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**Marty:** [00:00:00] What is up freaks? Welcome back to TFTC. Really excited for today's conversation. I'm sitting down with Mike Benz, who is the executive director at the Foundation for Freedom Online. And Mike has been doing incredible work to highlight the inner workings of the censorship industrial complex, which is really becoming a massive problem in our world today as people try to discern what is the truth, what is propaganda and.

How is the power complex trying to control us? So Mike, thank you for coming on the show really appreciate the work that you do

**Mike:** No, thanks for having me looking forward to chatting.

**Marty:** No, I think just to start I mean I think you came across my desk, my Twitter desk, this summer, uh, when you did, you were on like a long walk, just doing a dissection of the censorship industrial complex and how was it trying to attack Elon after he took over Twitter, now X, [00:01:00] um, and I think to start there, like, what is this censorship industrial complex?

Who are the stakeholders? How does it operate and affect

**Mike:** our lives? Sure. So, I mean, censorship industrial complex is kind of a play on the military industrial complex, which is a concept really from the 1950s with Eisenhower. It was his farewell address where he basically complained that, um, the end of World War II.

You know, from the late 1950s, there was spawned a, uh, war as essentially an industry, as a profit making thing, you know, at the time, a lot of manufacturing was wrapped up in, in the, in the war, the, the Pentagon renamed itself from the Department of War to the Department of Defense, and there was this defense industry with not just contractors, but also with lobbyists and also with civil society and private sector institutions.

Really, when the wheel of commerce wrapped itself around war, it completely warped [00:02:00] American foreign policy. Because now you would start doing wars not necessarily because they're best for the country, but because they're best for the industrial stakeholders of war. And this is obviously something that predated World War II.

Smedley Butler wrote about this in War is a Racket in 1936. But essentially you have a very similar thing happening right now with the field of social media censorship. And it is a field, it is an industry. Before 2016, you could not. Make a living censoring what other people have to say on the internet.

That was not a job description. That was not something like Ruth Poat where you can make $45 million a year doing. There was no industrial complex to sustain a hundred, 200,000 American jobs all in the field of controlling. by tuning down the information that you try to distribute on the internet. Now it is a massive field, it is an industry, and what's even more curious about its industrial nature than simply the dollars is [00:03:00] who is sort of controlling the flow of those dollars, because when you, when you trace all these domestic censorship organizations upstream, time and again what you find is what I term It's not my term, it's technically Obama's Deputy National Security Advisor Ben Rhodes term, but you find this thing called the BLOB, which is basically the State Department, the Defense Department, and the Intelligence Services, the same federal agencies that are in control of the American Empire on the foreign facing side, have basically redirected their own statecraft, military, and intelligence capacities, uh, for controlling domestic information flows, and that's really what you're up against when you're trying to uncensor the internet.

And so

**Marty:** With these intelligence agencies in the State Department permeating big tech, particularly social media, like how far back does the integration of these entities within these companies go? And what was the process?

**Mike:** It goes back to their founding for most of [00:04:00] them. You know, I mean, Google is the best example.

It's probably the cleanest because Google was started. As, as a Stanford project, it was called Backpage. It was, uh, it was a two man project by Larry Page and Sergey Brin when they were graduate students, their PhD students, students at Stanford and their Stanford grant was a DARPA grant for a joint CIA NSA program called the Massive Digital Data Systems Program.

This is in 1995. The World Wide Web had just come out, if you remember, the internet itself is a DARPA project, it is a military state department intelligence project, uh, it was initially created essentially to help the Pentagon digitize all of the Thank you. Information that they were, that they had to maintain in order to maintain the American empire against all these insurgency movements, like in Vietnam is a way of digitizing all this information, especially social science information for, uh, that was that was [00:05:00] flowing into how to manage these foreign populations in 1991.

We win the cold war, we outsource the Internet the same way we outsourced radio with. With Voice of America and Radio Free Europe, the same way we had these CIA proprietaries in the 1940s that were all piped in with these new mediums of radio and TV. We did the same thing by piping the internet into countries around the world in the 1990s.

And this is Web 1. 0 at the time where it was just forums and blogs. The intelligence services quickly noticed that birds of a feather flocked together. Political birds of a feather in foreign countries, um, were aggregating together on common forums and blogs. And so the CIA and NSA wanted a political radar system, an early warning detection system, to be able to detect how political groups were forming abroad.

And so this DARPA grant that Google started as... Uh, was, was to basically feed information into that, [00:06:00] into that program around how search engines would, uh, would affect the, the, the flow of birds flocking together politically overseas. And then that became Google the following year, 1996. Uh, the, the very first thing, you know, the very, very first year Google went public in 2003, 2004, they became a military contractor.

The only reason they got Google Maps is because they bought the Keyhole software. So Google has been an out, an outgrowth of the national security state since before they were even Google. Um, and of course that, that became a, you know, that went on steroids after the 2016 election when Google's own proprietary CIA branch called Jigsaw, uh, created the machine learning artificial intelligence censorship software that now powers much of the internet or internet censorship.

**Marty:** So you mentioned post 2016 election. Do you think that was a critical tipping point in terms of... Oh, absolutely.

**Mike:** Yeah. Why so? [00:07:00] Well, there were three things that happened in 2016. Basically, the State Department lost an election in the Philippines that they didn't want to lose, and it was an internet election.

The Philippines basically doesn't have their own internet. It runs entirely on Facebook. Um, and, uh, an uncensored Facebook led to, uh, the wrong, the wrong, the wrong, uh, direction in that election. Uh, then you had Brexit, which the State Department strongly, strongly opposed. Brexit was also an internet revolution.

It was powered by Nigel Farage's viral videos dunking on Herman Van Rompuy for a couple years on YouTube, and even though it had no support from British media. Essentially it was, it was powered by YouTube, Facebook, and Twitter. And then after Brexit, you know, five months after that, uh, the U S presidential election of Trump, who got zero mainstream media endorsements, not a single print newspaper endorsement.

Um, it was an internet election. And, uh, Trump defeated both the Bush dynasty and the Clinton [00:08:00] dynasty, uh, in a single edgelord meme campaign. Uh, and that was basically when the rules based international order said, okay, enough is enough. Um, NATO is going to fall apart, the IMF is going to fall apart, the EU is going to fall apart, unless we censor the internet, we're going to lose 20 consecutive European parliamentary elections, where the populist right wing was winning in Italy, and in France, and in Spain, uh, and in Greece, and in the UK, and so they said, listen, we need to, the only way to save the world is to end free speech on the internet, and so you had, uh, lock, stock, and smoking barrel, if you will, the Pentagon, the State Department, the CIA, MI6, the UK Foreign Office and Brussels all basically decide that civilians shouldn't be able to make up their own mind.

Uh, information is now a military affair.

**Marty:** Yeah. And I think the Twitter files really highlighted just how far the intelligence apparatus and the State Department is willing [00:09:00] to go to make sure that their message is the dominant message out there. And it's. A lot of projection, if you will, because they're trying to claim that they want to prevent misinformation and disinformation and hate speech on the web.

But I think covid, uh, particularly the lockdowns and the censorship that went on during the last three years, uh, highlighted acutely that the information that they're pushing forward isn't always the truth.

**Mike:** Which is, well, they know it. I mean, they even say that's what the concept of malformation is.

That's why they call it missed dis and malformation misinformation is if you're wrong, accidentally, disinformation is if you're wrong on purpose, and malformation is if you're right. But you're still undermining public faith and confidence in a critical government narrative. Um, by speaking the truth and malinformation is probably the biggest category.

That was how all the vaccine efficacy and all the mail in ballot [00:10:00] stuff was censored. Uh, you know, that's they don't care. I mean, this if you if you believe if you even accept For a second, what you think they think they're saying with misinformation, you're just a sucker. I mean, they don't even believe, I mean, some of the operatives believe it, but most of it is just cold, hard nosed, you know, we need to control the narrative and they're going to, whatever terms they roll out are just seasonal terms to put, to put basically, you know, a silk dress over, over the pig of government control over media.

Yeah,

**Marty:** and it's getting, again, going back to the Twitter files, like how pivotal do you think Elon bringing in journalists to go through the Twitter files, go through the Slack messages, and to essentially make public the integration of the intelligence apparatus and Twitter's [00:11:00] previous management, what do you think that means for us moving forward?

Like, It is becoming obvious, particularly after COVID, that the control over information is something that the government wants complete control over, uh, and if we don't do something, uh, in the short to medium term, it, we could be waking up in a complete 1984, like dystopia, where the, the government controls all the language that you're, that is appropriate on the web, particularly.

**Mike:** Yeah, I mean, in a lot of ways, we're very far past 1984. I mean, even 1984 didn't, uh, didn't contemplate some of these AI, uh, scan and ban techniques that are now, um, De rigueur, so to speak, uh, in terms of how information is managed on the internet, uh, you can't, I mean, even in 1984, there were weird ways to kind of escape and go off grid of some of the surveillance system, you know, in some of the chapters there, uh, that's not available to [00:12:00] us anymore.

I joke sometimes that there needs to be a sequel called 2024. It's a sort of 40 year update because some of the techniques we have now put, put that to shame. Um, but you know, I think the Twitter files did three. Fantastic functions. Um, that that helped shape the positive momentum we have today. I mean, one is it created a tremendous news cycle.

You know, just the fact is a lot of this stuff was available open source. If you had eyes to see it, I've been tracking this 56 years before this. I don't think there was anything in the Twitter files that surprised me, but I also had devoted my entire life to this. Um, yeah. You know, there were a lot of these conversations that were had on zoom calls, and in, uh, in the censorship insider sort of routine.

Folks daily, you know, you know, boards with each other. But, um, but the fact is it did create [00:13:00] a tremendous, uh, set of news cycles, almost a sort of reverse Russiagate, if you will, with the drip, drip, drip of it, um, that helped keep it in the news and keep it. Uh, help educate people, um, in a, in a sort of lockstep way every week, you know, for several months, there would be a new drop.

Um, so you have the news cycle media side of it. The other thing is it really gave a tremendous amount of confidence to house investigators and house committees to look for more files, facebook files. Um, you know, they're, they're going after google files to have hearings, uh, to feel like there was a tech titan Who was on the side of freedom is almost like having a defector, if you will, in a Rico case.

I mean, the fact is, is all of the tech tech titans before Elon pierced the sort of. Silicon Vale there, all of them were, um, were completely subordinate to intelligence services and the [00:14:00] federal agencies and the House and Senate Democrats who are threatening to break them up. I think when, when Jim Jordan, And, uh, and Dan Bishop, when you when you had, I mean, eight different congressional committees, weaponization, judiciary, oversight, foreign affairs, armed services, science, space and technology, energy and commerce, all of these different committees have have done their own internal investigations on censorship.

And a lot of that was buoyed by the fact that they felt like Twitter or X was going to be on their side cooperating, and they wouldn't have to pull teeth. Every step of the way, it makes investigations much more efficient. And once you have one platform who's providing a certain amount of transparency, it gives you leads and, uh, and leverage and being able to tilt onto other platforms for their equivalent.

Documents and communications, especially if you're going after a certain time period like 2020, where you know [00:15:00] that the censorship industry was going after all these platforms simultaneously. And then the third thing is, you know, on a go forward basis, I think a lot of the tech companies did not want to do the censorship that they were forced to do.

In the past five years, I, you know, I, I talk about how Mark Zuckerberg gave a speech in San Jose in 2019, where he said he thought the, the, the pendulum of censorship had swung too far. Then he got boycotted by a bunch of state department funded NGOs and lost 60 billion in a matter of weeks from ad boycotts and then quickly bent the knee to save his company.

Jack Dorsey said the only reason he banned Trump is because it was a business decision because of all the pressure on the company to do it. Um, these other companies are embo, are emboldened by Elon's, uh, bravery. And we know that because my Foundation, foundation for Freedom Online, or FFO just just published a piece last Monday, uh, with some of the top censorship indu, [00:16:00] uh, insiders like Yo Roth, uh, talking about this very phenomenon, how Elon started.

Um. In a sense, a kind of domino of other C suite executives who are still, by the way, not nowhere near as close to free speech as Elon is, but they are now putting out their arms and pushing away some of the, uh, some of the government mandated infrastructure that they accepted without question from 2018 to 2022.

So I think Elon's been huge.

**Marty:** And you touched on something there. I think we should really dive into, which is the participation of NGOs, particularly. Government backed NGOs that have a lot of ad dollars that they can throw around across these platforms I mean, I think these are one of the major stakeholders in that quadrant.

I believe you posted on Twitter Earlier today, you have big tech, you have the intel agencies, you have these NGOs and other actors that really play into this whole universe of people that are looking to control speech and [00:17:00] the apparatus via which they'll do that. So how, how big of a problem are these NGOs?

**Mike:** Oh, they're huge. I mean, they're, they're where the action is. You know, the NGOs, you can think of them as being government cutouts. And, uh, that is that they, they only operate because they're funded by the government and they coordinate with the government. They are the spawn army, if you will, the sort of clone army of the government.

They are, you know, when, when the State Department wants to overthrow a foreign country, for example, and they, they need, you know, 10, people on payroll in the country, uh, all because they're on U. S. government payroll, are, are basically dependent on the good graces of the government, and will do what the U.

S. government through, through liaisons directs them to do. Uh, that is something, you know, we don't just march in there with W two, you know, employee badges. Hello. My name is, uh, you know, X. I'm from the CIA. I'm from the State Department. Now you, what you [00:18:00] do is you create a cut out, you launder it just like, uh, just like the way, you know, the CIA, uh, you know, will launder money through Cayman Islands banks, uh, you know, and through and through foundations or through a series of entities in order to obscure the source of funds.

Uh, what we do is we capacity build NGOs. That is, we, we, we create these little non governmental organizations, but that are effective, that are government operated essentially. And we capacity build them. We, we flood them with money from the state department or from USAID or from the national endowment for, uh, for democracy or any number of.

Of state department government funding organs. So we capacity build them so that they can get a thousand people on payroll. They can Control the university system in a country or the health care system in a country or the unions in the country And we get all these people on payroll we capacity build and then [00:19:00] we instrumentalize them For a rental riot when we want to overthrow that country's government, or we instrumentalize them for a mass walkout to shut down the critical infrastructure in the country to destabilize it.

That has been our strategy since the 1940s when we did this in Italy to rig the 1948 election. And then wrote memos about how this was such a great blueprint, we should do it for the rest of the American century. Uh, there's nothing new about this, um, when it comes to toppling foreign governments. What was new after 2016 is we started doing it for censoring our own domestic U.

S. citizens, who ostensibly still nominally have the right to vote for that government. Uh, and so what you have now is this spawn army that's government funded on the outside of government who's doing the dirty work of what the government is banned by the First Amendment from doing itself.

**Marty:** And that gets into a bigger question.

I mean, you mentioned the right of each individual American and the right to vote. Like, [00:20:00] who's really in control here? Like, are the politicians just front end facade puppets that are essentially being controlled? By the intelligence apparatus that really runs the show behind the scenes.

**Mike:** Well, you know, a lot of people make the argument that the intelligence apparatus is, is, you know, basically a stand in for the corporate stakeholders on the outside.

I mean, the fact is, is, you know, if you go to work for the CIA, you're not getting rich. You know, even, you know, even CIA director doesn't make as much as Anthony, you know, Tony Fauci. The money is on the outside. The power is on the outside, but that power installs. Policy and personnel and personnel is policy, you know, at the intelligence agencies and at key key positions in government.

So what you have is essentially this, you know, I call it the donor and drafter class on the outside of the blob. You know, you have, you have the Pentagon, the state department and the CIA and intelligence services. So basically, you know, it's diplomacy, defense, [00:21:00] and intelligence. That's what comprises. You know what we typically call the American deep state or the blob.

Now, well, the policy and personnel of the blob is basically determined by this outside set of donors and drafters off of the foreign policy, off of the battering ram of that national security apparatus. So for example, you know, If you want to talk about what's happening in Ukraine right now, you know, as I did a video on how Chevron, Exxon, Shell, and Halliburton all have multi billion dollar contracts with the government of Ukraine to harvest the, uh, the second largest shale reserves in all of Europe, which are completely untapped, there was this big thing called the, you know, I call it the Grand Ukraine Energy Play, which was to privatize NAFTA gas, Ukraine's big, big gas company, invest in Ukraine's private gas, natural gas companies like Burisma, and [00:22:00] then kill Gazprom, kill the Nord Stream 2 pipeline of Russia into Ukraine.

Have NATO energy companies now become the suppliers. And then you have, you basically, over the course of a decade, you have a trillion dollars in windfall profits that come from that play to Houston based. LNG, liquefied natural gas companies like Exxon, Chevron, Shell in London, and to the New York and Wall Street, uh, I'm sorry, to the Wall Street and London financiers who privatized the Ukrainian gas companies and invested in Burisma and these other, uh, these other, um, Ukrainian gas companies.

So, but in order to pull that off, to pull off that trillion dollar play. You, you need to militarily acquire Eastern Ukraine, you know, at the time in, in 2014, even before this war broke out, Eastern Ukraine was basically, uh, militarily backstopped by the Russians, uh, after the 2014 Maidan coup. So you [00:23:00] have these, these.

outside companies with pools of their own, you know, huge amounts of money. You know, BlackRock's got 10, was it 10 trillion assets under, under, uh, under management worldwide. And, uh, they made a huge play into the liquefied natural gas market in 2015, but in order for them to, to, uh, to. Make good on those investments.

They need the Pentagon and the State Department, the CIA to do the dirty work for them. They don't have their own army. They don't have their own NATO. They don't have their own ability to cause all the European countries to mass sanction, not just Russia, but any other country that allows the import of gas.

They can't organize this military and economic and informational and political assistance. And cultural crusade against Russia in order to clear Ukraine for their own interests. Same thing you can argue in Iran. Same thing you can argue in Venezuela. You [00:24:00] go down the list. These outside corporations are, they, they draft off of the battering ram of the Pentagon the same way in how in a bike race.

You never want to be first in a bike race because you cut the you're the one doing the work cutting the wind. You always want to be behind the guy who's in first drafting off of the person cutting the wind. And that's what these outside corporations do a great example. Just one final note, like a great example.

This is the Pizza Hut example from the early nineties. You know, after we won the Cold War and we got Yeltsin to run Russia into the ground, essentially at the behest of the State Department and the Harvard endowment, you know, we privatized 2 trillion in, in Russian publicly held assets. We sold it all off to Wall Street in London.

And, you know, the Russia's stock, stock market crashed 95 percent by the end of the decade. Uh, but you had this funny [00:25:00] situation where, you know, Gorbachev. After, you know, 91 was doing these ads for western, uh, fast food. Like he did a Pizza Hut ad. This is the president of Russia about how, you know, regardless of how you feel about Gorbachev, if he was a drunk or if he was a bad decision, hey, at least now you got this tasty pizza.

Now, imagine being an equity shareholder in Pizza Hut watching this ad. You now have a captive market at the gunpoint. of the Department of Defense basically, uh, prying open this once closed off market with now 200 million dollar, 200 million people buying your product. I mean, this is a tale as old as time.

Coca Cola was doing this with the State Department, the War Department in the 1800s in Latin America, but now it's on steroids and you can argue that that's, that's where the money is and that's ultimately where government policy tilts towards. Yeah, the

**Marty:** LNG story, I just connected the [00:26:00] dot cause when Nord Stream 2 blew up and you had the energy crisis last winter, I mean, that was the big narrative here in the United States was that, um, that we were Essentially saving Europe via Wait, I think I lost you.

Uh oh. Can you hear me now?

Mark the time.

There

**Mike:** we go. Can you hear me? Yep. Can you hear me? Yeah, sorry. It froze for a second. Um, you were talking about the LNG thing, by the way. Is my camera okay? Yeah, you're good. Tilt

**Marty:** back a little bit. No, you're fine. Um, no, I was saying when you were describing the LNG play, it really helped me connect dots because, uh, during the winter, uh, energy crisis from last year, that was the big narrative here in the States is that U.

S. LNG was saving. Saving Europe. We were spinning up ports and [00:27:00] exporting our LNG and actually helping lessen the blow of the inability for natural gas to be piped in via Nord Stream

**Mike:** 2. Yeah, we set that up seven years ago though. I mean, you can go back and read the integrity initiative documents. Um, which basically talked about, I mean, killing the Nord Stream pipeline and installing, uh, you know, Chevron, Shell, um, Exxon, you know, basically all the Permian Basin, Houston LNG companies would, um, would profit at the bayonet of the battering ram of You know, our, our foreign policy blob, this has been a long, long, long time in coming.

I mean, you can look up the, the battle between Putin and George Soros over control of NAFTA gas, which is the publicly held Ukrainian, um, LNG giant. That's what Burisma feeds into. Burisma is the private, one of the four major private LNG companies in Ukraine. Naftogaz is the big, big publicly owned one.

And there's been a, there's [00:28:00] been basically a sort of intelligence war. Um, I have no doubt that the CIA is directly involved in that, as they have been in a number of corporate shenanigans when you're talking about big behemoth, geopolitically significant companies. Um, but you know, there's been this tug of war over over control of Ukrainian gas to be able to cut off Russia, to be able to replace that with Western energy companies.

Um, I mean, I said a decade, but it's right. I said seven years, but really it goes back to like 2006. Basically, you know, that that gas story is how is how Putin reasserted Russia's geopolitical influence over Central and Eastern Europe after Putin took power in 99. Uh, you know, and Russia was bankrupt. All they had at the time in terms of assets to be able to assert themselves on the world stage were military exports.

You know, they had they had best in class [00:29:00] anti aircraft weapons and small arms to be able to ship to rebel groups. Uh, so they had a military export economy and they had an oil and gas export economy. And on the gas side at the time, 100 percent of Europe's natural gas, it's now, it was, it was diversified away basically by forcing Europe to buy more expensive, uh, gas over time.

But in the early two thousands, 100 percent of Europe's natural gas was coming from Russian pipelines. And so after Russia. I'm sorry, after the U. S. broke up the Soviet Empire, you know, all of those Soviet states became their own countries. You know, you had, uh, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, you know, all the Baltics, everything basically from Eastern Germany.

up to the Russian border was, was basically folded into NATO. And, uh, we thought there would be no resistance from the Russians. That was all brought back by Putin's gas diplomacy. Basically, you had all these Eastern European countries [00:30:00] who are dependent on Russian gas. And so, you know, the State Department talks about how Russia exploited energy diplomacy to basically win back political control.

over much of Eastern Europe. And so it was at that point that the State Department, this is like 2006, began this crusade to pry Russian gas out of Europe. And that would just so happen to have a convenient, you know, trillion dollar windfall opportunity for the private energy stakeholders in the U. S. And in NATO, who would be become the new suppliers.

Of course, they would do it at a massive markup because it's much cheaper to use a pipeline than to liquefy gas and then ship it 5000 miles across an ocean, de liquefy it and then transport it. Um, but you know, that doesn't matter. Uh, that doesn't matter to us. We're not the ones paying for it. It's uh, That's all profit.

So essentially you had all these, these NATO energy [00:31:00] companies who were backing, uh, and essentially stacking the, the government, uh, the government personnel in those offices to, um, you know, to carry out this plan that was rudely interrupted last year when Russia decided to fight back.

**Marty:** Yeah. And it seems like everybody gets their cut going up to the executive branch.

I mean, that was the big story during the 2020 election. I mean, obviously Hunter's laptop, um, got swept under the rug right before the election, but it's become abundantly clear that that laptop was real and the information on it is material, particularly as it pertains to the business dealings between the Biden family and companies like Burisma.

**Mike:** Yeah. Yeah. No, he was getting 65, 000 a month just for sitting on Burisma's board and, and, you know, and then picking up the phone and calling his state department buddies, you know, for essentially for more aid to Ukraine and, [00:32:00] uh, to liaise. Listen, I mean, I think Hunter, I think Hunter was wittingly or unwittingly, uh, a part of this intelligence apparatus.

The fact is, is he sat on the Chairman's Advisory Board of the NDI, the National Democratic Institute, which is, which is one of the four branches of the most notorious CIA cutout in the entire... panoply of, of NGOs, you know, of government cut out NGOs in this country, the National Endowment for Democracy, which was literally created in the name, in, in, as a quote by its founder, Alan Weinberg, he said, we do overtly what the CIA used to do covertly.

And they are time and again in probably 85 countries in the past 20 years, um, a critical CIA conduit. For their capacity built to control media in a foreign country to get people on payroll, get unions on payroll, one of their other [00:33:00] branches is, is the union branch so that they can have rent a riot mobs to destabilize and take over a country whose government isn't doing what the State Department wants.

And so what the hell is Hunter Biden doing on the board of this, one of the most notorious CIA cutouts in the world while he is assisting an operation through Burisma that is, uh, one of the most geopolitically important initiatives for the entire state department. And who else was on the board of Burisma with Hunter Biden?

Kofor Black, who spent 30 years at the CIA and won the CIA's medal for highest distinction. And is, and is is, uh, is Mitt Romney's. So-called Sherpa to the, to the CIA World. You know what, what the hell is Topher Black doing with, with Hunter Biden, uh, on the, on the board of this private Ukrainian energy company that happens to be the Lynchpin together with NAFTA gas of this entire Grand Ukraine energy play that's been plotted [00:34:00] again for fif since for 15 years by the State Department.

Hunter Biden was knee deep. He was up to his elbows. In, in swampy poop from the intelligence services. And frankly, I think that's part of the reason he's protected the level that he is. I think that the intelligence services lean on the justice department, the injustice justice department, his entire divisions dedicated to basically doing what the intelligence services demand.

Bill Barr is the best case of that. That was, that was the head of the justice department for the Trump administration. For the entire just, uh, for the entire Trump administration, Bill Barr, how did Bill Barr start his career? He started his career at the CIA and his, his very, the thing he got famous for was being the CIA's mop up man for Iran Contra, being the guy who got the Justice Department.

To, uh, basically, uh, to stonewall the Justice Department, to block disclosures about CIA involvement and, uh, [00:35:00] in the attempt to end run Congress and overthrow the government of Nicaragua and run arms through Iran. All of that stuff was blocked at the DOJ level. Because of the CIA's man there, Bill Barr. So you have this, now who was, who was in charge, uh, of, of the Hunter Biden laptop situation as it was breaking?

Who was in charge of, uh, you know, this whole, this whole thing around the foreign policy blob in Ukraine of the Justice Department? It was Bill Barr! Bill Barr was the head, was the head of the Justice Department as all this stuff was, was going down. Um, you know, so, uh, I think, I think Hunter was protected for that same reason, but, you know, Hunter didn't just do the LNG trick in Ukraine.

He did it with China. Uh, one of the things the Hunter Biden laptop revealed. Was, uh, Hunter Biden pitching, selling off us LNG ports in Louisiana. Louisiana is a major, uh, you know, a major port city, probably the biggest port port state in the country, because it's [00:36:00] not just the, the mouth of the Mississippi river, but it's also the mouth of the.

Uh, of the Gulf in the, in the Gulf of Mexico. So all the Latin, LATAM and Caribbean, all that stuff flows through Louisiana. So we have these big gas ports there. And Hunter Biden is working with CEFC China Energy, which is run by the head of Chinese intelligence. And Hunter is pitching Chinese intelligence on buying U.

S. LNG companies, saying it's good for China, it'll be good for local, local economies. So he's selling off Louisiana to China, uh, for a personal profit for the Biden family, the same way you've got Newsom right now selling off California to China. Finally, cleaning up San Francisco, moving the turd under the eye, under the, under the, the, the, you know, the I 10 highway.

Uh, so that, uh, it looks so that San Francisco looks more investable to Chinese investors. We're selling off U. S. national treasure. At fire sale prices to, to, uh, foreign [00:37:00] countries because the people in charge of our policy have no skin in the game. They, they see themselves as, as citizens of the world. Uh, and what happens here to the plebs is of no concern to them whatsoever.

That's truly

**Marty:** disgusting. And I mean, would you go as far as to say it's somewhat treasonous?

**Mike:** If, if the FBI wouldn't kick in my door for using a word like that, I might. I mean, frankly, like, you know, um, it's certainly wrong. Uh, it's, I would not disagree with you if you use that word, you know, but, uh, the fact is, is like the solutions, they have to be political.

So, you know, we're vote the bums out, organize locally and, uh, and spread the message, you know, so, so that, uh, you know, these, these people are stigmatized at the level they deserve. Well,

**Marty:** that gets to a couple of interesting points. Like, do [00:38:00] you, it seems to me. And maybe I'm in my own bubble, but it seems like they're getting very sloppy and it's becoming very obvious whether it's via the hunter laptop disclosures or the Twitter files.

It seems like it's becoming obvious to more and more people that there's some overt and nefarious intention, uh, being brought to the American people by the people in power in our government and intelligence apparatus. Like, do you think you have unique opportunity here due to The relative sloppiness with which these agencies are operating.

**Mike:** Absolutely. And I would be overjoyed at where we are right now. We're not for one thing, the justice department. Um, I think we are winning on the press side. I think we are winning on the media side. I think we're starting to actually win even on the political side. Um, but we're facing something this country has never seen before, which is a justice department that has gone full in the tank [00:39:00] political.

And, uh, you know, no other department has a license to just kill you. Right? Like, you know, the, we give almost a trillion dollars a year to the Pentagon. The Pentagon can't just send a tank to your house and, you know, mortar shell you. Um, the Department of Labor can't assassinate you. The HUD can't assassinate you.

Agriculture can't. Um, but look what they're doing to President Trump. He's facing 750 years in prison. How many death sentences is that? I mean, he's a dead man. If he's, if he's convicted dead, just dead. Um, they rolled up 19 of his lawyers and confidants, uh, in a single Rico case in Georgia where every one of those conspiracy charges is 20 years.

Now, if you're 60 years old, 20 years is [00:40:00] dead. You're dead. That's a death sentence. The Justice Department is literally killing you. It's political adversaries and is doing so, you know, I mean, you had, you had Biden personally on tape three months before the first prosecution telling the New York Times, you know, the New York Times, it was reported that, that Biden had reportedly put pressure on Garland, you know, to do it.

Uh, the fact is, is it used to be sufficient to win. At the level of the press and the level of politics, because we said we had a democracy and if you win hearts and minds, then you went to political level and so you can change things. Well, it turns out there's actually a third variable in addition to press and, and politics.

There's a third variable, which evidently can trump the other two, and that's called prosecutors. And we have never in this country. You know, we've had presidents assassinated. We've had multiple presidents assassinated in this country. [00:41:00] Lincoln, JFK. Uh, the show goes on because it's not. We don't say the system did it, even if it Frankly, even if it did, um, you know, the jury's sort of out on the J.

F. K. situation and who really done it. It's a little curious that not all the files are declassified 60 years later, but topic for another time. But you know, we don't say that that that was okay. It was cleansed through the system. Um, we've never had a Justice Department Indict a president before or the high or the attorneys of a president before on totally novel legal theories, by the way, all these legal theories are completely untested.

They're, they're, they're stretch, uh, basically stretch interpretations and are being tested for the first time, uh, against, I mean, we broke two and a half centuries of precedent. The thing we always said distinguished us from a banana republic, the thing we sanction other countries when they do it to their own [00:42:00] political opposition.

Um, this administration has done gleefully, it's gleefully trampled on the most treasured China we have in our democratic cabinet, so to speak, um, and that's completely changed like what the conception of what this country is. If, if, if you can simply have prosecutors overrule, you know, the overrule hearts and minds.

Then, you know, we're just full authoritarian. We're, we're everything. Uh, we have set up our pro democracy covert action clinics to, um, to overturn in the last century. You know, we've, we have fully become the bad guys. Yeah,

**Marty:** pretty disturbing because from the prosecutor. Prosecutors perspective. It works both ways.

You can go, uh, levy these Rico cases on Trump and his confidants. And then the other end of the spectrum is not prosecute things that [00:43:00] are very obviously crimes and just let society devolve. into, uh, frankly, just chaos and it's what's extremely disconcerting and disheartening as an American citizen is if you're paying attention, you see it on both ends of the spectrum, uh, from the prosecutor's perspective, putting political opponents in jail and they're not prosecuting crimes that were that are common sense.

Like if you steal, you should go to jail. If you break into somebody's car, you should go to jail. If you incite riots, you should go to jail. And yet there's this somewhat like chaos crafting going on on both ends of the spectrum.

**Mike:** Well they're professionals at doing that. That's what we do when we try to topple governments.

You know, we capacity build the rent to riot function, and then we control the, the, the prosecutors. I mean, this whole thing about Soros buying prosecutors in the U. S. is, is, is. I [00:44:00] mean, it's new in the U. S., but this is what we were doing all over Central and Eastern Europe. You know, we were, you know, the whole thing is you control the prosecutors, and then your own anarcho tyranny mobs, your own destabilization forces, get away with it scot free, so they can shut down everything, and, uh, they're, they're untouchables.

And so, the government is, is forced to either basically kill them with a military, in which case, They get economically sanctioned into oblivion and become, um, you know, pariahs on the world stage because our own state department funded media captures it all and, and, uh, blows it up on social media and blows it up in the press.

So you have this human rights predicate to. Cut off their sovereign wealth funds held in, in foreign bank accounts to, you know, to cut off sanctions, cut off trade, and then they become economically too weak to deal with the riots. Meanwhile, more and more people from the inside are getting put on payroll in the company, in the country just.

Transitions over to the mob rule, and then a state [00:45:00] department picked asset from the mob becomes the president. And you have something, you know, I mean, basically you have these rental riots with the whole BLM Antifa situation. Where if you remember, they made money two ways. They got something like 50 billion dollars in contributions from the corporate social responsibility endowments of all the major blue chip companies.

50 billion. I mean, that's Ukraine aid level packages that went to BLM in the summer of 2020. And then the, and then the, the mayor's offices all paid these groups in Portland and Seattle, instead of getting 20 years in prison, like a January 6th protester, they all got lump sum payouts. Uh, for human rights violations of the police for trying to deal with them.

And again, you know, this is what we, this is what we do in a color revolution abroad. Uh, and, you know, they, they rolled out these domestic destabilization forces in 2020. It was the same people who did it that do it abroad are CIA, State Department, Defense Department people. You know, the head of the [00:46:00] Transition Integrity Project who, who role played.

Um, using BLM as a battering ram in case Trump won the election and talking about how Biden would need to do favors for them between the summer of 2020 and election day to make sure they were compliant to the campaign's wishes in case Trump won the election and they need to be rolled out of the box.

Um, the head of the Transition Integrity Project, Rosa Brooks, was a former high level Pentagon official who had a CIA blue badge. You know, to access the inner sanctum of the CIA. I mean, these are the people setting up these domestic, uh, destabilization cells. They're professionals at doing it to topple foreign countries.

Uh, you know, there's, there's evidence to suggest that they did that to topple our own country's government in 2020. And the question is, is are they tired yet? Frankly, I mean, does this weigh on their conscious? Are they, are they. You know, sometimes this Orwellian stuff, um, can sort of run out of gas because, you know, the, you start to lose a [00:47:00] coalition, it starts to just get too dirty, people start to defect, people start to sympathize with martyrs, there's a question of whether that's happening right now, uh, um, we'll see.

**Marty:** Yeah, that, I mean, that's a good lead in to what I was just gonna ask, like, what is the end goal? Because, like, you just mentioned, like, he can do all this stuff internationally for decades, and then get bored with that, and turn those tactics internally into the domestic population, but what is the end goal?

Just complete digital enslavement of the global populace? And then, what do you do then?

**Mike:** Yeah, I don't think it's as long range as that. I think, I think they have... Initiatives in process that need protection. They're fragile. You have investments and you have investment theses with. Billions or low trillions of dollars into them like the LNG story.

And so you need policy installed to, to protect that. And, and so you need guardrails, they'll [00:48:00] call it. You know, guardrails on democracy, basically rigging the political system, um, to make sure that those policies, uh, stay in place or escalated as they need to be. You know, this is the whole thing about, about eliminating populism in the same way that our foreign policy blob eliminated Fascism and then communism, they now are of the opinion that populism is a comparable threat, you know, populism being just basically ground up anger at international institutions and calling for a focus on domestic welfare as opposed to the international empire.

And yeah, this this threatens international institutions. Um, it threatens, um, international stakeholders. Uh, And so, yeah, I mean, in my focus on the censorship industry, they are in the process of installing a, a, a controllable censorship apparatus in every country in the world. And I'm not joking when I [00:49:00] say that.

I mean, we could play a game. You could spin the globe right now. And As long as it's not Antarctica, I can find for you, even the most remote, Tanzania. Madagascar, uh, you know, Moldova. You can't find, you can't name a country where I can't show you how CIA cutouts like the National Endowment for Democracy are rigging that country's information ecosystem through the use of their NGO swarm, through the use of university centers, and through the use of liaisons at all the tech company branches.

Um, there's not a plot of dirt on Earth. And again, you have to remember, that's not an accident. You know, the State Department has desks for every region in the world. There's a CEE desk for Central and Eastern Europe. There's a CEE, uh, there's a MENA desk for Middle East, North Africa. You know, there's...

Every one of those desks is going to have people whose career depends on the [00:50:00] correct political candidate winning that election. You know, we're backing this opposition group. You want a promotion, you know, you want to be able to brag, you know, hey, our guys got this person into office. Our guys, you know, were able to You know, we're able to create, you know, this, you know, favorable disposition with leadership of country X.

So every one of those regions, social media censorship. After 2016 became an instrument of statecraft. It became something that could simply be deployed by the State Department by working with the tech companies on a region by region basis, a country by country basis. You know, I mean, this, we can go through the list of this if you're interested, but, but that's now an instrument of statecraft.

And, uh, You know, and that means no plot of dirt on this earth, you know, and if we ever become a transplanetary [00:51:00] species, I'm sure there will be a State Department desk for, you know, censoring different, you know, subdivisions on the moon. To make sure that their own regional elections are rigged, you know, in case there's, I don't know, plutonium on some extractable plot of dirt on the moon, this is something that we're up against now, um, on a long range basis from now till eternity, because since the technology now exists for mass internet censorship to rig elections, um The, the interest, the demand for it is going to be constant.

And

**Marty:** earlier you mentioned things that we can be doing to, to fight back against this, I think you said, think locally, get involved in local elections. With that in mind, like, do you think the way out of this is falling back to the federalist ideas that this country was founded on and really leaning into the states, asserting their autonomy from the federal government?[00:52:00]

**Mike:** That's a big way. You know, I mean, Florida and Texas did something very brave about a year and a half ago. They created the first ever private right of actions for people who are censored on the internet. There were two major bills, first in Florida and then in Texas. These are state government bills that basically make the tech companies liable for censorship to the people they censor.

And now there's, there's a lot of fine print there. It could be better, frankly. Um, but, uh, you know, this was massively opposed by both the. you know, the private companies and by the, uh, and by the Biden administration, because it was an assertion at the state government level against the kinds of censorship that the federal government wanted to do.

Uh, that's something that really there should be a 27 state. You know, every red state, there's no excuse for red state not doing something comparable unless they're captured themselves by the GOP wing of [00:53:00] the foreign policy blob. And most of them frankly are. Um, but, uh, yeah, no, there's, there's a huge role for the state governments here.

Um, there's, uh, you know, but honestly, the biggest thing you can do is talk about it. People, people are all, I mean. Don't underestimate the power of a dozen small conversations with friends and family. Um, that happens law, you know, wide enough and long enough and funny things start to break in this in the system just from the Just from the power of something being on the tip of everyone's tongue.

Sometimes, political options don't even really avail themselves until enough people are talking about something that an opportunity even wakes itself up for creation. So, you know, if you don't have money to contribute to a cause in [00:54:00] this, if you don't have connections or... You know, corporate cloud or some, some substantial asset to lend.

Don't underestimate the power of just talking about this frequently. I

**Marty:** completely agree. I mean, I said this last week on another show that I do, but I think a lot of people severely discount. What talking about this can do to instill confidence in the silent majority to speak up and say, Hey, I'm not crazy.

This is wrong, and it should be known to more people that it's wrong.

**Mike:** Do you think Chris Ruffa would have had the success he did with taking on DEI stuff if, uh, if it wasn't on the tip of everyone's tongues? And, you know, and sort of started, I mean, a lot of these things start that way, where someone starts talking about something, it becomes a little bit popular.

But then there's this whole follow on wave because now Joe Rogan's talking about it because Joe Rogan's only talking about it because his fans are spamming in the comments. Oh, talk about this, talk about this. And the only reason they're talking about it is because they heard it from some [00:55:00] other podcasts.

So there is a crest like wave of how movements build by word of mouth. And honestly, the best thing you can do is just Word of mouth spread the message

**Marty:** completely agree. And that's, I mean, part of why this podcast exists. What I do professionally focuses on Bitcoin and is because I identified the monetary system, the control of the issuance of debt via treasury markets or the, uh, Control of the monetary base, be a, the expansion of that and the manipulation of interest rates at the federal reserve is two things that really fuel what we just discussed throughout this whole conversation.

And so I view Bitcoin as a grassroots emergent P2P way to, to fight back against the funding of all these things that have led to this censorship industrial complex that we suffer under today.

**Mike:** Yeah, no, it's very interesting. You know, um, You know, Bitcoin's role [00:56:00] in, in a, in a free, free market and free speech world, you know, I mean, the, the censorship industry is nothing if not monomaniacally focused on defunding, um, you know, and creating a, a pecuniary cost to speaking non government narratives.

Um, this is why, I mean, it's incredible in 2017 when all this architecture was first getting set up. You had these CIA cutouts like the National Endowment for Democracy, the State Department funded, you know, NGO think tanks like the Aspen Institute and these Pentagon and State Department funded outside of works like the Atlantic Council, all getting together in these round tables, talking about the need to kill advertiser revenue, to make major platforms and to outside news, news sites and to large social media accounts.

Who were spreading [00:57:00] misinformation online, you know, so you basically had the CIA targeting, um, the, the ad revenue of people who were engaged in narratives that challenged. Basically, State Department policies. Now, the reason they were so focused on the money side is because the only way you can actually scale media and have it be effective is for that to earn money.

You know, this is the difference between an amateur and a professional. If you can kill a professional field of alternative, uh, media, all that will remain is mainstream media. All that will remain... are the narratives of the regime. So the regime sends its little gargoyles to kill the, you know, the industrial revenue of alternative media.

And the promise of some sort of, um, direct peer to peer money transfer that would evade a lot of the blockages of, uh, you know, the traditional system is obviously [00:58:00] something that, if used for good, could be very powerful.

**Marty:** Yeah, it goes all the way back to WikiLeaks. They didn't like what WikiLeaks was doing, so they cut off all their, all their monetary rails. Um, with that being said, I think... A lot of what we discussed today can seem again, unnerving for a lot of people paint a pretty bleak picture, which it certainly is in some regards, but like you said, I think word is getting out despite all of the efforts to shut down alternative media.

I think it's stronger than it ever has been. And I think there's great reasons to be optimistic moving forward to understand, uh, how we fix this thing. You have to understand the problem. Thank you. Pretty, uh, intuitively, and it seems like the world is becoming more and more aware of what the problems are, where they lie.

And once that information gets dispersed and hits a critical mass, we can then begin to focus on solutions that get us out of this [00:59:00] morass.

**Mike:** That's exactly right.

**Marty:** Well, Mike, thank you for the work that you do. It's really important, um,

**Mike:** and you're crushing it. Thank you. Thanks for the show, and, uh, looking forward to speaking again soon, and I appreciate your time today.

Uh,

**Marty:** where can, uh, anybody who's listening find out more about what you're doing, uh, at the foundation

**Mike:** for freedom online. Yep. So you can, you can follow us at, uh, at foundation for freedom online. com all one word, and you can follow me on X slash Twitter at Mike Ben cyber all one word. Uh, post pretty much every day, lots of updates and nitty gritty on all this stuff.

So that's probably the most real time way to interface with me. It's just at Mike Ben cyber. Yeah. So pretty

**Marty:** epic. Um, first person rants into the, into the phone there. So if you're looking for guilty daily content covering the headlines and. Uncovering where the fuckery [01:00:00] is go follow Mike.

**Mike:** All right. Thanks.

Have a great day. Peace. Love freaks