



Rip McIntosh



You can ignore reality, but you cannot
ignore the consequences of reality

Ayn Rand

March 6, 2024

Remember The Alamo

- > **Victor Davis Hanson** - **Gearing Up for 'Biden' Versus Trump**
- > **Judd Garrett** - **Brave New World**
- > **Richard A. Epstein** - **Trump and the "Corrupt Obstruction" Charge**
- > **Jim Buckley** - **Purely Political Cover-Up (Part III)**

**Gearing Up for 'Biden' Versus Trump:
Not If, But When and How to Replace
Biden**

By: Victor Davis Hanson

American Greatness

March 4, 2024

President Joe Biden is declining at a geometric, not an arithmetic, rate. His cognitive challenges are multifaceted.

His gait is shaky. His daily use of stairs now risks the chance of a tenure-ending fall. Even when he sticks to the teleprompter, he so slurs his speech, mispronounces words, and glides his syntax that at times he becomes as incomprehensible at the podium as he is unsteady in his step.

He now speaks a strange language foreign and untranslatable to most Americans. White House transcribers leave hiatuses in their written texts of his remarks to reflect that they either have no idea what he said, do not wish to publicize their guesses at what he said, or do not wish the public to know what he was trying to say.

Despite the circling-the-wagons media and the passive-aggressive sycophants like the opportunistic Gov. Gavin Newsom in waiting, the left understands that Biden will be lucky to get to the August convention. This spring and early summer, he will not campaign as a normal presidential candidate, and this time around, there is no pretense of the COVID epidemic to excuse his absence.

The people have already polled numerous times that their president is unfit to serve now and, in the future, should not run. So the 2020 Faustian bargain is in shambles. Remember its quid pro quos: all the major Democratic presidential candidates of 2020 nearly simultaneously pulled out the primaries to coronate Biden—but only on the condition that Biden would play to the hilt his “*ol’ Joe Biden from Scranton*” schtick that would offer a

vener to the otherwise unpopular hard left agenda of the new Bernie Sanders/Elizabeth Warren/the Obamas/Squad Democratic Party.

The people voted for a “*return to normalcy*,” all while the left destroyed the southern border, unleashed a critical legal theory/George-Soros crime wave, dismantled hard-won deterrence abroad, and printed money to spur hyperinflation.

Moreover, it is increasingly clear that the entire Biden family consortium is compromised and corrupt. Neither Hunter, Jim nor Frank Biden had any consulting skills, business expertise, or corporate experience to warrant leveraging over \$25 million from foreign interests. Their only commodity was to sell corrupt parties the appearance that Joe Biden would be quite willing to help their various causes if they enriched his family. Everyone knows that to be true, and only now, as Biden sinks into incoherence, are his protectors shrugging about the obvious money-making schemes that revolved around a corrupt senator, vice president, and private citizen, Joe Biden.

None of Biden’s record is popular. His policies on the border, economy, energy, foreign policy, and crime poll below 50 percent. And this trifecta of Biden’s mental deterioration, family corruption, and failed presidential record will only grow worse.

Then there is the Kamala Harris issue—the Spiro Agnew insurance policy of our age that so far has protected Biden from overt efforts to replace him. She is as unpopular as Biden and often as incomprehensible, but without the excuse of age or mental diminishment. Of all the major Beltway elected officials, only Sen. Mitch McConnell polls worse.

By August, Democratic donors and politicians may well conclude that the only way to rid the party of both is to release Biden's delegates, open up the convention, and let candidates fight over the now-free delegates. Harris then will not be nominated, but not through a backroom, Machiavellian removal of a black woman. Instead, she will *"fairly"* lose an *"open"* and *"transparent"* free-for-all of various Democratic want-to-be replacements and recede into a sober and judicious Mike Pence-like retirement.

The problem with this scenario, of course, is that late-season convention or post-convention machinations in the modern era don't work out too well. In 1976, Ronald Reagan, after losing a series of early primaries and being declared nearly inert, suddenly caught fire and entered the August 1976 Republican convention in Kansas City within striking distance of incumbent Gerald Ford. President Ford, remember, had never been elected either president or vice president.

In the end, in one of the most acrimonious Republican conventions in memory, a wounded Ford won the nomination by only 117 delegate votes out of some 2,257 cast. In some sense, Ford never recovered and lost the election to Jimmy Carter, even as the tumult gave Reagan the exposure and his team the experience needed to win the nomination in 1980.

About two weeks after the 1972 Democratic convention, a desperate George McGovern and the Democratic hierarchy removed Vice President running mate Sen. Thomas Eagleton from the ticket due to revelations of little-known past electric shock treatments given to combat depression. After futile efforts, the Democrats settled on the Kennedy clan's Sargent Shriver, who had never run for office. McGovern would have lost anyway to an incumbent Nixon. But the margin of defeat in one of the greatest landslides in presidential history was often attributable to the sheer chaos of changing a vice presidential candidate so late in the campaign.

In sum, the Democrats can—and may have to—replace Joe Biden, and they can ensure that Kamala Harris is not the nominee, but the means of doing so will be chaotic and messy and will wound the winner for the rest of the campaign.

Trump's Circuitous Path to Victory

Donald Trump's challenges have now been discussed ad nauseam, and they are threefold: he must either beat or postpone campaign-season court trials—and find perhaps \$800 million to \$1 billion to post bonds, pay interests on them, and meet gargantuan legal fees—without turning off donors and supporters and by avoiding the diversion of Republican National Committee and various campaign funds to his own personal defense.

As in the past, Trump will be vastly outspent, perhaps by 3-1 or 4-1. Molly Ball's infamous Time 2022 essay outlined the left-wing scheming that ensured a mail-in/early balloting election by aggregating the deep state, the corporate boardroom, the social media monopolies, and the 2020 riotous street thugs of Antifa and BLM. What she called a "*cabal*" and "*conspiracy*" was designed not so much as a one-off to defeat Trump as to create a permanent system by which a Trump-like candidate could never win a presidential election, both in 2020 and afterward.

Given changes in the 2020 state voting laws that saw 60-70 percent of the ballots in many swing states not cast on Election Day, while the rejection rate of faulty ballots counter-intuitively plunged despite such an influx, Trump will have to win by 3-4 points. Otherwise, in the swing states, we will again stare at the late-evening televised wizardry in which his huge leads mysteriously melt on the screen as drop boxes and mail sacks are tallied.

To achieve a 51-plus majority in the popular vote—no Republican has achieved such a national ballot margin in 36 years since George H.W. Bush beat Mike Dukakis in 1988—Trump will have to win, or win back, more Independents, apostate Democrats, and RINO Never-Trumpers.

He can do that in only two ways:

One, he must hammer away at Joe Biden's disastrous record on the border, energy, race, foreign affairs, the economy, and social issues that scare moderates and fence-sitters, especially when comparisons are made to the achievements of 2017-2020. Inner-city residents are being tag-teamed by both the influx of thousands of illegal aliens who apparently have first claims on stretched social services and street criminals who loot, assault, and carjack their law-abiding neighbors mostly with impunity.

Two, Trump needs to model his remarks after his Iowa Primary victory speech or his recent Fox Townhall event with Fox's Laura Ingram.

Translated, that means there is no reason to reference Nikki Hayley's deployed husband, to refer to her as a "*birdbrain*," or to say much of anything other than she will lose, and in the process, she is needlessly hurting more than half of America by draining resources away from the only real chance to repeal the current socialist agenda.

Hayley is imploding without any need for a Trump push. Magnanimity, rather than salt in her self-inflicted wounds, is the better strategy to unite the party. Trump has cemented his base. He will increase his share of minority voters who have been hurt the worst by the Biden socialist agenda. But to ensure victory and a Republican Congress, he cannot give swing voters a reason not to vote for policies and initiatives that they overwhelmingly prefer over those of the now hard-left Democratic Party.

In sum, after Super Tuesday, when Hayley will either quit the race or become inert, Trump needs to call her, politely remind her of her promise to support the nominee, and welcome her back into the fold. If she is wise, she will likely agree to disagree, let bygones be bygones, and thus pledge to support the assured nominee, Trump.

Two of her three choices are in her own interest:

- 1) She endorses him, and Trump wins, and she is vibrant in 2028;
- 2) she endorses him, and Trump loses, and she is still viable;
- 3) she opposes him, and Trump either wins—and she is persona non grata—or he loses, and she is blamed for splitting the party and his defeat.

Breaking her public promise to support the nominee will bleed what support she retains, and would prove a suicidal blunder.

Trump has achieved the greatest political comeback since Richard Nixon arose from the ashes of defeat in California in 1962 to win the nomination and presidency in 1968. Trump's Phoenix-like rebirth from January 2021 to the present was achieved by Biden's failure, the natural empathy accruing from the weaponization of the law by partisan or corrupt prosecutors against him, and Trump's greater success in giving independents fewer reasons to vote against him. If he can praise those he defeats, call for unity, and campaign in 50 states in non-Republican strongholds, then he can win—even despite the hatred of the left, the corruption of the media, the weaponization of the bureaucracy, and the eroding trust in the way we vote.

Brave New World

By: Judd Garrett
Objectivity is the Objective

March 3, 2024

Last month, Apple released its Vision Pro – a virtual reality headset designed for people to wear during most of their waking hours which they configure to their own specifications, allowing them to live in their own virtual world. The variety of applications that they use to construct their world is not seen by anyone else, so everyone using these devices will be living in different realities. This is exactly the last thing the human race needs right now. We need not be more dependent on technology, nor seamlessly connected to technology, to the extent that we are completely disconnected from other flesh and blood human beings. This will not make the world a better place, further detaching humans from each other, giving humans the ability to completely immerse every part of themselves into a technologically created simulated existence so we can become further and further separated from reality and each other.

In recent years, society has continually rejected the idea of shared objective truth and embraced personal subjective reality by promoting concepts like “*living your own truth*” and discovering your “*authentic self*”. Now through this computer-driven subjective reality, people will not only live their own truth but create it as well. There will no longer be a shared objective truth, but our own private truths. Each person’s objective reality will be the subjective reality that technology created. Since the dawn of history, the universal struggle for humanity has been deciphering between the subjective and the objective. No longer will that battle exist. Everything will become subjective. And then, when everything is subjective, whoever controls the technology that creates the subjective reality will be able to dictate everyone’s objective reality.

In previous generations, most of the people who are driving this technological revolution would have been seen as “nerds”. The people in school who just didn’t fit in, who couldn’t make personal connections with other human beings. Many of them are a lot like Elon Musk, borderline Asperger’s who feel more natural connecting to a machine than to a human being. So, these people created technology like the computer, the smartphone, and now virtual reality machines, because that is where they feel most connected in the world.

Elon Musk is now working on a technology called Neuralink, which is a computer chip implanted into our brains to allow us to connect our whole bodies to the computer or the Internet seamlessly. Only a person who is so emotionally void could view this as good. The people who are creating these things, do not understand the value of human connection, because they never had the social skills to engage in significant human interactions in their lives. Their minds were not wired to need other human beings. They were just as content connecting with machines as they were with real live people.

Most of the rest of us are flesh and blood human beings, who not only need human connection and human interaction, we thrive on it. It is our life's blood, but most humans can very easily get trapped in this computer-generated world and allow our humanity to shrivel away. You go out to dinner, and you see four people sitting at a table, and all four are looking down at their phones for most of the evening. We are all turning into these emotionless machines, who prefer staring at blips on a screen, than staring into the eyes of the ones we love. Almost every human connection these

days is filtered through a machine whether it is talking on a cell phone or texting or Face Timing or D-Ming, and now they want to sell us a device that we wear on our heads through which to filter our entire existence, turning us into a mass of Arnold Schwarzeneggers in the Terminator.

Computers, through Artificial Intelligence (AI), are now producing our art. Art has always been an expression of what it means to be human, but now we have machines telling humans what it means to be human. The inauthenticity of that dynamic negates the entire artistic expression that it produces. Their ultimate goal is to strip humanity away from human beings. When we are no longer humans, when we become part of the machines, they can do whatever they want to us. They can decommission us at their will with no remorse. They have no understanding of what it is to be human, of what makes humanity so unique and special. It is not how smart we are, how high functioning we are, or how much we know, it is everything about us that cannot be produced by a computer – our consciousness, our hopes, our dreams, our fears, our compassion, our love, our belief in things greater than ourselves, our ability to contemplate our own mortality. These people are trying to remove humanity from the human race primarily because they have very little humanity themselves.

The world is not a better place because of these technological advances. It is not. Israel and the Palestinians are still fighting. Russia is at war with its neighbors again. Millions of people are still starving to death. Millions are committing suicide every year. Hundreds of thousands are dying of drug overdoses. Over 50% of marriages are still ending in divorce. People are still murdering each other. People are still raping each other. With each one of these technological advancements, society seems to be getting worse, not

better. Technology has made our ability to harm each other much easier – cybercrime, identity theft, and child exploitation are at an all-time high because of all of this new technology.

We are not any closer than we were before. We are more connected, but we're not closer. And how we are connected these days has prevented us from making those true human connections we need. What the world is missing, cannot be produced by a computer or a virtual reality machine. Those things are inhibiting us from getting the real human connection for which we are starving. We need more reality, not virtual reality. We need real-life human interaction, and the people who have created this brave new world built it to not need human interaction.

The goal of all of this technology is to totally consume the users' lives. The business model for all of these technologies, whether it's a computer, iPad, iPhone, virtual reality device, or the countless apps that you download onto those devices, is to create addiction. They rely on the users becoming addicted to the technology. They tweak the algorithms that govern the apps to create the most addictive platforms possible, so people will get lost in these completely unreal and made-up worlds.

And we all know the endgame. Ultimately, all this will be used for behavior modification. Advances like Musk's Neuralink will be sold to people for medical purposes – to help stroke or spinal cord patients – and then it will be promoted as a way to enhance our intelligence and cognitive ability by giving us the proper data feedback to help us to make better decisions and work more efficiently and productively. Then at some point, the data will be controlled by the government or the oligarchs to control the masses. We are

seeing that in real-time with social media. Government censors pressured social media companies to control the information spread on their platforms to control the population.

These tools will become the consummate distraction of the masses – put on your Vision Pro and live in an alternate reality of your own creation, so you are blinded to what is actually going on in the world. You do not see the things that are being done to you because you are getting a steady stream of dopamine hits. Go live in a fantasy world, because reality is too hard to face. And then, when you become so dependent on that fantasy world, the people who have made your life so miserable that it drove you to live in that fantasy world, will use your dependence on that fantasy to control your lives. If you don't do what we tell you to do, we will pull the plug on your virtual world. If you do not think the way we want you to think or say the things that we demand that you say, you will not get to live your fantasy, you will not get your dopamine hit.

That is what they are doing with electric cars. Get everybody in an electric car linked up to the internet, and then, the people who control our country will determine whether you can drive or not based on whether you adhere to their orthodoxy. We saw that with Covid. If you didn't take the medicine that they demanded you take, you couldn't go to work, you couldn't go to the movies, you couldn't go out to dinner, and you couldn't support your family. You couldn't live your life unless you did what the government told you to do.

Why do you think the governments want to turn to complete digital currency? We saw it in Canada. The government didn't like the trucker

protest against the government's COVID mandates, so the government seized the protesters' bank accounts, so they would not be able to live their lives if they disagreed with the government.

The people who have created all of these technologies do not care for you and me; they do not care for humanity. They are incapable of that emotion. To them, we are merely data points on their computer screens that they can manipulate, exploit, or delete at their convenience. We need more objective truth, not subjective reality. We need more compassion, not more computers. We need more understanding, not more data. We need more humanity. Not more technology.

Trump and the “*Corrupt Obstruction*” Charge Justices will examine the legal authority Jack Smith is using in his January 6 prosecution.

By: Richard A. Epstein
Hoover Institution - defining idea
March 4, 2024

Now that the efforts to keep Donald Trump off the ballot were soundly rejected in the Supreme Court in *Trump v. Anderson*, the largest cloud over the former president's re-election campaign is Jack Smith's four-count indictment, which makes no reference to insurrection but alleges only “*a conspiracy to corruptly obstruct and impede the January 6 [2021] congressional proceeding*” to certify the election of the next president. Smith's indictment cannot be read in isolation, for next month the Supreme

Court will take argument in *Fischer v. United States*, which deals with the same section in Trump's case, 18 U.S.C. § 1512(c), reading:

(c) Whoever corruptly—

(1) alters, destroys, mutilates, or conceals a record, document, or other object, or attempts to do so, with the intent to impair the object's integrity or availability for use in an official proceeding; or

(2) otherwise obstructs, influences, or impedes any official proceeding, or attempts to do so, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both.

These heavy sanctions explain why prosecutor Smith is trying to shoehorn Trump's case into this section even though he had at his disposal, but did not bring, counts for civil disorder, assault, or entering and remaining in a restricted building. Thus this high-stakes battle over statutory interpretation must be read in the context of the facts that Fischer set out in his successful petition for certiorari.

Joseph Fischer, the man now before the Supreme Court, first entered the Capitol grounds on January 6 after Congress had gone into recess in light of the earlier threats, and he entered the building at 3:25 p.m. After he had gone some twenty feet, he was pushed to the ground by the crowd; he got up, returned a pair of handcuffs to a police officer, and then was pushed into the police line, where he was promptly blinded by police pepper spray. He left the building less than four minutes after entering. Section 1512(c) looks like massive overcharging. There is no evidence that he was part of a mob, or that his actions were not coerced by others. Nonetheless, the operative charge in the complaint reads as follows:

On or about January 6, 2021, within the District of Columbia and elsewhere, [Fischer] attempted to, and did, corruptly obstruct, influence, and impede an official proceeding, that is, a proceeding before Congress, specifically Congress's certification of the Electoral College vote as set out in the Twelfth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States and 3 U.S.C. §§ 15-18.

The question is whether the case falls within the second clause of Section 1512(c), an obstruction-of-justice provision. Fischer argued that the second clause was by the word "*otherwise*" necessarily tethered to the first clause, which was passed after the Enron accounting fraud scandal of October 2001 to close the loopholes dealing with the preservation of evidence pertaining to the case. The first clause of Section 1512(c) clearly serves that purpose, and the "*otherwise*" seems as a matter of ordinary English to be a backup provision to make sure that some novel scheme does not escape the law. That was the conclusion of District Judge Carl Nichols, who insisted on the close connection between the two clauses.

Judge Nichols invoked the rule of lenity, under which criminal-law statutes are read narrowly both to give the accused clear notice of the charges against him and to constrain aggressive prosecutors. But in the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, Judge Florence Pan reached the exact opposite conclusion, treating the "*otherwise*" as separating the two clauses, so that the latter clause allowed for an independent corrupt obstruction to cover the case. Her view is now the law of the circuit. Yet, as Judge Justin Walker argued, Judge Pan had to be wrong in thinking that the section could be properly interpreted without addressing the term "*corruptly*," which frames both halves of Section 1512(c).

Judge Gregory Katsas in dissent took a position similar to that taken in the District Court, so that the matter reaches the Supreme Court with three separate positions, with Trump's indictments waiting in the wings.

So, what should the court do when it hears the case?

First, it should reject the incomplete summary of the facts offered by Judge Pan, which at no point mentions Fischer's tardy arrival and prompt exit within four minutes. She wrote as if it were settled fact that he pushed his way into the police when he claims that he was pushed into them. She omitted any mention of the returned handcuffs and his hasty exit, allowing these matters to be re-examined at trial. But she did refer to obnoxious and foolish texts that he (like so many others) wrote to acquaintances before January 6, stating that "*war*" could ensue if Trump were kept out of office, and that Trump's Democratic opponents deserved the "*gallows*," without linking these texts to the events on the day. It is highly unlikely that these abstract statements count as unprotected speech under *Brandenburg v. Ohio* (1969) which requires that all prohibited inflammatory speech be:

- (1) "directed at inciting or producing imminent lawless action", and
- (2) "likely to incite or produce such action."

Neither of those conditions is remotely satisfied here.

More disturbing is her reading of § 1512(c) as "*unambiguous*," in the face of several opinions that said the opposite. Worse still, she is unable to explain why before this case, no federal prosecutor sought to give that section a free-form reading on matters unrelated to financial affairs. It is dangerous business to give an initial aggressive reading in a highly charged case.

The mystery only deepens because she does not offer any close reading of the key adverb “*corruptly*.” Indeed, Judge Walker only concurred with her judgment because he thought that “*corruptly*” had to be read carefully to prevent the term from having a

“‘*brehtaking*’ scope [which] is a poor fit for its place as a residual clause in a broader obstruction-of-justice statute.” But he then attaches a meaning to “*corruptly*” that equates it with acting “*with an intent to procure an unlawful benefit either for himself or for some other person.*” Too broad: this reading is jumping from the frying pan to the fire.

Corruption is a subset of unlawful cases. To shoot someone is unlawful, but corruption is never part of any murder charge. In general, the entire class of criminal trespasses is not corrupt either. Corruption requires that the actor in question seek to disrupt some business or deal. To speak of inducement of breach of trust or bribery as corrupt is part of the English language, but to speak of physical obstruction as corrupt mangles the vernacular so that obstruction of justice in Fischer has to refer solely to his entry, which was illegal but not corrupt. Nor was it linked to any effort to bribe or deceive anyone who was in charge of the vote count. And given his tardy entry, it is hard to link him in any way to others who might have sought to engage in improper influence. So, prosecute on the lesser offenses.

My prediction therefore is the Supreme Court will not spring for the broader reading of corruption. In the earlier case of *Yates v. United States* (2015), a divided court held under a similar statute that a commercial fisherman who threw back an undersized red grouper did not violate a statute that punishes for twenty years a person “*if he knowingly alters, destroys,*

mutilates, conceals, covers up, falsifies, or makes a false entry in any record, document, or tangible object” to impede a federal investigation. A tangible object for these purposes is an evidentiary object, not a stray fish, and the parallel to Fischer is close.

A correct reading of Section 1512(c) torpedoed a key part of the Smith indictment. Previously, Smith lost big in *McDonnell v. United States* (2016), when a unanimous Supreme Court vacated a conviction for overreading a statute that allowed for prosecution of official acts, which did not cover introducing well-heeled private parties to important public figures. The outcome in *McDonnell* will not be lost in Smith’s application of Section 1512(c) to Trump’s case, which is far weaker than in Fischer. Trump never entered the Capitol building, and he never made any statement urging rioters to enter the building. His despicable conduct consisted of watching the proceedings before asking the rioters and trespassers to leave the premises, which does not count as obstruction under any legal authority of which I am aware. His call for people to “*fight*” for their rights is certainly an incitement, but to protest, and cannot be read as a call for illegal action. Smith had lesser charges to bring against Fischer, but he does not have that luxury on this record.

So, if this prediction is correct, then Smith should fold his tent on this key count. His other main charge is a far-out case of defrauding the government under a statute that is aimed at various financial shenanigans, none of which are involved here. Politically, Smith needs to make a powerful case if any conviction regarding January 6 is both to appear and to be legitimate. That just won’t happen on this flimsy indictment.

PURELY POLITICAL Cover-Up

(Part III)

By: Jim Buckley

Editor-in-Chief of Santa Barbara CURRENT

www.sbcurrent.com

March 5, 2024

They All Knew All Along

Kentucky Senator Rand Paul's appearance at the Reagan Ranch Center in downtown Santa Barbara recently allowed the 350 or so people present to begin to understand the how, what, and why of the conspiracy to hide the origins of COVID-19. The Senator's book on the subject Deception, the Great Covid Cover-Up offers up a day-to-day, hour-by-hour unfolding of the great Pandemic of 2020-21.

What follows are some of my notes taken from that presentation.

"The real coverup began even before Anthony Fauci got involved," Senator Paul says, submitting that the coverup began in Wuhan, China with a 33-year-old doctor who saw people getting very sick and dropping dead. *"They all have pneumonia of unknown origin,"* the doctor reports, noticing that when X-rays were taken, *"it looks like viral pneumonia."*

Researchers' original suspicion was that this was a return of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) 2003, so the young doctor sent an e-mail to his chat group with other doctors and wrote, *"I think it's come back."*

"So, what does the Chinese government do [upon receiving this information]?" asks the Senator.

"Do you think they give him a medal?"

"Do you think they thank him?"

"No.

"They arrest him. This is totalitarian China," he says.

The Chinese authorities take the young doctor in on the charge of *"spreading gossip."* They claim he is guilty of *"sowing discord, of spreading misinformation."*

What they're really trying to do, the Senator suggests, is suppress any kind of connection to their research or of the funding they'd been receiving.

The 33-year-old doctor, by the way, died shortly afterward.

Another young researcher, virologist Shi Zhengli, known as *"the bat lady"* or *"batwoman"* was also concerned, afraid that her research as Director of the Center for Emerging Infectious Diseases at the Wuhan Institute of Virology, had led to this quickly evolving epidemic.

She also knew that in the fall of 2019, three of the Wuhan researchers came down with a viral pneumonia.

"We actually now know," says Senator Paul, *"...that the first person – Patient Zero – to get Covid was a man named Ben Hu [along with his two research colleagues, Yu Ping and Zhu Yan]."* Mr. Hu was leading the virus gain-of-function research team in the Wuhan lab.

Senator Paul tracks back and pinpoints Wuhan, China, November 2019 as the time and place of the *"accident."* Cell phone data from the area around the lab indicates a normal amount of cell phone activity taking place daily until all phones went silent for a week around that time, indicating something serious had occurred.

"They knew from the beginning where this came from and yet their instinct was to cover it up. We also know this – and we're pretty certain

of this – that they were creating a virus that would infect humans on purpose and be more deadly, not necessarily as a weapon, but to create a vaccine.”

Senator Paul believes it probably was an accident, evidence for that being *“if they were creating a bioweapon, it’s not likely they’d release it in their hometown.”*

Resist Your Soul’s Desire to be Free

“By the middle of January 2020, The [Chinese authorities in Wuhan] were fumigating in place, but did they tell anyone? Did they warn the rest of us? No,” the Senator relates, “They’re still saying, ‘We don’t think it passes from human to human.’ They had to have known this in November and December of that year.

“They did.

“They’re obscuring this.

“They’re trying not to let anybody know, but they’re also beginning to lock down. They’re beginning to wall people into their apartments. They’re beginning to beat the crap out of people if you have the audacity to go out in the streets. You’ve seen the pictures. This is early on and we’re seeing these images. Most of us are horrified.”

Anthony Fauci responds and says, *‘Well, it was a good idea, and it looks like it may have bought us time.’* He sees people being beaten with clubs and welded into their apartments and his first response is, *‘It bought us time.’*

“Fauci and others lamented that the Bill of Rights and the Constitution were preventing our government from being as noble and as good as the Chinese government.

“How awful.

“And this man [Fauci] led the entire response.

“But as they're locking people down in China, as people were being locked up in their apartments, some people went stir crazy. They wanted to get out on their balconies. So, you'd see people out on their balconies gathering and the Chinese didn't like that either. So, they'd send drones up into these high-rise apartments and you'd hear the drone and the soothing voice of a woman saying, ‘Resist your soul's desire to be free.’

“And you think, ‘Well, that's just China, right?’

“But everything that's happening there, we have our leadership looking at that and saying, ‘Wow, this is the way to go. This is how you really can stop disease dead in its track.’”

According to official Chinese data, “Nobody died in China” of the disease.

But, of course, millions of people died.

“There probably were a million people who died in Wuhan [alone], but,” says the Senator, “they just don't record it and they say it didn't happen. Then they say it came on frozen food from the United States or something.”

Rand Paul has an exact time and date for the beginning of the cover-up in the United States.

“It was January 27, 2020, at 6:34 in the evening.

“Fauci gets an e-mail...

“And we know this because he's been honest and told us about it and admitted that there was a coverup and they were worried about this?

“No, we only know this because a federal judge forced the release of his e-mails through Freedom of Information.

“At 6:34 in the evening of January 27, Fauci’s assistant sends him an e-mail, and in the e-mail he says, ‘Wanted you to see this gain of function research paper...”

“You think they didn't know from the very beginning?”

“Yet, a year and a half later he's wagging his finger at me [in a Senate Hearing Room], saying, ‘I never ever, we never ever funded this research. We never ever funded gain of function research.’

“They knew from the day [they received] the first e-mail. Four days later, on January 31, there was a flurry of e-mails that started at about five in the afternoon. Jeremy Farrar, the head of Wellcome Trust, the biggest deliverer of private grants in the world, is essentially the Anthony Fauci of England. The head of Wellcome Trust is a former head of MI-6 or MI-5 in England. As I'm researching this book, I keep finding different organizations dispensing scientific money that are also involved with the intelligence community.”

Senator Paul held his audience spellbound for an hour and a half with his detailed chronicle of the unfolding cover-up of the “research” mishap now known as the Covid Pandemic.

If you want even more, I suggest you buy a copy of Deception, The Great Covid Cover-Up.

The book reads like a mystery spy novel and is as difficult to put down. It unwinds – in riveting detail – the worldwide conspiracy to deflect responsibility for the greatest human tragedy of the 21st century (so far).

The plan may not have worked perfectly, but it worked well enough to have propelled hapless Joe Biden into the White House. Well enough too, to have enlisted the “assistance” of all U.S. social media companies, the intelligence

community, the press, institutes of “*higher learning*,” and other venerable but gullible American institutions.

The most telling aspect of the COVID cover-up is that not a single individual (other than the scientists and doctors who succumbed to the disease early on) has yet to pay a price for having taken part in the scheme to cover up one of the most scandalous episodes in recorded medical history.

*IF YOU DO NOT TAKE AN INTEREST
IN THE AFFAIRS OF YOUR GOVERNMENT,
THEN YOU ARE DOOMED TO LIVE UNDER
THE RULE OF FOOLS.
PLATO*