



The Solari Report

May 9, 2019

Technocracy With Patrick Wood



Catherine Austin Fitts



Patrick Wood



Technocracy With Patrick Wood

May 09, 2019

C. Austin Fitts: Ladies and gentlemen, it is a great pleasure to welcome to The Solari Report a guest who I've wanted to have on for a long time. His name is Patrick Wood, and he is the author of a series of books on technocracy. I reviewed it in 2017, and as I introduce him, I want to read a few paragraphs from that review:

Since WWII, the shadow government has used an Orwellian combination of invasive digital technology and covert operations and finance to build a new form of centralized governance to succeed where communism failed. [Patrick Wood](#) has documented this history in *Technocracy Rising: the Trojan Horse of Global Transformation*. He calls this new form of 'command and control' governance 'technocracy'.

Documenting the emergence of a complex global rules-based system is not easy to do. Wood has done us a remarkable service by attempting to integrate the various systems into a comprehensive overview. For many years I have struggled to explain to financial professionals that the leadership does not want free markets; they want to communicate information through controlled networks rather than through prices.



As long as the debt growth model could grow, an infinite amount of zero cost capital could paper over a society managed by command and control, albeit with highly sophisticated information systems, analytics, and artificial intelligence.

Patrick Wood is the Editor in Chief of *Technocracy News*. It's a 'must know-about' website and is at www.technocracy.news. He is, in my opinion, absolutely the leading critic on sustainable development, green economy, and Agenda 21. His ability to define documents and explain the history of technocracy is an invaluable service.

When I read his first book – and I've now read his other book on technocracy, *The Hard Road to World Order* – I couldn't believe that somebody had accomplished this. It is a remarkable feat of scholarship and research and clarity of spirit and mind to be able to do it.

Patrick, welcome to The Solari Report. Thank you for coming, and how in the world did you do it?

Patrick Wood: I'm so glad to be here. I've watched and followed your work for a long time. It's awesome, by the way. I have great respect for all the things you've done. I don't know if it's all called 'whistle-blowing', but you've been out there like I have for a long time.

I don't want to commiserate among old soldiers, but when you've been doing things what we've been doing, trying to expose what is going on, those who have been in it 25-35 years is a long time.



Fitts: I would say ‘Technocracy’ is one of the most important – if not the most important-concept people need to understand that they don’t know about. In other words, this is the thing that is overwhelming your life, driving you insane, wasting your time, and it’s a plan. It is intentional, and people don’t even know that it exists.

I say that it’s the biggest secret that is killing your time. People need to know about it.

I have to ask you to do this again: Can you explain what technocracy is?

Wood: I am going to give you their definition rather than trying to make one up. This is from the magazine called *The Technocrat* from 1938. We’ll catch up on this later, but technocracy was actually officially started in 1932 at Columbia University. This is only six years later. By then they had a magazine, and they were talking all over the country about technocracy. Here is how they defined it in their magazine:

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

That is a direct quote, and that really sums it up. ‘The science of social engineering’ is a phrase that has always raised the hair on the back of my neck. It just bothers me.



Fitts: It's a system of micromanagement. The scientists can figure out how everything should work and define a rule-based system. So, there is no more democracy and there are no more prices; it's all a highly intricate, complex rule-based system. Is that fair?

Wood: It is, and it's their scientific method applied to society. In other words, they took hard sciences and tried to use the methodology they use in those hard sciences to manage the economic system. Back then, it was in the United States/North America. Now it's the world. I have expanded its scope, and now it is out running on a global basis.

The scientific method, so to speak, which you and I would probably understand from our high school chemistry class, is that you try this experiment, countless people have tried it before you, and you always get the same results. That was a scientific method.

In the technocrat mind, the scientific method does not mean that anymore. It's not demonstrable science; it is simply trying to apply some scientific principles to the management of society and thinking that they really have some type of hard science – some kind of a truth that works in every case type of scenario, but they don't, and they never have.

The danger of this is that all of society looks like a herd of cattle to the technocrat mindset today. I'm using the word 'mindset' on purpose because not everybody in the world is a technocrat or bought into technocracy, but this mindset now has spread like cancer throughout the planet. People who have adopted this mindset look at society like a herd of animals who can be managed like a herd of animals using scientific principles.



Of course, if science says (fill in the blank), then it has to be that way. It's like the old game *Simon Says*. You think of climate change, and they say that the science is settled on climate change. "So what is the argument?"

"Well, we don't agree with that."

"You're a denier, and you deserve to be punished."

It's a circular argument, and after a while, you can't go anywhere with it.

Fitts: What I see with technocracy is that you have a governance structure, and it divides the world into two classes: One to whom technocracy is going to be applied, and the other who are completely immune and above the law and above the rules and above the regulation, and they have another set of rules.

There is a bifurcation as to how it is being applied. It is basically to manage the herd, but it doesn't apply to the people in the governance structure.

Wood: That's right, and it never has. The people who promote this the most fly to their important meetings in private jets and stay at the best hotels. It has nothing to do with saving the planet.

I know that we are going to get into some of the history of this, but I want to read a quote that really sets the stage. It's a quote from my latest book, *The Hard Road to World Order*.



Back in 1992 when the first Earth Summit took place in Rio de Janeiro, that is where Agenda 21 and Sustainable Development came from – or at least, that is when it was popularized. Leading up to that point, the seminal book that produced the document of Agenda 21 was created by the so-called ‘Brundtland Commission’ in the mid-1980’s and terminated in 1987.

That commission produced a book called *Our Common Future*. That is where the standard was set for Sustainable Development and Agenda 21, and the United Nations has submitted this openly ever since. The chairwoman of that commission was Gro Harlem Brundtland from Europe, and she was the head of it and the chief editor on the book and the main contributor. I guess that she probably wrote 80-90% of the book.

She was a member of the Trilateral Commission. In my history, going back to the late 1970’s studying the Trilateral Commission, it promised to create a new international economic order. Not coincidentally, she was the chief editor and author of this book, *Our Common Future*. This was the Trilateral Commission policy that was fed to the United Nations under the name of Sustainable Development. You have to admit that that is a beautiful marketing name. Who wouldn’t want development to be sustainable?

It’s like ‘smart cities’. Do you want to live in a dumb city? What kind of person are you?

So, Sustainable Development got its life and its legs from an important European member of the Trilateral Commission who was already invested in creating a new international economic order.



This is that new international economic order, and I contend in both of my books that this is nothing more than warmed over technocracy from the 1930's, which is a resource-based economic system.

So, when Agenda 21 came along in 1992 in Rio de Janeiro, there were thousands of people who attended that meeting, and there were hundreds of people who were involved in the discussions leading up to the language of the document; leading up to the actual adoption at the meeting.

Some of those participants had other views of what happened in 1992. Two people in particular I quote in my book. They were actual participants in the Agenda 21 process, Pratap Chatterjee and Matthias Finger. They wrote a book in 1994 called *The Earth Brokers*. It's a very important book. These two people were environmentalists of the old school. They already understood how corporatism was destroying the environment around the planet, and they were fighting against it. That is why they went to Rio, but they came away with a different opinion.

So, they wrote this book, and in their book, one of the most important conclusions they made is this:

We argue that UNCED (United Nations Conference on Economic Development) has boosted precisely the type of industrial development that is destructive for the environment, the planet, and its inhabitants. We see how, as a result of UNCED, the rich will get richer, the poor poorer, while more and more of the planet is destroyed in the process.



Talk about a contrarian view! What they were saying, and what I have contended for a long time now, is that this whole scheme to ‘save the earth’ has nothing to do with saving the earth at all.

Fitts: Right. It’s the controlling concentration of cash flow.

Wood: That’s right. What the global elites are trying to do is capture the resources of the world.

Fitts: Total top-down central control down to the molecular level.

Wood: Yes. In the elite’s mindset, the people are just a resource like trees in a forest.

Fitts: They are trying to convert under the law and under the economy an individual human into a natural resource just like a gas or oil deposit.

Wood: That is right. Many people who were participants in the Rio conference came away with this contrarian view. The United Nations, of course, had their own view of the world. Their propaganda machine spun out a completely different story.

People like these authors of *The Earth Brokers* never got any media play whatsoever with their criticism of the process. We still have the United Nations propaganda today, and for the same reason.

All the scare-mongering tactics that came out of Agenda 21, which is the agenda for the 21st century, the biodiversity book that they produced on how everything needed to be micromanaged, _____



this has been passed down through the years. Even today there was an article on a million species that are going to be wiped out because of man's meddling and 'screwing around' with the earth.

They keep publishing these press releases that are scaring people to death. "Oh my gosh! The seas are going to rise and the ice caps are going to melt, and the polar bears are probably going to disappear. That is one of the one million species that is going to go away".

And the only possible solution that they offer is Sustainable Development.

Fitts: Or technocracy.

Wood: I argue in my book – in a full chapter in my latest book – that technocracy is Sustainable Development. I go down point by point and demonstrate how they line up. They are absolutely the same.

Yes, there are a couple of little subtleties, but basically, it's unmistakable. Sustainable development is historic technocracy, and this is the only solution that these people are offering.

We don't have door number two and door number three; there is never another alternative to solving these horrible crisis-type things that they throw at us.

They say, "What we need to do is have Sustainable Development." That is like the Green New Deal that AOC has been promoting lately. That's the same thing.



Fitts: I mostly see these as all different marketing scams. You are trying to say, “Okay. What does the population, particularly the young people, care about? Now how can we engineer that concern to give energy to take us where it is that we want to go?”

What you are trying to do is get the young people to agree to wipe out their parents’ and their grandparents’ wealth and their inheritance, and destroy their own future. How do you do that? You have to plug into what they care about, which is the environment and inequality.

You are constantly trying to hook those things and then turn it into marketing your scam.

Wood: I know you have a strong economic background and I do, too.

Fitts: You were originally an economist, weren’t you?

Wood: I was. Professor Anthony Sutton and I wrote *Trilaterals over Washington* in the 1970’s. He had just been separated from the Hoover Institution as a research fellow. He formerly worked as a professor at UCLA economics. He was a brilliant writer at the time, and he was removed from Hoover when he began to study the Trilateral Commission. He didn’t really think about it at the time, but the President of Stanford was David Packard of the Hewlett-Packard fame, who happened to be one of the original members of the Trilateral Commission.

Packard looked down at this man and said, “We have to get rid of him. He’s trouble. He is writing about us, and he is picking up the trail.”



His associates at the Hoover Institution used to have a name for Tony Sutton because he was a voracious researcher. The man was just insane over it.

Fitts: What a great thing it was to be able to write with him.

Wood: It really was. They called him the ‘Hoover vacuum cleaner’. That was his nickname. “Go give it to the vacuum cleaner; he will figure it out.”

Fitts: Here is the problem: Both you and Sutton figured out that the problem is not the economy; the problem is the governance structure.

Wood: These people in the Trilateral Commission used the government structure of our country, which was the engine of economic development throughout the world. They captured and used our government to restructure the global trade system. That is why the takeover of the Trilateral Commission Members was so notable back then. You had Jimmy Carter, Walter Mondale, Zbigniew Brzezinski (one of the co-founders), and all but one of the members of Carter’s cabinet were actually members of the Trilateral Commission as well. It was a ‘clean sweep’.

It wasn’t for the sake of gaining control of the political system as a political system; it was to gain control of the trade mechanism so they could restructure global trade in their own image. This is what they have done over the last few decades.

Fitts: And it was the control model.



Wood: It was a control model. They never really cared. They even said that then. They said, “We don’t care about political power. That’s not what we do. We are working on economic systems. By the way, in the meantime, we are temporarily taking over the American government to restructure the economic system of the world.”

Fitts: I want to mention one thing that you point out, which I think is very important, and is extremely well-done the way that you do it. The beauty of technocracy is that you can engineer it into every country in the world regardless of what they say that their political system is.

So you are going in with bottom-up rules, and it doesn’t matter whether they say that they are a one-party system, or they are a democracy. You can engineer and create technocracy like cancer inside of anything, and they do.

Wood: Indeed. They do, and they spread it to every country on the planet as well under the same name of Sustainable Development, but it has all kinds of manifestations in different countries. There are always similarities between countries, but you have to figure out that you have different cultures and different political systems. In some cases, you have radically different political systems such as in China and Saudi Arabia, and so on.

You have all these different countries that are implementing their version of Sustainable Development, and they are all bowing not towards Mecca, but towards the United Nations to look for policy guidance.



Fitts: Another thing that you do a good job of pointing out is that we are talking about a system which is totally a top-down control system where you give up on using price or market as a resource allocation mechanism.

Wood: That's right. This is key, and I'm really glad that you brought that up. I have a feeling that you understand this very well.

Capitalism and free enterprise, which I think I understand as well as anybody, and I know that you do too, the so-called free market automatically allocates resources according to scarcity. If something becomes scarce, the price goes up, that lowers demand, and there isn't scarcity anymore. So, things stay in a state of equilibrium. This has been the way that free enterprise has worked since its inception. It wasn't written about 2,000 years ago, but this is the way that it has always been.

The doctrine of technocracy, which was created in 1932 at Columbia University, was in the heat of the Great Depression. They believed that capitalism was dead, and these were dying signs with the Great Crash of 1929 and the Depression and the unemployment. They really believed that capitalism was dead, and it was up to them – the scientists and engineers – to create a new economic model.

They immediately rejected the price-based economic system. They said, "We can't do that anymore. That is what got us into all of this trouble in the first place. So, we need to do away with a price-based economic system where money is used to measure the sentiment between supply and demand and giving balance to the economic system."



So they said, “Out with the price-based economic system. Our resource-based economic system is going to use energy as its accounting system.”

This is difficult to comprehend how it would work overall, but it’s easy to understand if I use a personal example. I am wearing a shirt right now. My shirt is made of cotton. If I had enough resources available to me to figure this out, I could figure out exactly how much it cost in terms of energy to create this shirt.

There was a farmer in Egypt who was raising cotton, and a machine picked the cotton. Then it was put on ships, and sent to Sri Lanka for looming and for making fabric. Then it went to India, and they made a shirt out of it. They had to ship it by another boat to America where it was trucked all over the country and traveled on a railroad. By the time it got to me where I can go into the store and say, “I like that shirt. I’m going to buy it,” the question would be: How much energy went into making that shirt? Theoretically, this could be figured out.

This is what the technocrats in 1932 decided would be the way to control a resource-based economic system. Since energy is required for all economic activity, how much energy went into those goods and services? That will be what you must pay for those goods and services.

So, they devised a system of energy credits that would simply be issued to people – similar to food stamps – at the beginning of a period, i.e. a month or a quarter, _____



and they would make a forecast of how much energy would be produced during that same period. They would divide that number by the population, and simply send out these energy scripts to people for them to spend.

Yes, they would have to work, and they would assign jobs to them to do work in the economy in factories or whatever, but you would have those energy credits to spend during that period of time on any goods and services that you wanted to buy.

At the end of the period – let's say it's a month – if you had energy credits left over because you were frugal and didn't spend them all, then your energy credits would simply evaporate; they would just disappear.

Fitts: It's part of the negative interest rate plan.

Wood: That's right! Then if the energy credits ran out because you spent too much, that's tough! You will have to beg from somebody else to buy you food or something. So you had no way to accumulate wealth.

They believed that property rights were absolutely unnecessary in a technocracy, and there was no reason for people to accumulate wealth. So, they completely wrote that out of their economic system.

There was no accumulation of wealth, no inheritance, no savings, and the government or the economic system would simply take care of you. You would be happy for it because you would only be working 20 hours a week – because that was all that they needed from you –



– and you would have all this free time to go do whatever you wanted to do. You could do art or music or take a class somewhere. They basically described a utopian system, which is never ever going to happen. It has never happened in history and it will never happen in the future either.

This utopian system was very popular back in the 1930's because there was so much doom and gloom over capitalism. They devised this system that people at the time were almost willing to buy into. It was rejected as we got into World War II and the economic system recovered, but many people really thought that this was going to be great because, “The scientists and engineers really know what they are talking about. They really have this down to a fine science.”

Fitts: I would say it another way. My experience with leadership is that they have difficulty managing the herd, and they are afraid of the herd. They get very frustrated managing the herd. Ultimately, if you presented them a system where they could just do top-down complete control and concentrate wealth into their own hands, it's like a drug. It's a way out of the frustration of having to manage an unruly herd.

The problem is that if you let the herd choose in the marketplace or at the polling place, they might choose somebody other than you.

Wood: That's right. I just have to throw a barb at China at this point. One of the reasons that several technocrats over the last several years have praised China for their model of governance is that they only have one person to deal with. They only have one person to shake hands with, and it's done.



“So let it be written. So let it be done.” Who said that? I think it was Yul Brynner in *The Ten Commandments*.

Fitts: Let me turn to the technocracy in the economic and financial model because it took me years and years to realize that technocracy was fundamentally an invasion into the economic model of this thing. It wasn't until your book that I really got the full picture. I am very grateful, but I want to dive into the financial and economic model to help people see it in the context of their own lives.

If you look at our current economic model and what it is that makes technocracy go, we have fiat currency that produces a zero cost of capital for the insiders. One of my favorite goldbugs once said that fiat currency has done more environmental damage than the mining companies ever dared dream of doing.

If you look at how we are running the fiat currency and the Federal credit, it is designed to send many signals to people that is done in a way that is environmentally stupid. So, at Christmas I can go to Walmart's throughout Tennessee and pay less for a bunch of Christmas decorations from China that are going to cost the landfill to get rid of them.

So, we have used fiat currency and the Federal credit to engineer a system which encourages people to be environmentally destructive. Then we say, “Oh, people are being environmentally destructive. We need technocracy to come and control them,” which is ridiculous.



All we need is a financial system that prices it all, which is very easy to do, and you are off and running. The problem is that the top people may not be in control anymore. They may get voted out by the marketplace.

So, there is a huge multiple personality disorder in their claims about technocracy. All the reasons they say that they need it, they go back to this, “The rules are not for everybody; they are only for one group.” It’s really how one group of people takes over and control and micromanage another group of people, and it has nothing to do with environment or energy efficiency. It is hugely environmentally and energy-wasteful. That is what all of my calculations show.

Wood: It is, and it is important to note here that there are literally two economic systems vying for control in the economic space. It needs to be seen that way.

It’s like when two people enter a ring at an MMA fight, and you know that they are enemies. They could be best friends outside the ring, but you know that once they are in the ring, there is going to be trouble; there is going to be blood; there is going to be a lot of pain before one or both get out of the ring.

When the United Nations adopted Sustainable Development as a new international economic system, they have been pointedly anti-capitalism and anti-free enterprise ever since. We saw this in statements, from people such as Christiana Figueres, the former Executive Secretary of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (and I don’t know how you put that on a business card, but that was her title). She was in charge of the Paris conference on climate change a few years ago.



In a press conference she reiterated the sentiment. This was not a brand-new revelation at the time. She said, “This is the first time in the history of mankind that we are setting ourselves the task of intentionally, within a defined period of time, changing the economic development model that has been reigning for at least 150 years since the industrial revolution.”

We have seen calls from that orbit of people for the scrapping or the destruction of capitalism completely to be replaced by Sustainable Development.

This is not just, “competition is going to find its best level, and technocracy is going to win.” This is war being declared on technocracy. If we wonder why the previous economic models don’t work to explain what is happening in the world today, I struggle with that. It drove me ‘nuts’ about ten years ago. I couldn’t figure anything out anymore. Every type of economic prediction tool that I had was simply just not working. It wasn’t giving answers that were reliable. This is the reason: Technocracy and free enterprise capitalism are like matter and anti-matter. Wherever they meet, you get a dissipation of the whole thing. It’s as if economic gangrene will set in where capitalism and free enterprise will get shoved down the hole and where technocracy – so far – has been able to come out on top.

The United Nations swore that they were going to destroy capitalism and free enterprise. This is not just some innocuous manifestation of history that is happening here; this is the purposeful attack on everything that we know about capitalism and free enterprise, and the two systems simply do not mix. They are so ‘other-worldly’ to each other that they cannot exist in the same room.



You get immediate dislocation, immediate economic chaos occurring, and this describes the world today. This is exactly what is happening.

This battle between two economic systems is 'Titanic in size; it's huge.

Fitts: And the reality is that if you look at how it is playing out, it is playing out in a way that is destructive of our time day-to-day – right now. This is happening in our time budget right now, every day.

Let me go back to Rio and what happened right after Rio. One of my favorite videos to encourage people to understand what is happening in the global economy is a video of Sir James Goldsmith who came to the United States in 1994 to argue against the WTO.

One of the businesses that he came from was groceries. Goldsmith described what is going to happen when they adopt the WTO and proceed with the Uruguay Round of GATT with the WTO. They are going to drive two billion small farmers off the land and into the cities, creating the megacities and the big smart cities in a way that is going to be highly destructive of living systems, and highly destructive of two billion humans, creating massive slums and a huge mess.

What they are describing is the opposite of what Rio has been marketed as being. This is the industrialization of agriculture and the central control of the seed supply and the land and resources in a way that is hugely damaging to the environment. You could almost say that it is going to destroy the environment.



So, what they proceeded with in the name of what they were talking about was a huge increase in the power of the industrial corporations related to food, the seed supply, and the whole food chain.

What we are talking about is centralization here, and centralization is putting enormous pockets into corporate monopolies. I wouldn't say that they are capitalists. These organizations are not capitalist organizations. They don't compete and win in the marketplace; their market shares and monopolies are being engineered using technocracy.

Wood: That is exactly right.

Fitts: I want to bring up a couple of the things that brought me to your work. I was working in the financial area, and I used to do a lot of clean-up on financial fraud. I discovered from the National Security Act, they had this progression of financial fraud, and at the end of every fraud they would say, "Oh, we are going to do something. We are going to pass more rules," and then those rules would simply make life worse for the innocent people who had nothing to do with the scandal. The people who did the scandal would just proceed to do another scandal because.....

If you simply enforced the old rules, you wouldn't need new rules. If you enforced the old rules, you wouldn't have had the problem in the first place. But they never enforced the rules against this second class who are free from the rules.



So, all of these scandals were used to create more rules, which were then used to control the people so that they could steal more. It was very clever marketing because you are basically selling technocracy as a solution for fraud, but people kept ‘suckering in’ and falling for it.

So, I started reading two people. One was Michael Woodiwiss, who is a British academic who has tracked the use of narcotics trafficking. He did an incredible job of tracking how the war on drugs is used to build more technocracy and more control of the local economies. Then he brought it to the UN and showed how it was spread through the UN around the world and how the war on drugs was.

You can see from his description that it’s very much like reading your work. It is the nuts and bolts of how all this information is engineered, and it is very complicated and very ingenious.

Then I discovered a New Zealand legislator who became so frustrated with the rules coming down on the UN for Sustainable Development. She ended up getting a PhD and then going to work for the UN. Then she discovered, “Wait a minute”-she was tracking accounting as opposed to the war on drugs, and all these rules were not designed to produce Sustainable Development; they are designed to produce central control. This is essentially a fascist takeover. So she went back to New Zealand to be a sheep farmer.

What I discovered is that there absolutely is a very slow and steady effort over decades to get control of everybody and everything through these different systems of law and money.



It wasn't until I discovered the EU that I realized that somebody has put a name and identified what this is and the history and where it's come from.

Wood: If I had not been an understudy of globalization in the 1970's, I never would have had the background and framework in order to understand technocracy today. It would have been impossible. I never would have seen it and never would have been aware of it.

Fitts: I think that is because you have to understand so many different places and systems. That is the thing that is incredible about your work. You are talking about portfolio strategy for the whole planet to really see and identify this thing.

Wood: Yes, and maybe it was just smaller and simpler back then to see it as it is today. Today, everywhere you look there is something that you can comment on.

Back then our feeling and our sense of it-even though we did not understand historic technocracy-and our sense of what the Rockefeller crowd was trying to do with the Trilateral Commission was to prepare for a time in the future when the current economic system would not exist. We didn't know what that new economic system would be, although Brzezinski did write about the technetronic era in 1969, which I think was probably a book that he and David Rockefeller did together to create the Trilateral Commission.



I think what was in their mind was that we have milked the Federal Reserve debt-based money system almost as much as we can milk it. In other words, there is a limit to everything, including money. In today's terms I think you can probably say that about 99% of the value of our currency has been chiseled away by the central banks of the world. And it's not just in America; it's in every country on the planet.

There comes a time when the people who were chasing money, like the Rockefeller crowd, and they do very good at it, realized, "You know what? There is a finite limit to what we can do and how much we can get away with the current system and the way things work right now."

Their answer to that – and this is just my educated guess at it, having worked on it for 45+ years – was, "If we are not going to be able to rely on money to get ahead, then what was left? Where do we go from here? If we are going to stay in control, where do we go from here?"

The only answer to that is you must grab the resources of the world directly. You need to get control directly over the resources of the world, and don't worry about the money; just get the resources of the world under your control. If you have the resources, you will have wealth for the rest of history.

If you look in the bible into the life of Job, what made him rich? Well, he was described as owning herds of cattle and sheep and gold mines and timber and all that kind of thing. All of it was associated with the resources of the land. He had resources, and he was counted as a wealthy man.



The Rockefeller global elite crowd, I believe, saw this early on. Where they were going to have to go was to set up a system that delivered the resources of the world directly into their hands, and whatever surrounded it. They would be able to control the entire economic system of the planet because they had control of these resources.

Today, we see the economic monetary system flying out of control. I use the word ‘elasticity’ to comprehend the fact that interest rates and the supply of actual currency in the economic system now has no impact anymore – none.

We have almost come to our finite limit that I think they saw 40-50 years ago to where ‘it’s game over’. I’ve said for at least 15 years that when any given currency goes, they are all going to go at the same time. I never bought into the ‘hoopla’ that the dollar is going to crash and everybody else is going to do good. I never saw that as an option.

When the fiat currency system is finally done, it will simply blow up, burn up, and then something new will have to be put in its place. That ‘something new’ at this point, could only be technocracy and Sustainable Development.

Fitts: Right, and cryptocurrency is just part of making technocracy go. It’s not really a currency.



Wood: No, it's not. And the central banks now-especially the Bank for International Settlements-are looking very closely at block chain-based currency – except that it won't be distributed; it will be managed by them. It's a brilliant plan if they can make it work.

Fitts: Many of the big applications on block chain are trying to make the optimization within the asset side without even going to the finance side. So basically, as you said, money is a primary application.

Part of what makes technocracy really powerful on steroids is the combination of AI-what Glenn Greenwald called the 'one-way mirror' of the surveillance state. Then you add 5G and the internet of things and cryptocurrency, and now you're talking about a complete digital system where the technocrats at the top can optimize real time using the AI.

Now you're talking about getting into slavery systems, because when you implement that model, if families have no personal wealth or savings and no privacy, then you are really talking about going back and solving the thing that cancelled the slave trade. Now you can use digital technology to collateralize the investment, and if you look at what is happening with transhumanism, we are really looking at a model that says that a human being is a natural resource. "I can reengineer them and change them and integrate them with digital technology. Let's see which is more efficient: A robot or a human."



Wood: Exactly. The whole business of this ‘advanced technology’, whether it be big data or surveillance or facial recognition or national databases for DNA material and things like that, concerning the data that is being collected, (and data is the lifeblood of technocracy, and it always has been) the more data, the more power and more influence that can be exerted over where the data is being collected from.

So, the more data harvested from people, the more likely they are to be controlled in one way or another. I see this on every conceivable angle that I can use to look at society.

In fact, we used to say, “Follow the money and follow the power.” I now say, “Follow the data and follow the power.”

So, wherever you see data being collected, you need to take a second look and say, “What is going on here? Power is being accumulated here”. Just to show how this is so relevant to historic technocracy, if we go back to the original requirements that were written by the technocrats and their ‘bible for technocracy’ called *The Technocracy Study Course*, they could have written this last week. They only wrote seven requirements for the entire system to work, and the first five are absolutely telling:

1. Register on a continuous 24/hour per day basis the total net conversion of energy.
2. By means of the registration of the energy converted and consumed, make possible a balanced load.



That is smart grid right there. That is the whole definition of ‘smart grid’ today – controlling energy.

1. Provide a continuous inventory of all production and consumption.
2. Provide a specific registration of the type, kind, etc. of all goods and services where produced and where used.
3. Provide specific registration of the consumption of each individual plus a record and description of the individual.

That is exactly what is happening today! This is the plan for technocracy.

Fitts: One of the things that I focus a lot of attention on for subscribers is to encourage them to understand that all these digital systems come with entrainment and subliminal programming and other forms of mass mind control. I think that part of what is making this technocracy go is that you have enormous amounts of mind control being applied to the marketing and the use to one part of the population and not the other. The reality is that it’s as though many people have not realized they are being invaded by technocracy. Part of that invasion is that they are being mind-controlled by it. That is one of the scarier aspects of this.

Wood: It is, and the mind control is really a natural outcome. I don’t think that it is so much something that has been added to the mix, but it is a natural outcome of being watched because people who are being watched automatically change their behavior. It’s easy to suggest or to make suggestions. I think that one of the professional terms being used recently is ‘the nudge’.



When you give a nudge, when they know that they are already being watched, you can change their behavior in midstream. People are more and more aware today that they are being watched than ever before in history. All the various types of surveillance being used against us, you just can't count it on one hand anymore.

If you look at a product on a website on your browser, you are going to see all kinds of ads start to show up on your smartphone, or vice-versa. Or you were talking in your living room, and your smart TV heard you say something about some product on Amazon that you are looking at, immediately you get ads on your computer or your smartphone for that product from Amazon. How do they know this? Well, people automatically conclude that they are being watched.

If you add to that the growing science of geospatial intelligence, this is flat-out scary. You probably heard something about GEOINT (Geospatial Intelligence- the tracking of everything that moves, applying AI to determine the pattern). It's something that was developed for the military. DARPA had their hand in it at the time, and it's still ongoing.

The idea of geospatial intelligence says that geography no longer just consists of fixed things on the map like your office, your house, whatever; it also consists of things that move. Well, people move; cats move and they move around in different patterns. So, geospatial intelligence seeks to take the movement of people, to track the movement of people, and try to make sense out of what makes society tick and what makes that community tick and what makes that group tick.



They believe that by studying the normal, they now can see anything abnormal that takes place. When the crowd or the group goes out of its established pattern, they know something is wrong and they apply artificial intelligence to it, and try to figure out what goes on. They have proven this technology on the battlefield in Afghanistan and Iraq for the last 10-12 years. It is absolutely perfected at this point. Geospatial intelligence is being used, or ‘weaponized’ if you will, on the American people as well as other people around the world.

China has turned it into an art form now on how they can use it. Geospatial intelligence is the most significant watching of people that exists to date, and because people are being watched – whether they recognize it or not at the time – their behavior could be changed by the watchers. This has been written about in academic literature. This is not a myth or some kind of ‘tin foil hat thing’; this is documented and has already been proven, and it’s being implemented throughout the country by these same people – these big tech/technocrat-minded companies and individuals who think that this is a great thing. They think that this is absolutely necessary for the advancement of society.

Fitts: I want to tell you that I was recently in a wonderful workshop in Switzerland. I was in a smaller salon with the same group the next day. I ended up making a little chart of what came out in the discussion. In the two columns, one said ‘material’ and the other said ‘spiritual’ and the two rows were ‘overt’ and ‘covert’.

Then I drew a line that started midway in the ‘material’ column called ‘invisible’. I basically said, “Look, there is a portion of the material reality which is real – EMF radiation or entrainment technology –



– but it is invisible. Then the spiritual is invisible.”

What I heard from the audience is that everyone is very cognizant of all four quadrants. They see the material, both concrete and invisible. They see the spiritual. They understand the covert aspects of what is going on in this planet. They have a full picture of the whole thing, but increasingly in their lives, they are all dealing with people who only see the overt, visible material.

The word that we were using for them is ‘hyper-materialists’. We have a whole world of people where if they see all four quadrants, somebody is a ‘hyper-materialist’ who was just in the ‘material/visible/overt’ world and are essentially psychopathic.

One of my favorite allies would say that culture is the integration of the divine in everyday life. Well, technocracy increasingly is the integration of the demonic in everyday life. These people basically have a psychopathic bent, which is very difficult to understand unless they have dealt with spiritual evil.

I just wanted to throw that out because the thing that I’m hearing from my subscribers or my audience is: How do you navigate a world where you have more and more of these types of materialistics that are basically ‘nuts’?

Wood: You’re right. The grand illusion that is taking place now on a global basis is inconceivable. There was a great movie – and I know you are a movie fan- but I don’t know if you ever referenced the movie *Gaslight* from 1944.



Fitts: I love *Gaslight*! It's painful to watch, but it's a great movie!

Wood: Yes, and what a great cast with Charles Boyer and Ingrid Bergman. But the point of *Gaslight* was that this lady's husband tricked her. He manipulated her into believing that she was going insane. It worked until the end of the movie when he needed rescuing, and she pretended that she was insane. She really caught onto it!

Here is the deal: We have in the world today a massive 'Gaslight' operation going on where we are told what reality is, and when you disagree with their version of reality, you are targeted for some type of insane position. "Well, you're crazy to think that!"

Those are the kind of ideas that led Al Gore to call anybody who didn't agree with him a denier, and he said that deniers needed to be punished. That is a 'Gaslight' type of operation. "If you think that way, you are either stupid, insane, or irrational, but you are not normal."

Many people are wandering around the world today 'not normal'. There is a whole movement of women in Great Britain right now who are getting together routinely to talk about not ever having babies again because they can't tolerate the thought of global warming being any worse because of their childbearing. So, they are voluntarily foregoing having children, and they're sad about it I'm sure.

I'm not sure what they do with their biological timeclocks, but now we see this type of irrational thinking pockets everywhere we look.



We see it in different ways, but there are pockets of it. AOC with the Green New Deal is absolutely insane.

Fitts: I don't know if you saw this, but shortly after she came out with the Green New Deal, I spent an enormous amount of time tracking financial fraud and financial organized crime with the Federal credit in government. I've documented with various allies a recent report with Dr. Skidmore that \$21 trillion is missing from the Federal government.

I knew that they had stolen just about everything they could steal with the financial system, so I was waiting for how they would go after the real estate. So, when the New Green Deal came out – and it's to your point – I said, “Now they need something that is asset-based. They need to get the assets.”

I kept watching these various schemes where they tried to get the things that they couldn't steal through those mechanisms. So when the New Green Deal came out, I was about to do some major show on it. Then Dr. Naomi Wolf immediately came out with one of the quirkiest things that you will ever encounter unpacking the extent to which this was just central control and theft of resources by corporate and investment interests.

It's hard to imagine the scale of the corruption, and it was quite extraordinary. I never thought that they could come out with something that was more outrageous than cap and trade, but there it was. It was breathtaking.

They are going to keep on trying.



Wood: Yes, they will and they never give up. They have taken the Hannibal approach, and they never give up. They just keep coming back for more. When you think one of their ploys have failed, they just show up with another one or maybe two or three right behind it, and they keep plowing on.

Fitts: Let me mention one other thing. I have a concept that we talk a lot about. I discovered it in a book called, *Shadow Work*. I am a person who has spent much of my life in litigation. I am a person who tries very hard to be very compliant in terms of laws and regulations. There is no reason not to take care of the paperwork. As Bob Dylan said, “If you are going to live outside the law, you must be honest.”

So, I have really tried to be as close to perfection as I can be pertaining to regulatory compliance, and I pay plenty of attention to it. If you look at how much of our annual budget goes to that, it is extraordinary. I don’t know a small business person who I deal with that hasn’t steadily watched a constant inflation of the work load that is being put on them as a result of technocracy.

It’s putting businesses out of business all over the country. It is very destructive to small business and family wealth. If you look at the financial inflation, and I follow something called the ‘Chapwood Index’. According to the Chapwood Index – and it is very well done – the inflation in the United States is going up at 8-14% a year, depending on where you are, and it has for the last five years. However, that is not the greatest inflation.



The greatest inflation is shadow work and the time within a small business or a household that has to be spent on compliance, and the danger of it all is that there are so many laws and so many regulations and so many rules that it is impossible to be perfect. That means that if somebody wants to mess with you, they can fundamentally bankrupt you trying to get you to comply with regulations you didn't even know existed.

Wood: That is absolutely correct. I posted an article this morning on *Technocracy News* called 'Physician Burnt Out: Doctors Became Overworked Robots'.

There is a new study that came out showing how doctors are fleeing the profession in droves all over the country because of the regulations imposed mostly by Obamacare. This is a technocrat initiative where they are forced to use these electronic health records to document all this computer statistics using computers in their offices, and they have lost control of how they can give treatment to patients because all this data is being used to determine what the average treatment should be for any given condition. Doctors have been pressed into a corner that they can't get out of, and they are burning out. The suicide rate has gone through the roof, and this is only in the last five to six years.

Now they are saying that because they have become overworked robots, they just can't take it anymore, and they are leaving the industry altogether. This is a direct result of the technocratic initiative to 'dataize' all of healthcare. It turned all the healthcare people into data clerks rather than into medical professionals, and we are suffering for it, and the healthcare system itself is suffering.



You can hardly find a small clinic anymore that has an actual doctor in it; they are all either PA's or some type of nurse practitioner. There are few doctors because they are fleeing the scene.

Fitts: I live in a country where, when you go to the equivalent of seeing the doctor, you see a nurse practitioner; you don't see a doctor.

Before we close, I want to mention that one of the reasons it was very important to me to have you on this spring was because I am in the process of publishing the 1st Quarter Wrap Up. We do them quarterly, and every quarter we have a big theme where we look at important trends and look at it deeply. So, last quarter it was Megacities and I wanted to look at that phenomena. This quarter it is going to be ESG, which is the application to both business and investment of environmental, social, and governance structures.

It appears that part of the use of this technology is the next outrageous technocracy push in the investment world. When I finish it, I will send you a copy.

They are moving into investment in a big way. Of course, the amazing thing is shown in this story that I've used before. I used to do individual investment advisory work and now I only do screens.

I had a client who had a high-yield bond portfolio from a socially responsible investment company, and I didn't know anything about it. So, I looked at the prospectus, and most of the time they will have a master prospectus where they have all 20 funds in one prospectus.



So I was looking at this high-yield fund, and the fund next to it in the prospectus was a woman's fund. It was supposed to be only investing in companies that are good for women. I looked at the top ten holdings in the fund, and if you had asked me to make a list of the ten companies who did more damage to women of any of the corporate monopolies on the planet, it would have been those ten.

So, I looked at their criteria of what was 'good for women', and basically it said that if you hired gay women from Harvard Business School, then you are good for women. So, this is my effort to look at how technocracy is moving into investment and what we can do about it. In fact, that is one place where people can vote with their money still, which I think is a good thing.

Wood: Yes, to the extent that we can. Can we talk about global cities?

Fitts: Yes. I just saw on your website that Rockefeller shut down their initiative.

Wood: I have a chapter in my book, *The Hard Road to World Order*, called 'The Rise of the Global City'. This is a key concept, and I know there are so many key concepts. I say that every time I say something, but there really is. It's all important at this point.

What has happened on the global stage is when the Trilateral Commission first started in 1973, they talked about interdependence between nation-states. This was never a reality back then; they just started talking about it. They said, "Interdependence is inevitable. Therefore, we have to embrace it."



So guess what? As a self-fulfilling prophecy, if the world became interdependent and the nation-states changed radically over the decades, they don't look like they did 50 years ago. They still are there in border, but look at the EU for instance. The nation-states are still there, but they don't have power anymore; they have given it all up to the European Union. They deal with their local customs, but that is about it.

Along the way, this whole idea of interdependence changed. We knew from writings from Brzezinski and Gardner and others back then that there was a total disdain for national sovereignty altogether. They wanted to erase all the borders of the world right there on the spot. That really has never been questioned in academic writings.

But what would replace that structure of world order? In their mind back then – and it's so obvious today – the entity that will provide the primary structure of a global economic order is going to be the global city. The cities are rising in prominence throughout the world – and this is intentional – while the nation-states decrease in sovereignty and influence and control. This is being intentionally pushed now by academic scholars all over the planet in every country.

It's not quite to the point of a city-state, but it is going in that direction where the cities are being connected together into networks of cities, and they are looking at cities in a functional way. What economic benefit do those cities have?

Cities are different. They do different things and they have different industries and whatever.



So, they are examining the cities now like a global supply chain, and they are saying, “This city does this and this city has mining and this city has agriculture,” and they are creating these networks of cities to connect them together in an economic supply chain that will completely circumvent the framework of the nation-state.

This has been in the plan, I believe, since day one and we see it today. There are many people writing about this today, but the global city is now taking center stage.

A good example here in the United States is when Trump, at least nominally, pulled out of the Paris Climate Accord. Many people cheered that it was a good thing, but then San Francisco and Jerry Brown, the Governor of California, immediately rebelled against that and said, “We are not going to leave the Paris Climate Change Agreement. We don’t care what you do. We are staying in it. We are going to do everything that it says.”

That is a case in point of a city telling its national government to ‘stick it where the sun doesn’t shine’, and they will do what they ‘darn well please’. The national government – at least our national government – did nothing to ‘slap them around’ or say, “Listen, this is America and you take it from the top down here, fellows.”

So they got away with that, and other cities have followed. You had New York City following the same route, as well as Los Angeles and San Diego.



The global city is on the rise today, and we are seeing it in one sense. If anybody has a biblical interest, especially in the Old Testament, you see a rise of the city system that existed with Babylon, originally the City of Babel. But if you go back and read Genesis, there were a number of cities that were surrounding Babel, but it wasn't just that. You had Nineveh and other cities that were mentioned as well, and they were a network of cities.

Fitts: Right, and the cities make it much easier to draw in the talent that you want to use and keep them in a bubble away from the general population.

Wood: That is one big part of it for sure, and to put people into groups where they could be more easily controlled.

If I could relate this to the larger picture that we've been talking about how the economic system is going to work. I grew up in an agricultural area in Northern California on a farm. I actually got a degree in agronomy. I thought that I was going to be a farmer, and I ended up being a lousy farmer, but I do know a lot about agriculture as a result of that.

Back in those days we had tomatoes and other crops, but we hired many migrant laborers that came from Mexico on a green card. They were all legitimate. They came from Mexico and worked the fields. They picked tomatoes and things like that, and then they went home after the work was done, and took all their money with them.



That was essential to making our agricultural area work, and it really did work. But the people who brought the green card workers up created a shanty town type of work camp for people to live in. They had to sleep somewhere. So, they made these work camps with little bunk houses, which had a central kitchen. Sometimes you would see 200, 300, or up to 500 people in these work camps. They would harvest the crops, and would work very hard all day long – 12 hours a day or maybe longer. Then they would go home, and the camps would be empty.

These work camps were a part of my life growing up. Nobody viewed them as evil, and the people – by and large – were treated quite fairly and nicely, but it was just temporary, and then they went home.

I look at what is going on in cities and what is happening with the ‘Smart City’ initiative that they are trying to control and micromanage people and so on. I see a giant work camp where the corporate controllers that now own these cities – thanks to public-private partnerships and things like that – have turned these cities into giant work camps where they will draw from those work camps the laborers to work in their industries, and they will barely give them enough to survive. Witness what is happening in San Francisco right now. People are living in their vans and cars. They have jobs that are paying them \$150,000, and they can’t afford the rent.

This work camp mentality fits perfectly with technocracy.



Fitts: I will do you one worse here. I think that throughout the West Coast – Seattle, San Francisco, and Los Angeles – you have a drug-addicted population that has been created and weaponized to force small business and the middle class out so that they can finish building out the work camps.

Wood: Exactly. I haven't really spent a great deal of time documenting this. When I talk about it, I'm not really providing any specific study behind it. Nevertheless, this is just my lifelong impression of having lived and being brought up in that kind of environment. I see the same kind of psychology working today in the cities.

Also very interesting, is this anecdotal story from China. Two years ago, a press release came out of Beijing that said that China was moving 300 million farmers into cities. That is the population of America. They were moving them into the city, and they were going to essentially do it at the point of a gun. They were going to run them off their property that they've been farming for centuries, and they were going to move them into the cities. I don't know what they would do in the cities; the press release didn't mention that.

In the same breath in the press release, it said that they were going to reclaim the land that was left vacant and dedicate it to corporate farming. So basically, it was a giant eminent domain operation where the technocrats running China decided, "Those 300 million people out there, get rid of them, would you?"

Fitts: I would say that the same thing is happening here; it's just subtler.



Wood: Yes, exactly.

Fitts: We have one million acres of floods, we have fires, and it's much subtler. It is done in a way that people can't fathom exactly what it is, but it's the exact same thing.

One thing that I wanted to mention – and I am going to send it to you by email – is that we published a series of articles on something called FASAB 56. Are you familiar with that?

Wood: I don't think so.

Fitts: Last October, while everybody was paying attention to the murder of Khashoggi and the nomination of Kavanaugh and his high school sex life, the bipartisan Congress and White House approved a new policy. I call it FASAB 56-it's the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board Statement 56.

It allows the 24 agencies of the Federal government plus over 150 related public corporations and entities, and with the declassification laws, all the big contractors who work for the government to primarily run and keep secret books. So, it is the complete end of financial disclosure. I call it secret money for secret armies.

For example, we see a group of people working very hard to start a war with Iran. Well, FASAB 56 in theory, gives you the ability to take all the money they want and finance foreign armies and mercenaries to start the war. In theory, you can engage in a huge war without the line item military.



It's the next step in making technocracy go because transparency really does ruin the technocracy game. In my experience, when you look at anything involving Federal government money in the United States, the money is so wasteful. We are talking about a system that is ten times more expensive than it needs to be. Part of that is keeping the secrecy, but part of it is keeping central control.

When I first became Assistant Secretary, I found programs where \$0.70 of the dollar was going into the neighborhoods in 1989, and now \$0.29 of the dollar is going into the neighborhoods. It is all going into this unbelievably paperful central control system that keeps everybody busy delivering technocracy.

I can come up with hundreds of examples. We don't have time for them now, but I have to tell you that the way they are doing technocracy is bankrupting small business, and it is bankrupting the taxpayer, too.

Wood: It really is.

Fitts: It is unbelievably expensive.

Wood: I know. Since the machine of the global elite learned how to stick their 'kribaskas' into the public treasury, it's been there.

You and I know that it is wasteful and inefficient, but it is a gold mine to these people because they are the ones who are getting all the scarp from the table and getting 'filthy stinking rich' off this so-called inefficiency or whatever.



Fitts: Right, and they are also buying control. They are creating a lot of unnecessary employment that keeps everybody on their payroll as opposed to doing their own thing and being independent. Much of the Military-Industrial Complex payrolls are just keeping the smart people busy working for them.

You have been very kind and generous with your time, so let's just finish. I want people to understand how to follow your work. Your website is Technocracy News at www.Technocracy.News. You have four books that are excellent. If I was going to read them in the proper order, I would read *Trilaterals over Washington* first.

Wood: I would tell most people today who are just coming in and have listened to an interview or two and their jaws have dropped, to read *Technocracy: The Hard Road to World Order* first, and then read *Technocracy Rising*, both of which give some sense of what *Trilaterals over Washington* was all about.

Then when you are done with those, go back and read *Trilaterals over Washington* for the history of it.

Fitts: And then read *Globalization and the Crucible of Global Banking*?

Wood: *Globalization and the Crucible of Global Banking* was an afterthought book that I produced because people were asking for it, and I got tired of sending out printed copies of the articles. So, I put them all together into a single place and offered it. If anybody is interested in global banking, that is a good thing to listen to because I talk about the BIS, the Bank for International Settlements, ——



— the International Monetary Fund, and the World Bank, and how they work in concert with each other.

This is something that has been missed in the history books. They have written a lot about individual entities like that, but very few people ever wrote about how they work together. Do they hunt as a pack? Do they work as a pack? I say: Yes, they do, and I give plenty of examples in that little book.

It's not a very big book, but historically it is interesting. If you don't care about global banking, then don't worry about it.

Fitts: I have to say that I can't recommend your work enough. One, you have enormous scope and cover many different systems and regions. One economist said, "Our goal is to look at the world and see it whole." You really do see it whole.

The other thing is that you are able to look at all this and keep your state of amusement. I think that the hardest thing to do is to watch technocracy and the invasion of technocracy into our lives and see it clearly, but maintain a coherent spirit and a coherent mind. So, I have no idea how you do that.

Wood: I could tell you how very simply. I happen to be a born-again Christian. I studied the bible for 40-45 years as well, and that has obviously impacted my professional life.

I can look at this and analyze it with an open and clear mind for what it is and resist the urge to get angry.



The first thing that people want to do is get angry when they hear about this. Well, anger is only going to hurt you; it's not going to hurt anybody else. You can bang your fist all you want at Fox News, and you are wasting your time.

Fitts: This is spiritual warfare.

Wood: It really is and on a grand scale, it could be looked at that way. I don't push my biblical analysis onto anybody on my website. It is not a religious website. But, having said that, there are now well over 3,000 articles that have been posted on technocracy on www.Technocracy.News. It is a research gold mine for anybody who cares to dig through some of that information. You can search through the index, and it is all categorized.

At the top of every article I put my comments in to give context to the articles that I bring in from around the world. Probably a good third of the articles come from overseas, not from the United States.

Fitts: I've spent a lot of time visiting the cathedrals and the temples in the world. The fire at Notre Dame was a very upsetting thing for me personally, and for some of the people that I work with. One of my favorite quotes was when a French-elected official on Fox News got thrown off Fox News for saying, "Not even the Nazis dared to destroy Notre Dame."

He was promptly kicked off. We are dealing with a mentality which is that the Nazis knew how dangerous it was to destroy and arm that field. If you look at the burning of churches and temples ———



— and mosques around the world, the love of faith and the sacred is being attacked. They have no compunctions about doing it.

Wood: None whatsoever.

Fitts: It is important to know because I think they are attacking it because that is the power that will stop them. That is where the real power is.

Wood: History needs to be rewritten, and it needs to be recast. All the memories of the old school, whatever that was, they would erase that so they can replace it with new propaganda. All the statues came down in the Middle East as the radical Islamists moved through. We've seen that happen here in our own country with the removal of all the statues in the South and other places around the country. "We can't have that statue here; that is part of our history, but we can't have that."

In history books today, I would defy anyone, including any professor listening or reading this, to find anything about technocracy in the history books. You simply won't find it.

Fitts: It is quite remarkable and has really been scrubbed out.

If it wasn't for Brzezinski, we might not see how it was.

I should tell you one tidbit as we close. My grandfather was Dean of Social Sciences at the Rockefeller Foundation, and he was fired by the Dulles brothers because he was promoting decentralization.



Wood: Oh my goodness, I can see that battle in my mind!

Fitts: Patrick, it has been an absolute delight to talk with you. We think that what you are doing is terrific. If there is anything that we can do to help or promote your work, just let us know and we will do it.

Wood: I really appreciate that. I hope that this is of use to your subscribers somehow, and they will figure out how to follow along and learn more.

Fitts: Out with technocracy!

Wood: Here is some good news: America rejected technocracy by the end of the early 1930's and the beginning of the 1940's. They rejected technocracy outright because they knew it. It was in the newspapers, they understood it, and they not only said, "No," but also said, "Heck no! We are not going that way."

If America has rejected it once, I believe that it is possible for Americans to reject it again. Don't ask me how right this second because I don't see it yet, but if enough Americans wake up to the fact that this is the scam and this is the phone call from Nigeria asking you for \$10,000 to help bring money out of some other country.

Fitts: I will tell you, I wrote an article about the 2016 election called 'The Productivity Backlash'. I said that this was the heartland telling the East Coast and the West Coast that they don't want technocracy.



I don't think that I used the word 'technocracy', but I described how productivity in all the concrete functions was being destroyed.

If you look at the East Coast and the West Coast, Washington, New York, Hollywood and Silicon Valley, and they are all people dealing with invisible assets. They are not dealing with taking a harvest or drilling an oil well. They are not dealing with the concrete functions. The concrete people are just in revolt over technocracy.

The way that the politicians have tried to stop this pushback and the productivity backlash is to get everybody so busy in 'divide and conquer'. The divide and conquer is just off the charts. I live in a place where there is incredible divide and conquer between blacks and whites.

When I first got here I said, "Look, if you guys would just collaborate the money on the money, you could hate each other rich instead of hating each other poor."

So, the divide and conquer is the effort to stop us from seeing the fact that we are all choking on technocracy. That is what we have to figure out: How do we overcome this silly divide and conquer issue?

There are so many different divide and conquers. It's like Baskin Robbins; there is a new flavor every day. That is what we are going to have to overcome.

I should get you back to talk about that because I have spent a considerable amount of time trying to figure that one out.



Patrick Wood, you are great. Keep us posted, and thank you so much for joining us on The Solari Report.

Wood: Thank you for having me and I really appreciate the opportunity.

MODIFICATION

Transcripts are not always verbatim. Modifications are sometimes made to improve clarity, usefulness and readability, while staying true to the original intent.

DISCLAIMER

Nothing on The Solari Report should be taken as individual investment advice. Anyone seeking investment advice for his or her personal financial situation is advised to seek out a qualified advisor or advisors and provide as much information as possible to the advisor in order that such advisor can take into account all relevant circumstances, objectives, and risks before rendering an opinion as to the appropriate investment strategy.