon Proxy is not yet ready for use and is not recommended at this time.

Have fun out there – and stay safe!

THIS COMPANY WANTS TO MAKE YOUR DNA UNTRACEABLE

Kwame Opamon; The Verge

As the scope of the NSA's bulk surveillance program becomes all too clear, less attention has been paid to the issues surrounding genetic information and surveillance. BioGenFutures, a new company-cum-art-project launched by information artist Heather Dewey-Hagborg, hopes to bring DNA surveillance back to the fore. The company just announced a product it calls "Invisible," which endeavors to make it harder for authorities to trace left-behind DNA evidence back to people. Not only is the product actually launching to consumers, but Dewey-Hagborg believes solutions of its kind will be commonplace within five years.

Back in 2012, Dewey-Hagborg premiered "Stranger Visions" at New York City's Eyebeam lab. At the time, that project focused on how the physical traces we leave behind in everyday spaces — saliva, skin, and hair follicles — can become liabilities if regulations aren't put in place to restrict how that genetic data is mined. "I was just really disturbed but also preoccupied by this emerging possibility of genetic surveillance," she told The Verge. "It just struck me that we were having a national dialogue about electronic surveillance, but this form of biological surveillance isn't being discussed." "Invisible" expands on that work by imagining a future wherein discrimination based on genetics is an everyday fear.

"Invisible" comes with two sprays, both of which can be combined to keep your identity safe from those sifting for it. The first, "Erase," is essentially a lab cleaning agent that can allegedly destroy 99.5 percent of trace materials. The second, "Replace," covers up the remaining .5 percent with DNA material from other sources. Dewey-Hagborg calls it high security in spray form.

"Don't let them judge you based on your DNA."

Of course, the work itself is knowingly informed by art, and draws on theatrical hyperbole in illustrating the quasi-dystopian future that could conceivably call for ways to erase traces of your DNA. For example, one section of the site cheekily reads, "Dinner with the prospective in-laws going smoothly? Don't let them judge you based on your DNA, be invisible." Nonetheless, Dewey-Hagborg cites the passage of the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act (GINA) in 2008 and the more recent case of the NYPD trying and failing to link Occupy Wall Street activists to a murder using DNA evidence in 2012 as examples of the powers-that-be taking more assured steps into genetics and reasons for why citizens should have the choice to make their DNA harder to track. BioGenFutures will release "Invisible" to the market sometime this June, after which Dewey-Hagborg and her company will test out how consumers feel about the idea. "I think, basically, this is just the beginning," she says. "This is my first prototype. These issues will only continue to emerge and become a part of our everyday lives."

Source: BioGenFutures

WIRELESS MICROCHIP IMPLANT SET FOR HUMAN TRIALS

Nicholas West; Activist Post

Once again, it seems that yesterday's conspiracy theory is today's news.

However, the signposts have been there all along. Microchip implants to track pets and livestock and the elderly are now widely available, while microchipping kids is not far off. Extensive animal testing has been conducted on monkeys to enable them to control devices via brain-computer interface. Edible

"smart pill" microchips have been embraced as a way to correctly monitor patient dosages and vital signs.

In the name of health and security - always the dynamic duo for introducing the next level of science fiction into everyday reality - a new wirelessly powered implant a fraction the size of a penny, as seen above, promises to offer a whole new ease of medical monitoring and drug delivery.

Futurist and a director of engineering, Ray Kurzweil, has discussed at length the imminent Human Body 2.0, which will incorporate medical nanobots that can deliver drugs to specific cells and also identify certain genetic markers by using fluorescent labelling. Once these nanobots have entered the body, Kurzweil indicates that they could then connect our brains directly to Cloud computing systems. Most significantly, Kurzweil states:

It will be an incremental process, one already well under way. Although version 2.0 is a grand project, ultimately resulting in the radical upgrading of all our physical and mental systems, we will implement it one benign step at a time. Based on our current knowledge, we can already touch and feel the means for accomplishing each aspect of this vision.

The wireless microchip is one of those "benign" steps. Using a technology called "mid-field wireless transfer" researchers from Stanford, as reported in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, seem to have solved the problem of how to provide a low-consumption power source that can wirelessly recharge implantable microchips. They cite a range of benefits:

(The)work could lead to programmable microimplants like sensors that monitor vital functions, electrostimulators that alter neural signals in the brain, and drug delivery systems that apply medicine directly where needed. All without the bulk of batteries and recharging systems required today. So far, the wireless charging system has been tested in a pig and also used to power a pacemaker in a rabbit. The next step is human trials. Should those prove successful, it will likely take a few years before the system is authorized for commercial usage.

To those who have not looked into the issue of microchipped humans, this might sound all well and good within the realm of medicine. However, if we have learned one thing about sci-tech, it always has a tendency to spread - especially in an age of ubiquitous surveillance amid "security threats" of every stripe.

We can see the propaganda push beginning within corporate media that, indeed, microchips will not be limited in scope. As reported by Michael Snyder, a recent BBC article entitled "Why I Want a Microchip Implant" hides nothing in where this is all likely to lead:

Ultimately, implanted microchips offer a way to make your physical body machine-readable.

Currently, there is no single standard of communicating with the machines that underpin society – from building access panels to ATMs – but an endless diversity of identification systems: magnetic strips, passwords, PIN numbers, security questions, and dongles. All of these are attempts to bridge the divide between your digital and physical identity, and if you forget or lose them, you are suddenly cut off from your bank account, your gym, your ride home, your proof of ID, and more. An implanted chip, by contrast, could act as our universal identity token for navigating the machine-regulated world.

Beyond the clear privacy and health implications of literally opening up your body to security breaches - as all computerized systems are now known to have gaping holes - there is the question of radiation. The Stanford researchers insist that this "breakthrough discovery in wireless power requires roughly as much energy as a cell phone and exposes subjects to radiation levels well below the threshold for human safety," but an increasing number of studies show that cell phones and wireless technology are a grave threat to human health. Here are some of those sources:

- 34 Scientific Studies Showing Adverse Health Effects From Wi-Fi
- New Studies Show Health Risks From Wireless Technology
- Cell Phone Industry Beats Public Health Concern in Maine
- Mobile phones can cause brain tumours, court rules.
- Neuroscientist Exposes Dangers of Electromagnetic Fields

And not only a threat to humans. It is now being shown that birds lose their internal compass in environments polluted with various electromagnetic fields. It is also commonly thought that bees, dolphins and other animals are highly sensitive to electromagnetic radiation.

Lastly, we can never discount the role of the military anywhere within science, as most of what we see trickle into the consumer realm comes from military-funded labs like those at DARPA. And what we see there is not very comforting.

The U.S. military has been looking for ways to create super soldiers who are resistant to diseases and bioattacks through microchipping. Then we have DARPA's investigations into Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation as a form of remote mind control that would be made vastly easier through a tiny wireless brain implant.

One thing is for certain, Ray Kurzweil's Human Body 2.0 is being worked on as we speak. The only thing left to wonder is who will be in control of it?

DARKCOIN: THE CRYPTOCURRENCY PUTTING PRIVACY FIRST

Guy Bentley; via Activist Post

One of the newest cryptocurrencies has been experiencing a surge in recent days.

Created on 18 January 2014, Darkcoin has seen its price jump from \$1.65 last Thursday to \$2.58 today, while its market capitalisation has boomed from less than \$7m to more than \$11m.

This new cryptocurrency has not been created to lower transactions costs or provide a protection against inflation.

Darkcoin has instead been invented with privacy at its heart.

Many mistakenly believe that Bitcoin provides a high level of anonymity. In reality, Bitcoin users have to go to great lengths to secure a reasonable level of privacy.

The man behind Darkcoin, developer and resident of Phoenix Arizona Evan Duffield, explained to Simone Brunozzi why he decided to invent the digital currency:

I believe the central problem with Bitcoin is that the public ledger, although a remarkable accomplishment, also allows a gross invasion of personal privacy by permanently listing all transactions the users have ever done publicly.

So far it seems to be succeeding, with over 4m Darkcoins in circulation. The factor pulling digital currency enthusiasts toward Darkcoin is that individuals can make transactions without being seen on the public blockchain. Darkcoin uses a system called Darksend to protect the identity of its users.

The most recent update to the system resulted in the creation of release candidate two (RC2), which provides users with near total anonymity. RC2 is in essence implementing a tumbler into Darkcoin. The coins are mixed to conceal their source. Coinbrief's Dustin O'Bryant explains:

When a user, let's call him Tim, sends darkcoins through DarkSend to another user, let's call her Sandy, he must send 10 darkcoins, even if that amount is larger than what he would like to pay her. DarkSend then puts his coins in a pool, and pauses until two additional users initiate transactions. These new users will add their own 10 darkcoins to the pool, and DarkSend blends the 30 coins into a random assortment.

If we assume that Tim wanted to send Sandy 8 darkcoins, then at this point 8 darkcoins would be deposited into Sandy's wallet, but those 8 coins would be a mix of coins from all 3 users that had initiated transactions. Tim's remaining 2 coins are placed into a Random Pool Address (RPA) which was created during the transaction. This RPA is not tied to any user, thus it is impossible to connect to a specific user, but Tim can access it.

This process is also happening for the other two users, so it is impossible to identify which transaction was undertaken by a specific user. The system is similar to Dark Wallet's CoinJoin, the difference being that it uses a distributed collection of servers around its network that negotiate CoinJoin's multiparty payments.

Duffield has praised the Dark Wallet project, pioneered by crypto-anarchists Cody Wilson and Amir Taaki, but said "it's not a completely decentralised approach".

Like Bitcoin, Darkcoin is based on the proof-of-work system but with a twist. Instead of using

the Secure Hash Algorithm (SHA) 256 it uses 11 rounds of different hashing functions. Duffield is treating Darkcoin as an open source project and plans to spend the next two years working on Darkcoin full time.

TAFTA/TTIP: WHAT ARE THE BENEFITS? WHAT ARE THE COSTS?

Glyn Moody; Techdirt; via Critical Thinking

As we draw near to the conclusion of TAFTA/TTIP's first year of negotiations, the detailed differences are starting to emerge between the US and EU. But one thing they both take for granted is that it's a good idea. "Good" in this context is essentially about money: the argument is that concluding a trade deal between the US and EU will boost both their economies, increase companies' profits, create employment and generally make people better off. Of course, since all of those are in the future, the only way to justify those kind of claims is to model the likely effects of TTIP on the various economies -- of the US, EU and rest of the world.

That's precisely what a study entitled "Reducing Transatlantic Barriers to Trade and Investment; An Economic Assessment" aimed to do (pdf). Although it's not the only study, it's indubitably the most quoted -- its figures crop up in most articles about the benefits of TAFTA/TTIP. That's largely because it was paid for by the European Commission, and therefore forms the "official" predictions of the benefits that are likely to flow from the agreement:

An ambitious and comprehensive transatlantic trade and investment agreement could bring significant economic gains as a whole for the EU (€119/\$165 billion a year) and US (€95/\$131 billion a year). This translates to an extra €545/\$750 in disposable income each year for a family of 4 in the EU, on average, and €655/\$910.

Usually, those figures are repeated without further comment or analysis. That's unfortunate, because there are a number of important assumptions behind them. For example, the use of the phrase "ambitious and comprehensive" is no mere rhetorical flourish: it refers to the most optimistic scenario considered in the study -- in other words, the best-case outcome. Significantly, it not only assumes that all remaining tariffs will be removed -- since these are already low (around 4%), the benefit from doing so is slight -- but also many "non-tariff barriers", economist-speak for regulations and standards. Of course, what industry regards as "barriers", citizens may see more as protections.

The other fact that is almost never mentioned is that the Commission's figures quoted above all refer to 2027, and are the predicted gains from TAFTA/TTIP after it has been in place for 10 years. Leaving aside the difficulty of predicting the US and EU economies in 2027, it also means that the claimed increases in GDP -- 0.39% for the US, and 0.48% for the EU -- are cumulative gains over ten years, and amount to less than 0.05% extra GDP added per year.

Those figures not only refer to the "ambitious and comprehensive" scenario -- in other words, they are an upper bound on what is likely to be obtained -- but also fail to take into account key costs associated with the changes that TAFTA/TTIP would bring about. It's perhaps not surprising that the European Commission's own analysis does not include these -- after all, they reduce the already-small benefits yet further. But clearly, in considering whether to proceed with TTIP, politicians and the public need to have the full picture, and that includes the likely costs as well as the likely benefits.

Fortunately, estimates for those costs have now been produced in some new research. It has been commissioned by the Confederal Group of the European United Left/Nordic Green Left (GUE/NGL) political group in the European Parliament. That group has an obvious political agenda, but then so does the European Commission. What's important is to have a range of analyses of the benefits and costs of TAFTA/TTIP so as to be able to form an overall, independent opinion drawing on them all.

The report "Assessing the Claimed Benefits of the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership" (pdf) offers a critical analysis not just of the European Commission's study, but of three others too. It examines their underlying econometric models in great detail to expose the assumptions made and data used. Here's its summary:

All of the four scrutinized studies report small, but positive effects on GDP, trade flows and real wages in the EU. GDP and real wage increases are however estimated by most studies to range from 0.3 to 1.3 %, even in the most optimistic liberalization scenarios. These changes refer to a level change within 10 to 20 years (!), annual GDP growth during this transition period would thus amount to 0.03 to 0.13 % at most.

That confirms that the very low GDP boost from TTIP, as predicted by the European Commission's study, is also a feature of the others. That's interesting for economists, but for non-specialists the new report's chief virtue is that for the first time it estimates the likely costs of TTIP. It points out that there are several major classes of these, largely ignored in the four studies considered:

Adjustment costs are mostly neglected or downplayed in the TTIP studies. This refers in particular to macroeconomic adjustment costs, which can come in the form of (i) changes to the current account balance, (ii) losses to public revenues, and (iii) changes to the level of unemployment.

These are costs associated with the changes brought about by TAFTA/TTIP. For example, removing tariff barriers necessarily reduces the income received by governments; the GUE/NGL study considers this in various scenarios, and comes up with a cost over 10 years of around €30/\$40 bn for the EU economy. Costs are not calculated for the US, unfortunately, but it is likely that a similar figure would apply there too.

There are also significant labour adjustment costs, as some industries take on new workers, while others make them redundant. The report estimates these at around €10/\$14 bn over the first ten years of TTIP. There will also be concomitant losses as a result of lower income tax and social security contributions from those who lose their jobs -- another €7/\$10 bn.

That makes a total of €47/\$64 bn. On top of that, there are two other important classes of costs. One is those arising out of corporate sovereignty payments. These can reach billions of euros/dollars per award, and are likely to become common given that there are 75,000 companies that could use an ISDS chapter in TTIP to sue the US or EU. The amount potentially involved is hard to quantify at this stage, as are the associated "social costs" of removing non-tariff barriers:

the elimination of [non-tariff barriers] will result in a potential welfare loss to society, in so far as this elimination threatens public policy goals (e.g. consumer safety, public health, environmental safety), which are not taken care of by some other measure or policy. Though subject to considerable insecurity, these types of adjustment costs might be substantial, and require careful case-by-case analysis. As we will see in the following, although the social costs of regulatory change are of particular relevance for the analysis of TTIP because of its emphasis of regulation issues, they have not been dealt with properly by the four scrutinized TTIP studies.

In other words, the cost of removing or harmonizing regulations and standards is not fully included in the calculation of whether TAFTA/TTIP is worth pursuing. Once again, that reveals that TTIP is currently seen purely through the optic of business -- whether profits are increased, not whether society must pay a corresponding, or even higher, price to make that possible.

While some will doubtless argue about the details of the new GUE/NGL analysis, it has the valuable function of reminding us that TAFTA/TTIP is not just about corporate profits, but also concerns the 800 million people who make up the citizenry of the US and EU. Until they are included in the equation, and their potential losses and gains factored in, any claims about TTIP's "benefits" -- even the tiny ones that the European Commission's analysis comes up with in its "ambitious and comprehensive" agreement -- must be regarded as simplistic, one-sided and incomplete.

Follow me @glynmoody on Twitter or identi.ca, and +glynmoody on Google

CONTRARY TO POPULAR AND ACADEMIC BELIEF, ADAM SMITH DID NOT ACCEPT INEQUALITY AS A NECESSARY TRADE-OFF FOR A MORE PROSPEROUS ECONOMY

Deborah Boucoyannis; London School of Economics; via Obi; Occupy

The assumption that Adam Smith accepted inequality as the necessary trade-off for a more prosperous economy is wrong, writes Deborah Boucoyannis. In reality, Smith's system precluded steep inequalities not out of a normative concern with equality but by virtue of the design that aimed to maximise the wealth of nations. Much like many progressive critics of current inequality, Smith targets rentier practices by the rich and powerful as distorting economic outcomes.

Inequality is widely accepted as inevitable today, with disagreement confined to the desirability of redistributive action, its extent, and the role of government in the process. It is taken for granted even by the most progressive (and contentious) calls for high taxation on the top income earners, which aim to mitigate its effects.

But why has inequality been naturalized? This is where influential master-narratives of the market are so consequential in shaping public beliefs—from the 1970s anti-tax narratives that frame government intervention as a violation of free market principles to the original text that defined market discourse, the *Wealth of Nations* itself. Adam Smith is assumed even by his most progressive interpreters to have accepted inequality as the necessary trade-off for a more prosperous economy. This is, in fact, the default assumption.

But the assumption is wrong. As I show in my article, the building blocks of Smith's economic system do not allow the concentration of wealth—not due to normative constraints, but to how the blocks are set up in his theory to maximize the “wealth of nations.” Further, even in neo-classical economics, in a competitive economy with no entry barriers, profits should decline over the long term, so profit concentration is not an equilibrium prediction. Yet high firm profits, for instance, are treated as a sign of economic success that have to be sustained over time. These tensions have never been conclusively settled in economics.

Only recently have we seen a powerful position staked out on the need to avoid such inequalities from arising in the first place, and to implement “market reforms that encourage a more equal distribution of economic power and rewards even before government collects taxes or pays out benefits.” This is the idea of “pre-distribution,” advanced by the American political scientist Jacob Hacker and incorporated in the new Labour agenda for policy. It remains a programmatic position, however, a prescription of how the market should be structured to ensure more equal outcomes. It could thus easily be identified as purely a normative position with an egalitarian goal—two elements, however, that non-progressives will reflexively reject.

The important point about Smith's system, on the other hand, is that it precluded steep inequalities not out of a normative concern with equality but by virtue of the design that aimed to maximize wealth. Once we put the building blocks of his system together, concentration of wealth simply cannot emerge. In Smith, profits should be low and labour wages high, legislation in favour of the worker is “always just and equitable,” land should be distributed widely and evenly, inheritance laws should partition fortunes, taxation can be high if it is equitable, and the science of the legislator is necessary to thwart rentiers and manipulators. Political theorists and economists have highlighted some of these points, but the counterfactual “what would the distribution of wealth be if all the building blocks were ever in place?” has not been posed. Doing so encourages us to question why steep inequality is accepted as a fact, instead of a pathology that the market economy was not supposed to generate in the first place.

The key principles of Smith's system work against the concentration of wealth—they also speak to the top issues in economic policy today: profits, taxes, and the minimum wage. First, Smith thought high profits denoted economic pathology. The rate of profit, he said, was “always highest in the countries

which are going fastest to ruin.” The record-breaking corporate profits during the current crisis would not have surprised him. This pathology was not simply a symptom of mercantilism, but resulted from the incentives on the economic groups living by profit alone.

Unlike Ricardo, Smith believed the interests of profit-seekers were structurally and thus permanently “directly opposite to that of the great body of the people,” because “the rate of profit does not, like rent and wages, rise with the prosperity, and fall with the declension of the society. On the contrary, it is naturally low in rich, and high in poor countries” (with a few exceptions, especially new economies). Accordingly, when the economy is sound, wealth concentration should not occur. Only when profit-seekers have rigged the system through legislation do concentrations occur. Throughout, as I show, Smith states his expectation that fortunes would, indeed, not be high and that in any case they were prone to dissipation. Such a system cannot generate steep inequality.

Wages, at the same time, should rise with increased wealth. On this basis, Smith defends adequate labour wages, which had to be at least sufficient to provide the “necessaries,” covering lodging, food and clothes, the latter tailored to middle-class comforts. This baseline appears minimal, yet it provides for more than is covered by the contemporary minimum wage. In fact, a crude calculation suggests that Smith’s principles would set the wage floor at about \$25,000, more than double its current level. Moreover, high wage levels should occur naturally. Wages are only lowered artificially, through state intervention, because of the sophistry of merchants and manufacturers who are much more adroit in manipulating legislatures to pass laws in their favour. Moreover, employers enjoy a bargaining advantage over workers and can coerce them to accept worse terms, because they need individual workers less than individual workers need employment. It is no surprise Marx was an admirer. Wages are not the simple product of supply and demand in Smith; bargaining asymmetries are key.

Taxation is perhaps the most contentious topic today, with prescriptions of punitive levels as the main instrument applied to reverse inequality. As such, it is seen as a distorting intervention in the market and a departure from “free market” principles. Smith did not prescribe punitive taxation, but what is missed is that he praised the British tax system though it imposed double per capita taxes than the French. Yet, “The people of France...are much more oppressed by taxes than the people of Great Britain.” Why? Because taxes were less equitably distributed, falling disproportionately on the poor.

A fair distribution of taxation was key to the soundness of the English economy in Smith. The rich, he claimed, should be taxed “something more than in proportion” to their wealth. “The inequality of the worst kind” was when taxes must “fall much heavier upon the poor than upon the rich.” The reasons were not moral. Bad taxes were simply bad economics.

Taxes on necessities, first of all, afflicted hardship on the poor, but burdened far more the misguided employer who demanded them, as he would inevitably have to raise wages for workers to afford those staples. Taxing luxuries, by contrast, did no harm and it was an added bonus that it fell “heaviest on the rich.” Carriages, for instance, should not be taxed by weight, as this burdened the poor carrying bulk goods more than the rich transporting light luxury goods. In this way, “the indolence and vanity of the rich is made to contribute in a very easy manner to the relief of the poor, by rendering cheaper the transportation of heavy goods.” Trade thus prospered.

Smith’s overarching point was this: taxes were bad only when they undermined the productive use of capital. But taxation should be used to discourage unproductive economic activities. Landlords, for instance, charged tenants large fines for lease renewals, rather than raise the monthly rent. This is usually “the expedient of a spend-thrift, who for a sum of ready money sells a future revenue of much greater value.” It is “hurtful to the landlord,” frequently to the tenant, but always to the community. So it should be taxed at a higher rate. A tax upon house-rents would also “in general fall heaviest upon the rich,” a welcome outcome, since rent was an unproductive expense; when high, it was simply a luxury. And when Smith advocated against a tax, it was for pragmatic reasons, as with taxing capital: capital holdings could never be verified and could always flee the country, so taxing them was counter-productive. But ground-rents should be taxable, as “Nothing can be more reasonable than that a fund which owes its existence to the good government of the state” should be taxed more than in proportion to its benefit.

So who was to blame for bad taxes and bad policies? Smith revelled in showing how “those who live by profit,” namely the merchants and manufacturers, the dealers and bankers, habitually mislead the public, often by imposing higher taxes on the workers—foolishly not realizing that ultimately they would bear the real cost. They were also responsible for convincing gullible parliaments that high wages were bad. Legislators should always beware of the sophistries of employers, who, for instance, blame rising wages, yet “say nothing concerning the bad effects of high profits. They are silent with regard to the pernicious effects of their own gains. They complain only of those of other people.”

Much like many progressive critics of current inequality, like Stiglitz, Krugman, Hacker and Pierson and others, Smith targets rentier practices by the rich and powerful as distorting economic outcomes.

And although he strongly criticizes some regulation, I show that it is regulation favouring the rich and powerful that he attacks. The concern with the welfare of the labouring poor is palpable throughout the book. As is the awareness of “the insolent outrage of furious and disappointed monopolists” that endangers anyone willing to thwart them. Progressive concerns are therefore neither a departure nor a distortion of the original classical liberal vision and nor is the latter conservative: in fact, Smith encourages us to ask even more forcefully why inequality is accepted as inevitable, not out of concern with equality, but to secure the economic growth of nations, not just groups.

Note: This article gives the views of the author, and not the position of the British Politics and Policy blog, nor of the London School of Economics.

Deborah Boucoyannis is Assistant Professor at the Woodrow Wilson Department of Politics at the University of Virginia. Previously she was Lecturer in Social Studies and Olin Predoctoral Fellow at Harvard University. Her PhD is from the University of Chicago. Her interests lie in the historical and theoretical foundations of liberalism. Her personal site is <http://dboucoyannis.weebly.com/>

POSTIVE MONEY BULLETIN

Ben Dyson; Positive Money Team

In less than 12 months, the UK will have another general election and potentially a new Prime Minister. Whichever party wins the election, they'll have to deal with all the problems that the current debt-based money system has caused. They'll need to find solutions to problems like:

the fact that we have to keep going further into debt to the banks to keep the economy growing
that the huge sums of money created by the banks have left us with the most expensive housing ever, with most people priced out and facing soaring rents
that personal and household debt is close to record highs and forecast to rise even further
rising personal and household debt means there's a greater risk of a financial crisis in the future
the gap between the very richest and everyone else growing even faster
big banks benefiting from taxpayer-funded subsidies and safety nets for big banks, socialising the losses but privatising the profits

Today we're launching a petition calling for the government to ensure the power to create money is only used in the public interest. Please add your name- it takes just 5 seconds...

To the future Prime Minister of the UK:

The same banks that caused the financial crisis currently have the power to create 97% of the UK's money. They've used this power recklessly, putting most of the money they create into property bubbles and financial markets. And now they're back to their old ways.

We need a change. The power to create money should only be used in the public interest, in a democratic, transparent and accountable way. The 1844 law that makes it illegal for anyone other than the Bank of England to create paper money should be updated to apply to the electronic money currently created by banks.

When new money is created, it should be used to fund vital public services or provide finance to businesses, creating jobs where they're needed, instead of being used to push up house prices or speculate on the financial markets.

The Vollgeld" Initiative

Exciting News from Switzerland: An Initiative for a referendum on monetary reform is starting!

In Switzerland anyone can bring about a national referendum on changes to the Constitution by collecting 100,000 signatures within an 18 month period. It's called a “people's initiative”. Our sister organisation in Switzerland (MoMo) is launching “Vollgeld Initiative” on 7th June!

‘Vollgeld’ literally means “full money” in English, and it has the same meaning as “Sovereign Money” as used by Positive Money. The ‘Vollgeld’ reform is a change in the constitution to establish the Swiss National Bank as the sole institution allowed to create money in the form of coins, bank notes and also bank deposits.

Support Sovereign Money in Switzerland

When is it starting?

After translating everything into German, French and Italian, MoMo will be able to start collecting signatures from 3rd June. The launch party "Vollstart" is being held on Saturday 7th June.

What will be the consequence in Switzerland?

If MoMo can collect the signatures in time there will be a referendum in Switzerland. That will mean all serious Swiss media will discuss the issue and politicians will also be expected to have an opinion on the debate. After this referendum, regardless of result, all adults in Switzerland will have come across the arguments for and against money reform. If the referendum is successful, then Switzerland will implement money reform!

What will be the consequence internationally?

Swiss referenda are usually reported in all of the more serious newspapers across Europe. It is likely that outside of Switzerland as well as inside, economists, politicians, central bankers and the general public will widely discuss the issues. We're hoping it might just be the catalyst for change in other countries!

Where can I get more information?

See the website vollgeld-initiative.ch, where you can find information in German, French and Italian (and a brief explanation in English). The main principles are the same as those on the Positive Money website.

You can help too even if you are not Swiss citizen

One way to help would be to donate. MoMo (Monetäre Modernisierung) need many people on the streets explaining what it's all about and collecting signatures, and at the moment all of them are volunteers. They would like to pay for two people to work full-time coordinating the campaign. There are costs to get the signatures validated, and for campaign materials (flyers etc.), distribution etc. This will cost about 500,000 Swiss Francs (£330,000) in total. (Aside: Hardly any Swiss initiatives have been successful with less than around 500,000 Swiss francs). To date they have about 200,000 Francs donated. If you were able to support this initiative, it could just make all the difference to bringing this important referendum to Switzerland, and perhaps even become the catalyst for monetary reform in other countries.

To use online banking, the details are: IBAN: CH61 0900 0000 6035 4546 4, SWIFTBIC or BIC: POFICHBEXXX (For anyone needing help making larger donations, please ring Emma on her English number: 07958458386 or email at emma.dawnay@gmail.com)

More from the Blog

Why we can't leave the power to create money in the hands of banks or regulators (Open Democracy)

The Ecologist: Making money – the state must reclaim its sovereign rights

News from Italy – Positive Money ideas presented at the second largest book fair in Europe

Mortgaged Future

Keiser Report: What would the economy and banking system look like with Positive Money

Quantitative Easing vs Sovereign Money Creation (Infographic)

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