

Actionable intelligence to live a Free & Inspired Life



# The Solari Report

August 17, 2023

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter 2023 Wrap Up:  
Dutch Farmers and Fishermen:  
The People Who Feed Us  
with  
Elze van Hamelen**



**Catherine Austin Fitts:** Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to *The Solari Report*. I am in Friesland, Netherlands with Elze van Hamelen, the Dutch reporter who wrote our blockbuster, *Pharma Food*, and we have a new blockbuster, the Dutch farmers and fishermen.

For many, many months, everybody has been asking: What is really going on with the Dutch farmers and fishermen? Because I knew that what was happening was so much a part of all these other things that we've been covering in the *Food Series* and in geopolitics and the control grid at *The Solari Report*, I knew this was a big one.

I came to Elze and said, "Would you do another blockbuster?"

This is something you absolutely will want to see and read. I will start with the end in mind because our message from *Pharma Food* is also our message from the *Dutch Farmers and Fishermen*. Why don't you tell us what the message is?

**Elze van Hamelen:** You must secure access to your food. If it's not for the farmers, it is for your own security.

**Fitts:** So access to good, healthy, nutritious fresh food is critical, and you must take responsibility to use it, to find it, grow it, finance it, or whatever. For everybody it is different, but you have to do it. This is a matter of life and death.

We have a planet full of real assets – the land, the water, the livestock, and all the businesses and the technology and equipment. So we have a world of real assets. For decades we've been putting everybody into this debt control system where we pile on more and more paper. It's called the **Debt Growth Model**, and we've piled more and more paper on top of those real assets.

Now that the debt growth model is over, there is a drive for who controls the real assets, particularly because there has been so much criminality going on in the paper.

Now the 'game' is: Who controls the real assets? There are 1,000 different games occurring all to grab and control the real assets. It's fair to say that the other message from the Dutch farmers and fishermen is that there are 1,000

games to steal your land and real estate, and you cannot let that happen.

**van Hamelen:** Also, if you own nothing, you become a slave. The ownership of a property is the basis for autonomy and wealth generation. If you don't have that, you become completely dependent.

**Fitts:** One of the things I loved is that you started your article with a quote from Jon Rappoport. I'm going to read it because I love these interviews with Ellis Metavoy. So, this is Ellis Metavoy, who is a propaganda expert, talking to Jon. He says:

Not long after we met for the first time, Metavoy said to me, "I can tell you how to run a world, you know."

I laughed. "Really?"

"Sure!" He said, "You make up something complicated. Then you insert it into the bloodstream of society, and you watch it bloom. You make it complex enough that it will take armies of people to sort it out and argue about it. Then you have them. The other thing is that what you make up has to cost a lot of money."

Then you have another quote from the head of the **Dutch Farmer's Defense Force**, "They keep changing the rules of the game."

**van Hamelen:** Right.

**Fitts:** That's why it takes a real 'blockbuster' to look at it as a whole and reduce it down, and see the simple morals of the story to do risk management. So, I wanted to compliment you; you've done an extraordinary job. I know it took plenty of work.

Before we begin, I would like you to say a few words about how you got interested in all the different food aspects, and then tell us what you learned from doing *Pharma Food*.

**van Hamelen:** I used to be a sustainability consultant with chemical

companies. But with that, I always felt as if we went away from nature too much. So even though I didn't work in it, I was always fascinated by nature. I thought if we really wanted to do something 'sustainable' (even though I don't like using that word anymore) in a right way, then I feel we need to have this reconnection again. I felt like the reconnection started with the people on the land and working together with the land. It's a different philosophical attitude.

This always held my interest. Then when you asked me to write *Pharma Food*, that was interesting to study!

**Fitts:** It's shocking to see. You hear all of this about, "We have to be sustainable," and, "We have to be efficient," and then you see them making processed food like the \$18 hamburger. It's so bizarre; it takes you into Bizarro World.

I should point out for everybody that the whole *Pharma Food* presentation is available in a PDF on the website, and we are sending it to the printer soon. So, it will be in hard copy shortly.

I would strongly recommend that before you read this one, you read *Pharma Food*.

**van Hamelen:** Yes, they go together.

**Fitts:** You have certainly mapped out plenty of what is going on in the food system – whether it's the destruction of the old or the invention of Bizarro World new – or the invention of new that is quite wonderful. So, there is so much happening in regenerative farming that is wonderful. That is why if you go looking for fresh food, there is hope.

**van Hamelen:** Definitely.

**Fitts:** Let's dive in; let's start with the **Dutch farmers and fishermen**.

The world is watching. We are all very interested in what has been happening. There has been plenty of PR. You've been talking with a series of both the farmers and the fishermen. Tell us about your conversations.

**van Hamelen:** I call this the ‘policy tsunami’ because the farmers were in the news because of the nitrogen regulations. But if you ask about what happened, they will talk about all the other policies that have hit them before this. Then there is a lot of administrative burden. There are so many rules to comply by that many of them need to hire accountants just to make sure they comply with legislation.

They say, “We feel like criminals. If we do a little wrong, we are running into many problems.”

For the fishermen, perhaps they have it even rougher than the farmers. I found that painful to listen to their reports.

**Fitts:** First of all, I want to say that the Netherlands is a food juggernaut. You are talking about a country with 17 million people, and about half of the land has been recaptured from the sea, and yet it’s the third-largest exporter of food in the world, which is incredible.

**van Hamelen:** Yes, but it’s not all produced on this soil.

**Fitts:** Right, some of it comes in. And you see these huge greenhouses as you look around.

Needless to say, whether it’s the throughput coming through the ports or what is being grown here, the Netherlands is a food juggernaut.

**van Hamelen:** Definitely. Also, at the heart of farming, there are developments; there is industrial farming, precision farming, the AI farming, and the designing of machinery. So, it’s also a very innovative country in this respect.

**Fitts:** You have a combination of farming and engineering. In Friesland, there are plenty of farmers. The farmers here are much different than the US farmers.

**van Hamelen:** Really?

**Fitts:** Yes, they are much more a part of the community. They are much more

admired and respected; it's a very respected group of people in my experience.

**van Hamelen:** Yes, that is true, and that is my experience, too. I live in a rural area, but one of the farmers who I interviewed, Alex Brouwer, said, "When you listen to the radio, you hear them talking very negatively about farmers the whole time. I have a wife and family, and I can talk with people. But if you hear this, you start feeling bad about yourself, and especially the farmers who are doing the work by themselves or don't have a tied social circle. It really weighs on them."

He started selling milk from his house, and one thing he liked about that was he said, "Usually the truck comes by and the milk goes, and that's it. Now these people come to my farm, and they make a conscious decision that they want to buy milk at my farm. So, I meet all these new people who are really supportive and want to understand what I'm doing." So, he feels supported by that.

**Fitts:** The media beatdown is part of the game.

It was by talking with you I discovered that all the farmers in the Netherlands who got on the industrial model were put on the industrial model by the same people who are playing the game and saying they are bad because they are an industrial model. Tell us about how that all happened.

**van Hamelen:** Where do I need to start?

**Fitts:** We came out of World War II, and there was a shock doctrine, gut-wrenching reengineering of farmers and how farming worked in the Netherlands. (Thank you, US and Marshall Plan, right?)

**van Hamelen:** Definitely, the Dutch countryside was made up of all these tiny plots of land. They were very small areas, and each farmer would own multiple areas where they would work together with land workers. The government thought there was a small farmer's problem because all these tiny plots of land (and this was highly biodiverse) didn't have barbed wire yet, so there were hedges around these plots, or there were meandering brooks. There were pieces of land that weren't arable, so you would have little marshes, boglands, and sandy areas. It was super-biodiverse, but it wasn't suitable for mechanized

agriculture.

So already for 50 years, there were plans for more land consolidation to make it more efficient. There were reasons for improvement, but there wasn't a readiness for largescale government intervention. There was hesitancy about going into people's ownership and property rights.

After World War II, in the Netherlands during the last year of the war, it was a very cold winter. There was a blockage of food by the Nazis. Especially the western part of the country suffered a horrible famine. Many people perished. This is very engrained in the Dutch consciousness; it's called the 'hunger winter'.

After the war, much of the land was destroyed and farms were destroyed. Cattle were being robbed. They had a deficit in the trade balance, so they had difficulty buying things. Much of the food was still eligible for food stamps even a couple of years after the war. So there was a rallying cry, "No more hunger. Now we need to do something about the small farmers problem, and we need to start land consolidation processes."

So for the Dutch people, the word is 'Ruilverkaveling'. 'Ruil' means 'trade' and 'kavel' is a plot. So it's a 'trade of plots', but it's translated as 'land consolidation'.

This became an enormous modernization project, but it was basically run as a social engineering program. I found out that it was financed by the Marshall Plan aid money, and the Marshall aid was part money and part machinery and resources, but to a large extent, it was also knowledge exports. The US State Department had a program.

The condition of the Marshall aid was also a European corporation, and there was resistance to working with the Germans again. So, there were programs from the State Department to speak with businesspeople and politicians and everyone in an influential position to nudge them to a pro-American viewpoint.

For this land consolidation, they considered the rural population as 'backwards'. They said, "We need to teach them how to run a modern household." So at

some point, there was one advisor for 400 farmers on how to run the farm because all this land consolidation required fewer farmers. So, they would give clear advice to the farmers' sons, and they would specifically target the farmers' wives in this training. Then they started consolidating the land. In this process, 75% of the country was flattened.

**Fitts:** Was it 75% of the farmers removed out of farming or off the land?

**van Hamelen:** There aren't clear numbers on that, but this process took place over decades. By the 1990's, 75% of the entire country was part of one of these land consolidation efforts.

**Fitts:** That's huge.

**van Hamelen:** They removed 225,000 kilometers of hedges.

What was left was replaced by barbed wire, but those hedges were extremely biodiverse. They harbored little mammals and harbored birds if there were a lot of insects. Things will grow on the edges of the meadows. So, hedges are extremely biodiverse, but all of this was taken away.

There is a movement now to reinstall a large part of the hedges because some say that we don't need to give all this land back to nature. If we replace some of this barbed wire with hedges again, we can have some of the biodiversity without having to move everything.

**Fitts:** If you look at the 'spin', they move farmers out of regenerative farming and into industrial farming. Now they go back and say, "Ah! Industrial farming is very bad. We need to go to regenerative farming. Just take the land back to nature."

One of the things you point out is that the transition takes much longer than one year. It's a slow transition because, not only are you changing your farming practices, but you are moving from one economic model to the other. The last economic model has put you in a huge debt trap.

If you look at how they are spinning it, it all sounds well and good, but it's total



‘ya-ya’; they are running a hit on the farmers.

**van Hamelen:** The government right now is stimulating the hedges part, but what happens to farmers is they place these hedges, they are maintaining nature, and then they say, “We have an endangered species there now. So, now there has to be a buffer zone, and you have to reduce your cows.”

So, it is dangerous to increase the biodiversity because before you know it, you are in some protected area, and they will stop you from doing your work.

**Fitts:** I want to ask you about phosphate and nitrogen. I don’t know if it can be done quickly, but this is basically a gaslighting operation. The gaslighting goes with multiple rules and regulations that are all designed to bankrupt them so that they can acquire the land. I am grossly oversimplifying, but that is how it works.

Two of the gaslightings are around phosphate and nitrogen. Tell us about that.

**van Hamelen:** I’ll take it back a little. We have an industrial model that has been introduced, and then they say, “We need to give the land back to nature,” so there is a separation that man is bad for nature, and we need to protect nature.

Farmers are still taking care of nature. But then you get the surplus production because that had to do with the trade balance. When you have the surplus production against very low prices, the farmers need to scale up to just stay in business. Then you get the surplus production, but it creates issues on the world market. So, it was a very protected market with milk quotas from the EU for decades. Then in 2009, they said, “We are going to let go of this milk quota,” and then all the financial advisors and the farmers’ education experts came by and told all the farmers, “This is your chance. You need to grow. You can grow a lot now. Just take on a bit more debt.”

It was already clear that by letting the farms grow by this much it would increase the phosphate emissions. It has to do with more cows leading to more manure.

If you have a regenerative farm, then your number of cows would fit with the

soil that you have.

**Fitts:** Right, and the manure gets recycled.

**van Hamelen:** Yes, but if you are growing your cattle stock, then you get an excess amount of manure. I think they passed legislation in 2009, and then it went into effect March 31, 2015. Then on July 1, 2015, they said, “There is an excess of phosphate emissions. We need to do something about this.” All the farmers got allocated emissions quotas based on their current stock.

**Fitts:** It’s a classic double bind.

**van Hamelen:** Yes, but the farmers who were hit most by this were the regenerative farmers who didn’t even have a phosphate problem because they could do everything on their own land.

So, one of the former farmers who we interviewed, Jon Bergeman, was in a transition of a regular farm to an organic farm. Usually your production takes a hit. So, he had a year of very low production, which they took into account, but he got an emissions quota based on his low production.

Then they said, “You have too many cows. You have to get rid of more than 30 of your cows.”

He said, “This is what we need to generate a decent income.” They were in lawsuits for two years. Basically they said, “No, this is entrepreneurial risk.”

He said, “We are exactly the farm they want; we are regenerative, we are organic, and everything is in the soil.” He didn’t even have a phosphate problem.

**Fitts:** I would say they want farms that make money for insiders.

**van Hamelen:** Definitely.

**Fitts:** I would like to take a moment to describe the fact that part of our challenge here – and you see it with the Dutch farmers and you see it in the

Netherlands, and it's a perfect example or case study – is we have a society and a group of people who are being targeted in a very dirty, vicious game, and they can't see it whole. It's too complicated.

We are all focused on our function; “I'm a farmer,” or, “I'm a fisherman,” and we can't fathom that there is a group of people who have decided – as the World Economic Forum states openly, “It's 2030 and you have no assets.” That means, “We are going to take all of your assets, starting with your land.”

They can't believe that this is a plan; of course it's a plan.

I come from a world where if you are running large amounts of global investments, you have to plan 50-100 years. I used to work with people who planned 100 years forward. That is how you did it; everything was connected. This is how you talked: You would say, “We will do the energy in this country,” and things were very centralized and very mapped out and very clear about these policies.

When they decide, “We are going to consolidate all the land in the Netherlands,” you never say, “We are going to pass a law that dictates that.” Instead, they will say, “How can we do it in a way that makes us money?”

It's not, “How can I go to Rome?” but it's, “How can I get everybody going to Rome with me in a way that makes us money?” Then the policies are all engineered.

Then, of course, it comes down to these different lines where the health people are doing this, the media people are doing this, the bankers are doing this, and the government is doing this; everybody is in their little box. Of course, it's planned. It's very hard to manage the whole planet. You have to think ahead, and you have to plan.

What I find in the Netherlands is that many people in this whole ecosystem cannot fathom that this is part of a plan, even though the World Economic Forum keeps on announcing it.

Tell us about what you found in terms of people understanding that this is

actually a plan.

**van Hamelen:** With this land consolidation, the superficial story is, “No more hunger. We need to solve this. We are going to produce a lot,” and that is a success story. But if you dive a bit deeper, you see that it came from the Marshall money; it came from the US. Around that same time, the US made it its foreign strategy to become a dominant player (a global player) in world food production. Food production was considered a strategic aim for foreign policy. So, it’s a power policy and not about solving hunger.

**Fitts:** Did you ever read *Global Harvest*? We did a huge *Wrap Up* many years ago called *Global Harvest* that looked at the food juggernaut of the Anglo-American Alliance and how it worked.

**van Hamelen:** I never saw it.

**Fitts:** It looked at who was a food net exporter and who was a food net importer. It was clear, if you looked at what they had done after World War II and how it had grown, the Anglo-American Alliance basically said, “We are going to dominate food.” Of course, the Dutch are a very big important piece of this. They are very close to the UK and that whole world.

**van Hamelen:** If you look behind that, then you see it was really influenced by the Rockefellers who started doing many projects in the industrial food production in World War II, but also in the period before that. This model of industrial agriculture was exported to the global south as the ‘green revolution’ and it was exported to Europe as part of the Marshall plan. But if you look at the business model they are introducing, it is a complete diversion from the business model that has been around for thousands of years of farming because they pull everything apart.

With the traditional farming model, you produce everything on your soil, so it’s a mixed farm and a regenerative farm; it’s connected to the community.

In the name of efficiency and modernization and mechanization, they say that it’s more efficient if we have the cattle separate from the arable land. Then the arable land needs all these inputs like the fertilizers and the seeds and

knowledge. So, they pull everything apart to where the farmers, who are a basis for one of the most autonomous ways to exist on their own piece of land, becomes a financial operation that is dependent on capital and that is dependent on input from the world market.

**Fitts:** It becomes easy to control.

**van Hamelen:** Very easy to control.

**Fitts:** Did you read Jacob Nordangård's book on the Rockefellers?

**van Hamelen:** I ordered it when I ran into this research, but I haven't finished it yet.

**Fitts:** It's very helpful in this regard.

So, you interviewed a series of farmers and a series of fishermen.

**van Hamelen:** To go back to farming, the Rockefellers came up with this model. It was exported through foreign policy, but worldwide.

**Fitts:** And through the banking system.

**van Hamelen:** What happens as a result of the indirect production of this model is that the countryside is emptied. So, you get a surge in urbanization and an upheaval of the entire countryside on a cultural level.

In the West, the people who go into the cities get adopted into the industrialized model and economic boom after the World War, but in the global south, they end up in slums in appalling conditions.

In 1976, the UN started a conference called Habitat I. They wanted to focus on how to manage human settlements to deal with this surge in urbanization. Perhaps we can talk about that later.

If you talk about the planning, basically, they called upon all governments to develop policies for land use. They said that private property is an issue, so all

land needs to be managed in the public's interest. They sent out a whole list of policies and taxes that they can implement to get control over the land and redistribute people over the land. They are very open in what they plan to achieve.

I think the tricky thing with Agenda 21 (non-binding action plan of the UN regarding sustainable development) and sustainable development goals now is that if you don't know what is lying underneath it, you read it and you think, "These are wonderful goals. Who wouldn't want this?" Nobody will read further. I actually fell for this as well. But in this specific declaration, they are so clear about what they are intending, and it is an attack on private property.

It shows the planning.

**Fitts:** In the US, agriculture is down to less than 1% of the population producing the food. When we did *Global Harvest*, if you look to China and India, it was 35% and 48% - somewhere around there – still farming. When you listen to Sir James Goldsmith talk about globalization and the fact that their goal is to take those numbers down to one percent as well, and what that would do in terms of moving people into the slums in the cities or depopulation, he gives an eloquent description of how entirely mad this is; it's total madness.

**van Hamelen:** It's a control agenda.

**Fitts:** Yes, but it's a control agenda that is so harmful. I was struck by your description of the farmers living together in a community, and then being reorganized so now they are all individual and separate. That must have been absolute 'gut-wrenching'.

Nobody ever said that my old partners were nice people.

Are you ready to go onto the fishermen?

**van Hamelen:** Yes.

**Fitts:** Of course, we are in a sailing community right now. I love the fishermen.

If you look at all the different tricks that they have played on the fishermen, – and I agree with you – it sounds like it's even worse than what they've done to the farmers.

**van Hamelen:** And it's more effective.

**Fitts:** Fish are fabulous here. The entire wealth of the North Sea was driven by fish being taken out of the sea. It's extraordinary the history of the fishing and the wealth that it has created along the North Sea. But you watch these hideous windmills going up throughout the IJsselmeer (closed off inland bay in the Netherlands), and then the fishermen being told they can't fish.

In other words, the ocean is being grabbed for wind farms. If my understanding of energy is right, these are far from being economic or efficient. Basically, if you look at where the energy is going, it is going to fuel the control grid.

We are swapping healthy, nutritious fish and happy, productive, profitable fishermen for bitcoin and CBDC. Is that correct?

**van Hamelen:** Yes, that is a good summary.

**Fitts:** It's a little oversimplified.

**van Hamelen:** Similar to the farmers, we still have a very small amount of people who know how to get food. Farmers know how to grow food or how to manage cattle, and fishermen know how to fish. They are making it so impossible to just let them do their job that they are putting their 'towel in the ring'. It's undermining our access to food in a very fundamental way. The farmers and fishermen realize this.

People are so used to getting their food from the supermarket that they cannot think these supermarkets may be empty. They don't think about who is taking care of their food, but they will notice when the problems arise.

With the fishermen, first you had Brexit, so they were losing fishing grounds.

Then there were the windmills and offshore wind parks. They were expanding these in a very insane way. So, there were already plans a couple of years ago for expansion. Then in April, they said it was the whole North Sea. So, that's not only the Dutch part.

There needs to be 30,000 windmills along the North Sea coast in 2050.

**Fitts:** If you look at the energy return on energy invested in the windmills, it makes no economic sense. But if you look at the calculations, they are assuming that in 15-20 years, it's not going to be expensive to deal with the fact that you have 30,000 windmills that need to be replaced or put in a landfill. I don't know what they are planning on doing with these things when their expected life is over, but it could be an environmental disaster.

**van Hamelen:** Even if they take the windmills away, they put enormous amounts of concrete at the bottom of the sea, and the fishermen can't fish there anymore because it will destroy their nets. The whole business case around these windmills is extremely 'fishy'; it doesn't make any sense. That is why I described it as economic warfare.

It's blowing up the energy system. It's extremely costly, it's extremely polluting, and it's damaging and changing the sea ecosystems. There is even some research, and I quoted one of them, that the windmills change the winds around the coast. They have an effect on the formation of clouds. So, there is some reason to assume that is creating droughts on land. It is also affecting the waves that come to the shore, especially in the lower parts of the ocean, and the fish use it to spawn.

They don't know what kind of ecosystem effects it will have on the longer term, like on the entire marine ecosystem.

**Fitts:** When you talk with people in the Netherlands, they say, "We have to do this so we're not dependent on Russian gas." Is that true?

**van Hamelen:** Yes, but it's not replacing gas; it cannot be a replacement in any way.

**Fitts:** So when you see these things, my understanding is that much of the



energy is going to the big data centers.

**van Hamelen:** Simultaneously with where they are placing the windmills, they say, “Because of the cool climate, that is a good place to put the data centers.” The expectation for the energy use of the data centers is skyrocketing because of the Internet of Things and 5G and AI. So, they need these enormous data storage and processing capacities.

I think it was in Ireland that they wouldn’t onboard new data centers because they were already using too much energy. So, they are placing these new data centers near where they are also planning the windmills.

These windmills are not providing stable energy; they don’t have a solution for that.

**Fitts:** In the United States, we were looking at a company, and will determine how the monetary policy and inflation and interest rates have destroyed it. The economics were bad enough with wind, but then the inflation and interest rates are destroying it.

You go back, and keep walking around the ecosystem. As I read the van Hamelen blockbusters, I am walking around this ecosystem, and you have all these things going on which are economically insane. Then they keep gaslighting the farmers and fishermen with, “You’re not economic for this little thing and this little thing.”

In the meantime, you are watching this whole system which is so wildly economic – whether it’s the windmills or the pharma food and the 3D printed sirloin steaks.

**van Hamelen:** It’s all these little things. But even when you recorded the conversation with Ulrike, control happens one by one. Even with the farmers, if you are not protecting nature in a buffer zone, then you’re not in too much trouble. So, it’s a selection of the farmers that have started it. With the phosphate emissions, it was the regenerative farmers who were unduly hit by these regulations.

For each of them, it's a different type of regulation. Everyone feels that it's their personal problem. There is also some divide between the farmers who are in the industrial model or those are more in the regenerative model because each time that a farm is chosen for scale enlargements, there are many other farms that went bankrupt because they couldn't get by if they didn't go for the enlargement as well.

Many farms were lost because a couple of them stayed in business. So, I see that some of the small farms that are struggling to get by still say, "They've chosen all this debt. If they are now running into problems, it is their own responsibility."

**Fitts:** Part of it is that I don't think they understand the full gaslighting involved and the double binds involved. That gets back to what Jon Rappoport said about complexity: Complexity protects the plan.

**van Hamelen:** From World War II on, it's education that says, "You need to use a lot of fertilizer. You need to run your apartment this way"; it's the banks.

Then there are the advisor companies. Basically, everyone in the community believes that the industrial model created the food surplus production: "That is what you need to do, and small farming will never help you get there."

I also spoke with a couple of farmers who are running the regenerative model, but they feel that the community looks strangely at them for choosing something else. They ask, "Why aren't you building a larger stable? Why aren't you expanding?"

It's a sensitive topic because everyone is kind of locked in their own model. It is also used as a 'divide and conquer'.

**Fitts:** The last thing we have to mention is that part of the excuse is that 'we need to take land back to nature'. It's different in every place. Here there are wilderness areas and there is nature protection. There are all sorts of reasons we have to be good to nature by taking your land. In the meantime, we are destroying everything by doing the windfarms.

So on one hand, we are doing things which are environmental disasters, but on the other hand, we are insisting that we can take your land to help nature because 'you are bad for nature'.

Did you want to say anything about nature protection?

**van Hamelen:** That is a very important one because after this whole land consolidation they said, "We destroyed a lot of nature here. We need to start consolidating land and give it back to nature."

Then the environmental NGOs (non-governmental organizations) were allowed to manage those pieces of land, but you can't run a farm there anymore.

This idea of putting nature into protected areas kind of flows out indirectly from the Habitat I convention in 1976. It became a part of the international treaty in the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development in 1992. There they devised a biodiversity convention. They said, "You need to put land into protected areas, and the land around these areas needs to be managed as well."

I won't go into all the details, but that leads to the ecological network model. The ecological network model talks about these protected areas, the buffer zone, and it is connected by corridors. Between the 1990's and 2005, hundreds of these areas got implemented worldwide.

In the US, that is the Wildlands Network (formerly the Wildlands Project). In the EU, it is called Natura 2000. It's from Russia, Asia, and South America. It goes under different names, but it's everywhere in the world. In the EU, it's part of the EU legislation process, but in many other countries, it is implemented through NGOs. So, it's somewhat like a stealth attack because they pose as a civil society and nature protection. But if you look at the details, they have special consultant status at the UN. They are working on behalf of the UN to implement UN policy.

**Fitts:** They get top-down funding, but they are not subject to any kind of economic accountability. And you also have many people who are young and fervent and have no idea what the complete game is.

**van Hamelen:** Pete Kennedy interviewed the owner of Drakes Oyster Bay. If you heard what happened to them, that is a personal story of what happens to somebody who was exposed to the type of legislation and the program that we are discussing here. For him, it was the same thing. Suddenly, he was in a protected area, and they said he was being bad for nature, even though they were running a perfectly good business and taking care of nature. All these environmental NGOs were running media hate campaigns against him. That is kind of like the governance structure that I described in this report.

**Fitts:** Part of what has to happen is the general population needs to become immune to the media game, and they're not yet.

**van Hamelen:** When you read media, assume that somebody is trying to influence you. Who do you want to be influenced by? Choose your sources very, very carefully.

If you read mainstream media or legacy media, keep that in the back of your mind. What is the narrative they are trying to sell? Every time it's a narrative; it's not a piece of information that helps you make a good decision. They promote a narrative because they want to steer you in a certain direction.

**Fitts:** They are not giving you a good map, and they are not helping you with risk management.

We've been talking about the policy tsunami that has been torturing the farmers and fishermen, whether it's phosphate or nitrogen or land management or nature conservation. There are many different things here. We did not talk about the discards. When I read the discards, it was hard not to cry. Tell us about the discards.

**van Hamelen:** First, it was Brexit, and then they protected nature areas and they weren't allowed to fish there. Then there are the windmills, and then there are the discards.

When fishermen fish, not all the fish are suitable for sale. So they put the discards overboard. At least half of the fish are still alive, and they swim away.

Now the EU says, “That’s really unsustainable. We want you to catch fewer discards. You need to bring everything on land.”

So now there is a landing obligation. One of the fishermen who we interviewed said that it’s insane because if you put those fish overboard, they are still alive. You shouldn’t bring that young fish onto land; it needs to swim. But now, because they don’t trust the fishermen bringing them back to land, they voted that cameras need to be installed on the boats.

This is another interesting thing: The fishermen were already being tracked by GPS. This has been going on for decades. When they weigh fish, there are special sensors for that. When any wire is loose, they will get a letter from the ministry that they are not in compliance.

What else is interesting is that these fishermen know where the currents go and where they can find the fish, but because of the GPS, the government knows exactly where they are and where they are fishing. A couple of the fishermen said it was interesting that each time they wanted to start the ‘protected areas’, they happen to be the areas where they fish.

So, there is a landing obligation, and then they had to deal with the fuel prices. After the war in the Ukraine, the prices went ‘through the roof’. It really adds to the cost of their operation because their boats use a lot of fuel.

All of these things are happening.

**Fitts:** Yes, and their equipment is being legislated. You said they must put in a new motor costing 150,000 euros.

**van Hamelen:** The smaller boats are shrimp fisheries and smaller fisheries near the coast and the IJsselmeer. Then you have the North Sea boats, which are the bigger boats. Then there are the boats on the open ocean – on the non-territorial waters. So, the shrimp fisheries are fishing in protected areas. Now they say they need to invest in a catalyzer and a new engine, and if they don’t do that, they won’t get a new permit.

Each of them is 100,000 euros per investment for a small business.

**Fitts:** It's a debt trap.

**van Hamelen:** Yes. In 2010, it was the SumWing method. The fisheries disturbed the bottom, and then the fish on the bottom rise up, and they catch these fish. But because they disturb the bottom, it costs plenty of energy. So, they gathered together with an engineer, and basically there is another story on how they drew this out in a discussion in a bar. They had a new innovation where they would have very low voltage electrical pulses. So, they didn't need to disturb the bottom. Another thing the nature protection agencies said was, "The fishermen are destroying nature."

You don't need to disturb the soil anymore. There is a very low electrical pulse. The fish are startled by it, and it's called 'SumWing'. It's devised in such a way that their fuel costs were reduced by more than 50%.

They got a temporary permit to use this because there was a lot of research. They wanted sustainability prices because there were fewer emissions and lower fuel costs and less bycatch. So, they can catch fish in a very direct manner.

**Fitts:** Naturally they had to outlaw this.

**van Hamelen:** Yes, and they did. The research supported this, but the French fisheries have much older boats and they are smaller, but they have a lot of political clout in the EU. So, there was this whole campaign about 'electrocuted fish' and 'destroying nature', and then it was forbidden. All those fishermen had invested in this, which was 150,000 euros for a small boat.

Imagine the fuel prices going 'through the roof', and you have something in storage that you knew was half the fuel cost, and you are forbidden to use it. That is the entrepreneurial risk.

The worst thing about the fishermen was that after all of this, they said to the fishermen who ran the North Sea boats, "We offer a subsidy if you turn in your boat." The condition was that they wouldn't start a fishery in the next five years, they would turn in their fishing quota (which they invested a great deal of time to get their quotas), and the boat needed to be destroyed.

**Fitts:** When you read this description, you realize that this is really about control of the food supply; they want complete control.

One thing you point out is that one of the consequences is corporatization of the food supply.

**van Hamelen:** Yes, that is an important consequence.

**Fitts:** You are destroying all the independence.

**van Hamelen:** And the culture. I don't write about that in the report, but I knew somebody in Urk (in Flevoland, Netherlands), and he introduced me to a fisherman there. Urk is a very interesting case study. They are a very tight-knit Christian community. It used to be an island, and it's a fishing community.

You ask a fisherman, "How long have you been doing this?" and they can't tell you because it goes back through their whole heritage. It's not only many generations, but it's ages – like hundreds of years.

Also, the fisherman go out to sea, but it is a whole industry in the form of the island itself; it is part of the whole community. So what do you do when you ask somebody to destroy this boat? It's not just a thing; it's your livelihood and your heritage; it's the culture.

I realized, if you look at this land consolidation, all of these uprooted people are going into the cities. I thought, "This must have been such a homogenization of culture as well with all these uprooted people." That is why I was also interested in this culture at Urk.

**Fitts:** You're killing the world; you're killing a family; you're killing a field; you're killing a community.

**van Hamelen:** I asked a fisherman, "What happened during the COVID lockdowns?"

He said, "The first person was diagnosed with COVID, and everyone was on the 'tip of their toes' wondering what was happening. But, of course, we know everyone's medical history. So, we knew if someone had three heart attacks and

respiration issues.”

For them, it was quickly very obvious who was at risk and who was not. They still met in the churches; they had many churches.

He said that the Monday after church, it was spreading like ‘wildfire’. What I thought was interesting was that he said, “For us, the question that mattered was not what we are doing here, but the question of eternity. Our life and our lifespan is given by God.”

It’s about how you live and how you come together. So, if somebody is dying, you don’t put them in a plastic box. If you are dying, you are with someone because that is their faith, and that is how they support each other.

I had a couple of other conversations with him as well, and I realized they had a real reality check, whereas, everyone in the cities were atomized and hypnotized by a black screen. The only information was death and fear and testing.

**Fitts:** They had a community and they ended up working together.

**van Hamelen:** They have a different source of information, and it’s a real source of information because they see what is happening in their community. They are talking with each other; they have a sense of connection. I think that it was really a bulwark against getting so brainwashed.

**Fitts:** One of the things that frightens me the most – and Urk is a perfect example – is if you look at Urk, and the community, you see a group of people who would be much less likely to do something in terms of delivering food into the system that would poison or kill people, whereas, you put together a corporate system, and there is absolutely no sense of caring about what happens to the consumer. It’s a machine.

Now you are talking about people who feel an ethical obligation and a long-standing relationship with the consumer versus a machine that couldn’t care less.

**van Hamelen:** With these North Sea boats, 76 or 78 have already been



applied for destruction. There are 40 left, and only 30 big boats.

**Fitts:** I was in Urk a year ago, and that is a phenomenal number.

**van Hamelen:** Yes.

**Fitts:** Just because this is really ‘cheerful’, let’s turn to ‘**Impact of Monetary and Fiscal Policy**’. We’ve been talking about the policy tsunami. There is another tsunami that is arguably just as big in terms of its impact, and that is the fact that we have a central banking machine that is pumping out huge amounts of cash to the insiders, and all the farmers and fishermen are outsiders; they are not getting the benefit of most of that cash.

There was some fiscal cash coming through that machinery during the pandemic, but generally, you are getting slaughtered by inflation and interest rates in a way that the insiders are protected from. So, the people who are trying to buy you out of business, or put you out of business, or buy your land have a very low cost of capital, and you have a ridiculously high cost of capital.

This debt trap is all part of that game.

**van Hamelen:** There is a major land grab occurring. On the one hand, there is a land grab giving all of this land back to nature. There is a UN goal to bring 30% of the land and 30% of the sea under this NGO nature protection control (and that is an EU goal as well), and restoration goals are added to that. So, 30% is protected and 20% restoration is added. Then you have this land grab like BlackRock and asset managers and private equity buying it up.

**Fitts:** Remember, Ukraine is farmland. We had BlackRock show up in Ukraine a month or two ago, talking about how they will, basically, buy, invest in, and own everything.

**van Hamelen:** One condition of the aid to Ukraine was that they would create land markets. They’ve done so. So, while all of the civilians are dying, the land is being sold off to oligarchs.

**Fitts:** Right, it’s a huge land grab.

Let's turn to consequences and the **corporatization of food**. That is one of the things that is happening. As this is happening in the Netherlands, what can you tell us about corporatization of food?

**van Hamelen:** You have an industrial model, and you need to grow bigger and bigger to be able to run your farm. But at some point, your farm is very big and leveraged, and you cannot give it to your sons and daughters anymore because they cannot take over this debt. They can only sell it to the big players – the large food producers.

**Fitts:** So, you have a much lower cost of capital.

**van Hamelen:** Yes, that model makes it difficult for the small farmers to get by. More small farmers and independent farmers are going bankrupt because of this model. So, they are buying all these farms in the Netherlands, but they are buying all this land in Eastern Europe. They are actually doing this worldwide. For example, they will do it for large areas of land in Eastern Europe, and you have a corporation that is running it. It's also devastating the communities there.

They don't have the food standards, so you don't know what the cattle are being fed or what kind of medication is being applied or what our food safety standards are. Jeroen van Maanen, one of the farmers who we interviewed, said, "Well, here they have all these strict regulations. We have a high-quality food production. Then they say that we are bad for nature or they make up something about how we are bad for the animals. It's not as if this production quits; they just move it to Ukraine or some other country, and then we import it back again. Then the supermarkets sell food that we are not allowed to produce because it's 'too dangerous.'" So, it is bankrupting the farmers here and putting it in corporate hands there, but really lowering the quality.

**Fitts:** I'm terrified of most of that food because, if you dive into some of the real food safety issues (not the phony food safety issues), there is so much criminality going on in the corporate system that it is truly frightening.

**van Hamelen:** If there is one takeaway after reading this complete report, it's to invest in your food. If you can afford it, pay premium. Even if you are not

doing it for farmers, and even if it appears cheaper when you buy something at a supermarket, you are financing your enemy; they are part of a system of controlled food.

**Fitts:** You are financing somebody who is in the process of killing you.

**van Hamelen:** Yes.

**Fitts:** I would like to look at it from the subscribers' point of view: We are working on the '*Learning Plan for Building Wealth*'. Somebody said, "You need to give an example of a time budget," because we were talking about how to do a time budget.

I keep talking about different risk issues related to the great poisoning. I said that I wanted to do one section of the time budget saying, "There is the great poisoning, which starts with bad food and bad water and pharmaceuticals, etc. So, there is the great poisoning, but then there is shadow work."

If you look at the policy tsunami, much of it is shadow work that was made up to destroy farmers' time. Then you have inflation, interest rates, and crime/safety. So, much of what has been happening with the immigrants in certain areas – certainly in the United States – falls into this category.

I did this with one of our teammates: You have a man, a woman, and a baby. So, I decided to only use the two adults for one week. So, that is two adults, and that is seven days each; that is 14 days' worth of time.

It resulted in one person getting food poisoning, and the other person had gotten it, though not as bad. That took up two and a half days, and it destroyed productivity for two and a half days. Then they bought a new piece of equipment, and it turned out to be faulty. They had to keep waiting for the repairman to fix it. That was half a day that shouldn't have happened; that was time stolen. Inflation, if you look at how much their food and other essential household goods had gone up over the last year, turned into a day of work. So, if you considered the amount of money they had to pay, they had to determine how many hours they would have to work to earn that, and it was a day.

For interest rates, they were lucky; they protected themselves against that, so that was zero. For crime and safety, they were very savvy and smart, and they had no bad luck. So that was zero.

It totaled to four days out of fourteen they lost to the game of draining you with these different risk issues.

If you look at this and how much food poisoning or sickness in health can drain you, locking up excellent sources of fresh food is a no-brainer.

**van Hamelen:** Definitely.

**Fitts:** You can't afford to lose two and a half days.

**van Hamelen:** Right, and possibly more.

This is not in the report, but if you look at the weather during the last couple of months, I suspect there is some serious weather warfare going on. They forecasted that the harvests will be bad. So in addition to inflation, expect higher food prices.

At some point, you want to secure your access to food, and do not want to be dependent on the supermarket or the government.

**Fitts:** Lowering food quality is a problem, too.

One of the things that is happening is we now have an invading army of NGOs, which appears to be growing. How are the NGOs in the Netherlands?

**van Hamelen:** They are basically the implementation arm of a governance layer that many people do not take into account. If you look at both the farmers and the fishermen, I think they are both examples, but I think the fishermen are the better example. You have stakeholder engagement processes which are very much like a Delphi method (multiple questionnaires reviewed a group for a consensus opinion). The end is already predetermined, but they invite everyone; everyone can talk. Then they say, "You had your say," and then they do what they had planned to do.

The nature protection NGOs have a seat at the table as a stakeholder, but why? Who are they representing? They say they are representing civil society, but they're not.

**Fitts:** They are representing whoever funds them; that is who they really represent.

**van Hamelen:** If you go back to this whole UN matter, then you see that many of these NGOs have special consultative status at the UN. So, they are part of developing these policies to give back land to nature, and they are part of creating protected natural areas through creating ecoregions, which is like a new governance layer above municipalities and under government. So, it's actually created to subvert national sovereignty.

Then these areas are run by the same NGOs. So, many of them are basically an implementation arm, which is a 'tricky thing' as well. You know the research of Corey Lynn (Global Landscape on Vaccine Passports) laundering with the immunity. She has gone into the UN history and discovered that many of these UN organizations have been given diplomatic immunity and privileges after World War II. That means that they have a diplomat status, so you cannot turn in a FOIA (Freedom of Information Act) request, and you cannot start a criminal investigation. If you want to go into their buildings, you are not allowed to.

The people who work for them don't need to show vaccination proof or testing proof; they can pass freely through customs.

Those UN organizations with the immunities can – in some cases – pass these immunities to their members. One of the biggest NGOs and municipalities and governments have many members, and they are probably allowed to give their privileges to their members. They don't need to be transparent about that.

So, we don't know which NGOs under them have the same privileges, so you have an arm of the UN that is implementing this agenda, and they are protected by a wall of secrecy and community.

**Fitts:** I would put it this way: You have a tsunami of money financing a tsunami of invading armies, whether you call them government, civil service, or energy. You have a tsunami of money financing all of these people, none of whom have to be accountable on an economic basis; they don't have to be productive.

**van Hamelen:** Also, not on a legal basis because they have diplomatic immunity. A diplomat still resides in some country, but these organizations like the BIS (Bank for International Settlements) bank, is part of the system as well. They extend this immunity to all the central banks under them. So, you have a layer of UN organizations, central banks, and NGOs. If you want to start a legal case, there is no court that you can file anywhere.

**Fitts:** I would say that the New York Fed depository is still legally obligated, and the BIS cannot protect them. That is what I believe. I don't put it past them, but if you are running the depository function for the US government, you have contractual obligations.

After Mark Skidmore published his report – and I'm assuming that some of that laundering was done through the BIS – a week or two later there was a fire at the New York Fed on a Saturday night. That tells me they don't think they have it (immunity).

This agenda is accelerating. One of the things that you cover is the **rights of nature**, which gets even more frightening. I would point out that Chile rejected the constitutional change with giving rights to nature, so we are making a little progress.

Talk about the frightening rights of nature: I keep hearing in my mind, "Wait, no! It's worse."

**van Hamelen:** It's all the 'Protect nature because man is bad for nature' agenda. The protected areas are one part, but now there is a movement that says that nature needs to be protected as if it's a legal personality under law.

Apparently in some areas, they have given a river or a natural area already legal personhood rights. If you look at the changes that are proposed in the World

Health Organization's international health regulations, they say, "We need to get rid of human rights," and they replace that with some fake wording like, "We need to protect equity and equality of all life."

So, they are moving from an entreprisentic to an egocentric world view, and 'all life' means the forest, or a river, or a toad, or some animal living somewhere, and with a human, you have to balance their equity and their rights. They have 'equal' rights, and they see that as something progressive. It's very scary because you think, "Who is going to protect those rights for nature?" The NGO's will start these lawsuits with the tsunami of money behind them. And there are no human rights anymore.

It is basically saying that humans don't have real intrinsic value.

**Fitts:** Back to this bubble, on top of the real assets you have trillions of dollars of real assets owned by humans, and the humans used to have a decent life. Now they are saying that all of the laws that protect those rights we should throw out so that they can get the real assets.

**van Hamelen:** It shows that it is an attack on property rights. They are very honest about this.

**Fitts:** This is about the property rights of the people whose land they want to steal, not the property rights of the people who are going to do the stealing.

**van Hamelen:** That is true, but that is not part of their conversation. With these natural areas, they say, "People are using that." The quotation marks are important in this article because they are treating this land as their 'property'. This 'property' needs to be protected because this meadow has rights, and how come this person thinks that they own it? So, it needs to be protected under UN rules by NGOs.

**Fitts:** In the accelerating stream of, "Wait! No, it's worse," talk a little about **One Health**. We will talk about the WHO, but we need to talk about both the WHO and One Health because you go into the WHO and you think that it can't get worse. Then you add One Health, and it integrates this.

**van Hamelen:** One Health is basically an infrastructure. It says that almost anything can be a source of a pandemic potential. So, natural areas and the environment can be a part of a pandemic potential. Food production, cattle, and humans themselves can be a pandemic potential. So, you need to put everything under genomic surveillance.

**Fitts:** So, we are talking about unbelievable surveillance on everything.

**van Hamelen:** Yes, and they already created the infrastructure for this.

**Fitts:** Right, and the BIS put together a database of everything. So, whether it is surveilling or tracking or having complete data and intellectual master on everything, they have it, and our money is paying for it.

**van Hamelen:** Yes. With the One Health, the way I discovered it was in one of the first proposals of the changes in IHR (International Health Regulations). Before there will be a pandemic, they will call in the atomic agencies. I thought, “That makes sense if there is some nuclear disaster.”

But in the changes, they said, “We need to include UNEP,” which is the United Nations Environment Programme. They also want to include the OIE (now known as WOAHA- World Organisation for Animal Health). They have a new name now, but that is the animal part. They also want to include the FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization), which is the agricultural part of the UN. I thought, “That is all food production and the environment. What does that have to do with sickness?”

Then you have a theory that it’s not only diseases, but how diseases jump from animals to humans and all that theory. They’ve been pushing this for a long time.

One of the farmers said, “These farmers used to live in one farm together with a family with eleven people, and they had their cows and goats – all living in one area. We didn’t have zoonotic outbreaks then.”

**Fitts:** Right, we had very strong immune systems.



**van Hamelen:** That, too. I think the whole narrative is that anything can make you sick, and everything needs to be under surveillance, and nature, and humans, and animals are being put on one level. So, the theory behind that is zoonotic diseases. The narrative being prepared is there will be some disease among the cows or chickens. You had the bird flu, of course, which they have been pushing for some time. But then that is a reason to cull many animals. I've forgotten the number, but an enormous amount of chickens worldwide have been culled in the name of the bird flu.

I cannot completely discover this because I thought it was another one of those pandemics that is being run by the PCR (polymerase chain reaction) tests. I spoke to one farmer, and he had a chicken factory that had undergone this culling. He said, "Yes, they do a PCR test."

I asked, "Were the chickens sick?"

He said, "No."

But I was speaking to another farmer, and he said that if they were sick, it 'runs like wildfire'. So I thought, "What is running like wildfire?"

I thought that the most interesting explanation was from Arthur Firstenberg's newsletter because he was talking about Ameland, which is one of the islands north of the Netherlands. Within a couple of months, a whole colony of birds died – thousands of birds. But when he looked into the details, he saw in the same period that these birds died, they had placed many 4G towers there.

Then they said that it's not always the 4G towers causing the birds to die, but this was an area where there was a lot of shipping traffic, and it was near the sea. So, the EMF radio waves get reflected. So, he had a couple of examples where there was very high EMF, and colonies were disappearing. Then there was one colony 20 miles away that was in perfect health.

He said, "If this is a contagious disease, and if we say that this disease is all over Europe, this wouldn't happen." There are examples of more birds dying. Of course, these birds navigate based on the earth's magnetism. So, I can imagine that these birds would be much more sensitive to the increase in

electromagnetic changes.

**Fitts:** Everybody should read his book, *The Invisible Rainbow*, because this is very much a part of what is in the mix here. My concern is, of course, that they can trigger disease using EMF. You want to have a bird flu? Okay, then turn it on.

Let's talk a little about the **control grid** because what we are talking about is control of food, control of money, control of media, and control of all these things.

I recently did an interview with James Roguski. I think they are basically building an invading army that can say, "Elze, there's a pathogen in your sewer system. We have to condemn your house."

You are talking about, not only surveillance, but the ability to move in against any neighborhood or building.

**van Hamelen:** They are surveilling all the sewage, and then they say, "We see that there is a viral load in the sewage, so this neighborhood is at risk."

**Fitts:** The next thing you know, it's very easy to pick up a large amount of real estate cheap.

I believe it looks like a big real estate steal – the whole thing.

**van Hamelen:** It is. Look at all the numbers and where the houses are that they are buying up and the land.

**Fitts:** They are doing it with all the fishing and farming. But if you look at what the WHO is preparing, they are building a machinery of a combination of different resources that can literally operate to control or steal the real estate anywhere on the planet. It's quite phenomenal.

I should say that Liechtenstein and the Cook Islands are not members.

**van Hamelen:** Lucky them!

**Fitts:** I know! The people in Liechtenstein really understand money; they are very, very smart. If you are one of the tiniest countries in the world having to get along with all the biggest countries in the world, you get very, very smart; they are smart people.

You talked about 15-minute cities and some of the things they are doing in the Netherlands to build smart cities.

**van Hamelen:** With the habitat policy, they say we need to redistribute the population over the land area, and they also say that we need redistribution of assets. They do this through implementing all these land use policies and regulations.

This whole trend of urbanization was not so much a natural process, but it was really steered from UN policies – which many governments had implemented as well – by making it more difficult to use land in rural areas, and by stimulating people going into cities, and finally, by managing how cities are being developed in the urban growth boundaries.

Rosa Koire describes how you have all these redevelopment agencies creating housing development projects, but disowning people off their property by creating all this legislation like saying, “This house is a blight.”

There are all these regulations that you need to abide by. She says that this eminent domain is taking the housing people and using it in an unjust way. She was a real estate appraiser, and she said that in some cases, you do need to have a road, and then they appraise the land, and take the land by eminent domain. So, there are cases where this needs to happen, but she saw that what was happening in cities was a very big fraud.

You now see that the same kind of planning process is being used for the smart cities, and smart cities are now being divided into ‘15-minute’ zones. What you then have are basically open-air prisons. These smart cities are full of cameras and sensors and IOT infrastructure. The 4G is already up, and they are increasing 5G, so there is heavy electromagnetic pollution. It is becoming impossible to stay in the countryside. People are going into the cities.

They are bankrupting people, as well, because the homeowners need solar panels and they need to comply with all these other legislations. So in the end, you have people who can only rent.

BlackRock and Blackstone are buying up many of these homes, so you can only lease. But they are turning the houses that you can lease into surveillance homes as well.

This has been a policy that has been implemented over a long time span, and it's putting people in cities that are like open-air prisons.

**Fitts:** When you read *Pharma Food* and *The Dutch Farmers and Fishermen: The People Who Feed Us*, you see the system hull. You go through the whole ecosystem, and you see the game.

The expression in America was that the Indians used to say, "The white man speaks with forked tongue." The deception and the lies and the gaslighting are remarkable.

You see the game, and I see the game, but yet, I am continually baffled by talking with people in the Netherlands and how they don't see the game.

**van Hamelen:** It requires time. Many people are sending memes to each other on Twitter. Sometimes I get a question, and I think, "I cannot respond to this question in two sentences. If I try to, you will misunderstand me, and it will be taken the wrong way."

**Fitts:** Just send them the link.

**van Hamelen:** That as well. That is why I feel so grateful that you have given me the opportunity to do this research. Even in this report, there were so many areas that I thought needed a deeper dive and led me to more questions.

**Fitts:** You need to map out the whole ecosystem. Dr. Joseph Farrell says, "The quality of a piece is judged by the number of footnotes," and I would say that the footnotes on *Pharma Food* and the footnotes here are quite extraordinary. So if anybody wants to dive into it, there is much more that you can do.

I see *Solari*'s job is to do the deep dive that maps out the whole thing. From there, we can start to make it simple because we can always link back, if we want the details, to there.

You have the detailed map. My hope is that this piece – and we do this a great deal – can turn you to a reporter who wants to understand and cover this, but it would take them months to duplicate what you've done. They can read your piece, and suddenly, they are standing on solid ground, and they can do something in a week that is very meaningful.

**van Hamelen:** There are a couple of researchers who I site here, and I thought, "They already saw this in the 1990's." Their work has helped me so much. They were going to the UN conferences, and were going through these reports. By reading their work, I immediately knew, "Oh, this is where I need to look," or, "This is the key issue."

**Fitts:** We are doing that for each other; we are getting to the point where somebody can say it without taking up all of 'Sunday dinner'.

One of the issues we were talking about, we don't have the answer for. If we have this game for the real assets, including the land and the real estate, we know the BIS is running the innovation hubs globally for all the CBDCs. They are putting together a unified database of all the real assets. What we don't understand is: What are they planning on using as collateral for the CBDC? I think it's humans, but where do all the other assets come into play? We don't know, but there is clearly a relationship between mapping and trying to own all these assets and what the collateral will be.

If you look at the planet right now, we have more promises of collateral than we have collateral. So, if you look at this mound of paper, the real assets have been promised too many times over, which is part of this control system. It's bringing that process to an unhappy conclusion. Clearly, one of the critical issues is: Who gets the assets?

If 100 more people have been promised assets where there are none, then who is going to get the assets?

**van Hamelen:** It's like the game of Monopoly: The bank always wins.

**Fitts:** Maybe not this time.

**van Hamelen:** But that is what they are planning.

Then we get back to this nature protection.

I cite Henry Lamb a good deal. At some point, he says, "It sounds very strange, but they are trying to put all this land which they say to protect into a trust under UN control. That is how they are trying to control the land."

I also interviewed Patrick Wood about his books on technocracy, and he said that this whole sustainable development agenda's forerunner was the technocratic agenda. He said that those technocrats in the 1930's devised a system, and they said, "We shouldn't have an economic system that is run by supply and demand, but we should put all the world's assets into a trust."

Then the technocrat scientists will be able to devise what is an optimal usage level. You use an energy-based currency to distribute the use of the assets. Basically, the idea of putting the assets into a trust was already in the technocrat model. He said it's been revamped into Agenda 21 where they say, "We need to manage all of the global commons for the sustainable development."

Dr. Farrell posted a small piece, and he gave comments on it. Russia has declared the World Wildlife Fund as 'undesirable'. That is interesting because from reading about the World Wildlife Fund, they are one of the key NGOs who is creating this subversive governance layer to control land. The reason they are 'undesirable' is that they were subverting economic activity. (I can't imagine that!)

Then Dr. Farrell quoted a man from the 1980's who coincidentally was invited to a World Wildlife conference. You would think that's kind of like a nature-protecting conference, and who was there but Maurice Strong and Baron Rothschild. He said the highest of the high financiers were there.

In the 1980's, you heard of a plan to bring wilderness areas under UN control as

collateral for world currency. And they are really ratcheting up this agenda right now. So, Russia is very important in this case because they have the largest world land mass.

**Fitts:** It spans from Europe to Asia; I think it's eleven time zones. The wealth of resources there is extraordinary.

**van Hamelen:** We go back to the war in Ukraine: It's not only about Ukraine; they want to divide up Russia.

**Fitts:** Yes, they want to implode Russia. To do this plan, they need to implode and get control of the assets in Russia. This is a 'big deal'.

**van Hamelen:** So, this was a small piece of news that the World Wildlife Fund is ousted, but it is very big because the real game is about the land and the assets.

**Fitts:** I want to go back to what we can do. I have talked with you before about the movie, *The Neverending Story*, where the protagonist is fighting with a force in the universe called 'the Nothing'. When you look at this machinery and it touches you and your life, the Nothing is coming at us from every direction, and it is stealing our assets and it is stealing our time.

Part of what you can do is get prepared to do more with the Nothing because the Nothing is on the move.

**van Hamelen:** I've noticed recently how many people have said, "We won't win this in my lifetime."

This person was over ten years younger than me. I thought, "What? Why do you say that?"

**Fitts:** We are willing to win it.

**van Hamelen:** I hope so! Also, with the farmers, I don't know what you can do about this; this is too big. But I think that each of us are all creative in our own way. We have to step into our creativity and start doing something. Also,

sometimes it helps to let go; if you think we need to ‘win’ or ‘not win’, that kind of thought can be almost blocking.

Just think, “I’m here at this point, and I will do what I can do.” I think that faith helps plenty as well.

**Fitts:** And fresh food helps a lot.

**van Hamelen:** Yes, and filter your water. One very simple thing that you can do is go to your farmer and have a conversation. If you are in a big city and cannot get to your farmer, go to the farmers markets or go to networks where somebody buys from the local farms and brings the food to your home one day of the week.

**Fitts:** That’s what we do.

**van Hamelen:** I get it directly from the farm, but I did that for a while as well. Find a way to do this.

If you are thinking, “I want to start a business,” and this business is not yet in your neighborhood, I would say to start that.

I also quote Jan Douwe van der Ploeg, who has written about peasant farming, like the regenerative farming model. He said you have all these food monopolies, but the peasant farms are at their best in the margins. Their margins cannot be touched.

So, if you have a direct line to your farmer or with one person in between, and all these informal networks and are paying cash, they cannot touch that. So, I would almost plead for some very big campaign, such as #boycottagrabusines. Boycott everything that is the corporatization of food. Try to avoid it as much as possible. I think you can be creative in that. So, that is a smaller personal choice.

If you still have money that you invest or are looking for investment opportunities, invest it somewhere where you can buy from farms, and even the larger agricultural farms. Right now, there is policy in the Netherlands that says,



“We want a regenerative model,” but this will be the next policy wave that will bankrupt everyone.

Perhaps an over-leveraged farm could be bought up by people who are knowledgeable. You can devise a plan and say, “How can we make the transition in a way that doesn’t collapse food production?” because you cannot turn organic overnight. Perhaps you can even divide up the land to some extent or put it in a foundation.

**Fitts:** There are different ways. People can come together to buy a farm and hire a farmer to help them produce all the food for their families. So it’s private.

I remember having dinner with a farmer, and she and her husband started a farm where they were essentially providing food to a group of families at cost plus. So, it was whatever the bill was at the end of the year plus a profit margin is what they got paid.

There are ways of doing this with personal coops that can work.

**van Hamelen:** On another level, it is super-important to change the narrative because the narrative is that man is an enemy of nature, and property rights are bad.

Nitrogen emissions are an issue. If you go along with the narrative, then you get a discussion about how much nitrogen emissions are good or how you should deal with them.

**Fitts:** It seems that many of the environmental problems on the planet can be changed by changing from industrial agriculture to regenerative farming in a proper way and in an evolutionary way. If you try to do it ‘shock-doctrine’, it won’t work. But it can be done, and it’s a good economic model.

**van Hamelen:** That is the big selling story of industrial agriculture: We need that to feed the world.

**Fitts:** Here is the problem: How do you solve the environmental problem while asserting complete control of the full food supply?

If you just solve the environmental problems by moving from industrial agriculture to regenerative agriculture, then you can't have central control of food. That is the problem. Since we don't want central control of food, it's not a problem for us.

All of these debates keep going back to the fact that we have a secret governance system that wants complete control. That is a win-lose proposition, and they either win or lose; if they win, we lose. It's that simple.

Part of changing the narrative is getting the total ecosystem to see that is the problem and it's that simple. That is what has to be debated out – not these thousands of little complex things that have been manufactured.

**van Hamelen:** Don't get pulled into these complex discussions that are designed to distract you.

There is a large piece in the report about the property rights because I was taught – because I'm from the Netherlands – about the Declaration of Independence and the US Constitution. I found that the Declaration of Independence stated that everyone had the right to pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness. That was taken from John Locke (English philosopher and physician known as the father of liberalism), and it was actually the pursuit of life, liberty, and property (or estate).

**Fitts:** I didn't know that!

**van Hamelen:** The reason for that was access to property was seen as a condition for freedom.

**Fitts:** Absolutely.

**van Hamelen:** If I can explain this correctly, if you have a piece of property, you can generate your wealth and generate your independence. If you don't have property, you become very dependent on something else.

In this line of reasoning, the only reason for the government is to protect your

property because it's a condition for freedom. So, if your property rights are taken, you cannot have freedom without property rights.

**Fitts:** For years now, whenever I'm with groups to talk about human rights, I keep throwing in property rights. It's almost as though, at first, I would get funny looks, and I would keep saying, "No, it's about property rights."

Then I started talking about family wealth, and they associated 'family wealth' with rich people who are evil. I said, "No, family wealth is the basis of democracy; it's the basis of freedom; it's the basis of everything." I kept 'throwing it in the hopper'.

We had an activist who did an hour and a half 'hit job' on me – which I haven't watched. We did a *Wrap-Up* on ESG, and she thought that I said the opposite of what I said. She admitted that she hadn't read it; she just assumed what I had said.

She said that all the information I do on family wealth is very bad. My retort was, "You can build wealth, you can build poverty, or you can build nothing. Which do you want?"

I am absolutely in agreement with you that property rights are essential for human freedom.

**van Hamelen:** Apparently, in the US, there is a complete property rights movement. I collected plenty of information, but I didn't have time to read it yet. I find it very interesting how this has been elaborated in the philosophy of law and in the Constitution. They are taking that away, and there is also a big indoctrination process that property is 'dirty and greedy'.

I had the story of Jan Douwe van der Ploeg. He describes how his grandfather was a landless worker who went from one area to the next. He fell in love with his grandmother, and they were engaged for seven years because that was how long it took to get a pig and a cow, or something like that. Then they were able to get their tiny plot of land. He worked very hard to expand that piece of land and farm so he could send his son to school. His son was able to send his son to college, which is Jan Douwe.

He said, “That is how you build autonomy. That is how you build wealth.” And that is all by legislation and rights and infringements on a prior piece of land. That is what you are taking from people – the right to autonomous existence.

Even when I was doing this research, I always assumed that the land was this way because of some sort of natural process. But when you see how orchestrated it is, I thought, “We don’t need to live in Hobbit houses, but in *The Lord of the Rings* you see everyone doing this. They have a large piece of land around their homes.” I thought, “Why not? Why are we all living so close?”

**Fitts:** There is no reason not to.

**van Hamelen:** The only reason is the way they devised the policy. If you want to control people – like if we go back to the beginning of the story – and if you have all of these farmers who have tiny plots of land, and each plot of land has 30 owners, you cannot control these people. But if you have many people who own nothing and who are grouped up in 15-minute smart cities, it becomes very easy to control them.

I think we need to put land ownership and property rights back to the forefront of this fight.

**Fitts:** It goes back to the governance model: Are we going to optimize what we do and how we do it so that we are a happy planet, or are we going to optimize what we do and how we do it to produce the planetary dividend, which is going someplace? That is still a big question for another time.

I daresay that the message of the Dutch farmers and fishermen is that somebody is trying to steal our property rights and our land. We are in the same basket with the Dutch farmers and fishermen. The question is: Can we see that? I think, thanks to your map, we can see it much easier.

**van Hamelen:** I hope so.

**Fitts:** And can we see that, and then can we start to understand that we are all in the same ‘basket’, and start to help each other?

Whatever we do, we need this map if we are going to risk manage our life. So, eat fresh food, start looking in your community and your jurisdiction to see how you are going to protect your property rights because they are coming.

**van Hamelen:** Yes, for everyone.

**Fitts:** They are coming for everyone.

**van Hamelen:** The operation is everyone thinks that it is them individually.

**Fitts:** Although each person is unique, in this aspect, we share the same enemy.

Elze, this has been absolutely fantastic. The full piece is up on the website, which will be converted into a PDF. *Pharma Food* will be up in a PDF. This report will be up in text with the graphics on the website, and we will convert it into a PDF and then get it into the printer behind *Pharma Food*.

The two of these are a blockbuster, and we are very grateful.

It's hard to find people who can do what you do. It's quite special.

**van Hamelen:** Thank you. I love doing this.

**Fitts:** Is there anything that you want to tell us before we close?

**van Hamelen:** No, I think we covered it. But you need to read the entire 60 pages because it's one story.

**Fitts:** Now that this is done and on the way to the editor, you are off for a vacation – which is very well-deserved. Have a wonderful time.

Thank you for joining us on *The Solari Report*.

Ladies and gentlemen, as you know, at *The Solari Report*, we think that your eating healthy, fresh food is very, very important. So, we are delighted to have the opportunity to bring this to you. Thank you for joining us.

## MODIFICATION

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

**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.**