

Tech Vs. Media: Balaji Srinivasan on the Battle Shaping Our Future - Index

Source: a16z Podcast

Type: Podcast Interview

Theme: The transformation of media, power structures, and truth in the network age

Date: 2025-08-01

Speaker: Balaji Srinivasan

Content Overview

This comprehensive discussion with Balaji Srinivasan explores the fundamental conflict between traditional state institutions and emerging network technologies, using the media industry's economic collapse as the entry point to understand broader societal transformations.

Media & Economic Disruption

- 01 - Media Economic Collapse & The Birth of Wokeness - How the internet's disruption of newspaper revenue led to ideological radicalization
- 04 - Journalism as Psychological Warfare - Redefining journalism as "non-consensual invasion of privacy for profit"

Power Structures & Frameworks

- 02 - State vs Network Framework - The organizing principle for understanding modern conflicts across all industries
- 03 - Social War & Platform Battles - The digital tribal warfare and the significance of Elon's Twitter acquisition

Strategic Response & Future

- 05 - Strategic Response: Go Direct - How tech leaders should build their own distribution and avoid legacy media
- 06 - Cryptographic Truth & The Future of Information - Blockchain-based consensus replacing institutional gatekeepers
- 07 - Democracy, Exit Rights & Network States - New models of governance beyond failing one-party states

Key Themes Across Chapters

- **Economic Disruption as Political Catalyst:** The collapse of traditional business models drives ideological extremism
- **Institutional vs Network Power:** Every industry faces the same battle between centralized gatekeepers and distributed networks
- **Information Warfare:** Modern media operates like intelligence agencies, using psychological operations for profit
- **Cryptographic Consensus:** Truth becomes mathematically verifiable rather than institutionally declared
- **Exit Over Voice:** The future favors those who can leave failing systems rather than reform them

Core Mental Models

The State Vs Network Dichotomy

Traditional institutions (NASA, taxi medallions, the Fed, legacy media) versus distributed networks (SpaceX, Uber, Bitcoin, citizen journalism). This framework explains conflicts across all sectors.

The Woke Capital Paradox

“Go broke, go woke” - Economic pressure from tech disruption drove media toward ideological extremism as a business model, creating the modern culture war.

Truth as Property

“Truth is everybody’s property. It is not Sulzberger’s property. It’s cryptography.” The shift from institutional to mathematical verification of facts.

Query Examples

- “How did the economic collapse of newspapers lead to wokeness?”
- “What is Balaji’s State vs Network framework?”
- “Why does Balaji call journalists ‘stalkers, spammers, and scammers’?”
- “What strategic advice does Balaji give to tech leaders about media?”
- “How does cryptographic truth replace traditional journalism?”
- “What are Network States and how do they relate to democracy?”

- “What was X-Day and why was it significant?”
- “How should founders think about building distribution channels?”

Key Quotes

“For them, the best thing they can do is to put a man out of work. And for us, the best thing we can do is we can put a man on the moon.”

“The non-consensual invasion of privacy for profit is what legacy media is.”

“Truth is everybody’s property. It is not Sulzberger’s property. It’s cryptography.”

Chapter 1: Media Economic Collapse & the Birth of Wokeness

Source: Tech vs. Media: Balaji Srinivasan on the Battle Shaping Our Future

Type: Podcast Interview

Mental Model: Economic Disruption Creates Ideological Retaliation

Tags: #go-broke-go-woke #media-collapse #blue-america #state-vs-network #distribution-power

The Core Insight: Go Broke, Go Woke

“You’ve heard the saying go woke, go broke, right? But in their case, it was actually go broke, go woke.”

The fundamental revelation is that wokeness didn’t emerge as grassroots ideology - it was **the direct response to economic catastrophe**. When the internet destroyed media’s business model, it didn’t just disrupt an industry. It disrupted “blue America” itself, transforming media from profit-seeking entities into ideological warfare machines.

The Graph That Explains Everything

“This shows that essentially newspaper revenue rose to like \$70 billion in the year 2000. And then right after the financial crisis, it just suddenly collapsed over, of course, like four or five years. And Google went vertical and Facebook went vertical.”

The Double Disruption

“The thing about this is this was the internet disrupting blue America. There’s a similar graph for manufacturing that shows China disrupting red America. Almost exactly the same time.”

Both red and blue America were being economically gutted simultaneously:

- **Blue America:** Internet destroyed media revenue
- **Red America:** China destroyed manufacturing jobs

This parallel collapse created the conditions for today's political realignment.

The Timeline: From Allies to Enemies

2008-2012: The Alliance Period

"From 2008 to 2012, tech was just part of the Democrat party... There's actually this article from 2012 on the Atlantic, like the nerds go marching into tech, helping to reelect Obama and Facebook was helping."

"So 2012, tech was part of the coalition. So there were no reason to attack. There's no reason to attack them."

2013: The Knives Come Out

"After the inauguration 2013, and it's literally that spring and summer, the knives came out. And media started attacking tech."

"Once you see the internet disrupting blue America because media is like a core thing for them, this is actually what led to wokeness because it was... they just fell off a cliff like this."

The 17-Year War Generation

"It is now 17 years after the collapse in media revenue. So somebody who is born, then, who is 18 years old... from the perspective of someone who's 18 years old, the war with the journals has basically been a feature of their entire existence."

Before the Collapse

"In the 90s and the 2000s, the journals were secure enough in their economic position, because you could write, like, four or six articles for Time Magazine a year and get paid a nice salary and travel around the world. So they didn't, I mean, did they kill? Yes, they killed, but they didn't feel the need to kill all the time."

State Vs Network: The Master Framework

“The master framework on the whole thing is at state versus network... Basically, the state is, someone should pass the law, and the network is, someone should write some code.”

Who's Who in the Battle

“The state is everybody who is directly or indirectly paid by essentially either the US government or a government more generally, and the network is all those people who directly or indirectly monetize and make their living on the network.”

The Ring of Power

“When I say the state, there's like the literal state in the sense of the US government, and there's the unelected institutions that surround the US government in a ring that give it instruction. The newspapers tell the state what to do, the universities tell the state what to do, the philanthropies tell the state what to do... But they're also in turn funded by the state.”

The Philosophical Divide

“For them, the best thing they can do is to put a man out of work. And for us, the best thing we can do is we can put a man on the moon.”

“We want to build Google's and Facebook's and AI and giant companies, giant cryptocurrencies, and now internet communities. What they want to do is they want to exert authority over others.”

The Accountability Lie

“Every journal is so courageous as to attack your boss, but never they're on. Whenever you're talking to a journal, you're not talking to the journal, you're talking to their boss.”

The Bloomberg Confession

“Bloomberg news... actually posted this amazing thing, which said, we will report on but not investigate Michael Bloomberg. Amazing, amazing phrase.”

The Visibility Game

“Zuckaburg deserves our respect because he’s the man, he really is the man in the rear. He’s taken the hits for 20 years... But Zuckaburgur doesn’t get good coverage. He gets no coverage.”

“The guy who’s surrounded by thousands of journalists at all times is the only person in the world who has any privacy.”

The New Money Vs Old Money War

“They project on to us what their lifestyle is... They’re all heirs, right? They’re not self-made.”

“Old money treats the journalists much worse. Tech people, we treat our employees so much better because we give them equity... We create more rich people than anybody else. Journalists create no rich people other than the family that owns them.”

The Distribution Revolution

“Freedom of press belonged to those who own one.” Until the internet democratized distribution, media had an unbreakable monopoly on reaching audiences. The collapse of this scarcity model triggered their existential crisis.

“Until really the early 2010s, there’s no actual practical freedom of speech, you know why? Because... never argue with the man who buys ink by the barrel.”

Applications

Recognition Patterns

1. **Economic disruption** always triggers ideological retaliation from threatened industries
2. **State vs network** explains conflicts across all sectors - from NASA vs SpaceX to banks vs Bitcoin
3. **Follow the funding** - understand who pays to predict behavior
4. **Generational perspective** - recognize that Gen Z has only known the war state

Strategic Understanding

1. **Media hostility is economic**, not personal or ideological
2. **Power shifts** from institutions to networks create predictable backlash
3. **Distribution control** determines narrative control
4. **Old money vs new money** underlies surface political conflicts

Key Insight

The media industry's transformation from profit-seeking to ideological warfare wasn't planned - it was the desperate response of a collapsing economic model. Understanding this economic foundation explains why traditional "media relations" strategies fail and why building direct distribution becomes existential.

Related Concepts

- Chapter 2: State vs Network Framework - The organizing principle behind all conflicts
- Chapter 3: Social War & Platform Battles - How the war moved to digital territory
- Chapter 5: Strategic Response - Go Direct - The defensive strategy against economic warfare

Chapter 2: State Vs Network Framework

Source: Tech vs. Media: Balaji Srinivasan on the Battle Shaping Our Future

Type: Podcast Interview

Mental Model: The Master Organizing Principle

Tags: #state-vs-network #new-vs-old-money #innovation-vs-litigation #build-vs-regulate #network-effects

The Master Framework

“The master framework on the whole thing is at state versus network... Basically, the state is, someone should pass the law, and the network is, someone should write some code.”

This isn't just government vs tech. It's **two fundamentally different approaches** to organizing human society and solving problems. Every major conflict of our time maps onto this division.

Who's on Which Side

“The state is everybody who is directly or indirectly paid by essentially either the US government or a government more generally, and the network is all those people who directly or indirectly monetize and make their living on the network.”

The Ring of Power

“When I say the state, there's like the literal state in the sense of the US government, and there's the unelected institutions that surround the US government in a ring that give it instruction. The newspapers tell the state what to do, the universities tell the state what to do, the philanthropies tell the state what to do... But they're also in turn funded by the state.”

The “state” isn't just government - it's the entire ecosystem of institutions that derive power and funding from centralized authority.

The Universal Pattern

“NASA versus SpaceX, UAW versus Tesla, taxi medallions versus Uber and Lyft, the banks versus fintech, the Fed versus Bitcoin, FDA and big pharma versus Biohackers, the FCC versus Starlink and Substack, and essentially every other internet company versus like woke Twitter or New York Times. ”

The Fundamental Choice

“It’s the same thing over and over again... Do you choose to innovate or do you choose to litigate? Do you choose to go direct or do you go to DC? Do you choose creators or do you choose credentials? Do you tweet storms or do you write for the New York Times? Do you found or do you join? ”

New Money Vs Old Money: The Hidden War

“The big thing that’s not talked about is actually new money versus old money... Zuckaburg versus Zuckaburgur. New money that we’ve made it all ourselves, even if we come from a middle class background... versus all the old money.”

The Nepotism Projection

“The reason they project on to us that we’re all nepo babies is because Zuckaburg is Zuckaburgur because he’s a four generation... Zuckaburgur is... Zuckaburgur Junior from the four generation New York Times company. ”

“All old money like Rosenfeld and Zuckaburgur and Bloomberg, this is actually the nepotism, nepocracy... these are actually the plutocrats, the heirs, the ones who they’ve actually inherited all the stuff.”

How Each Side Treats People

Tech’s Equity Model

“Old money treats the journalists much worse. Tech people, we treat our employees so much better because we give them equity... We create more rich people than anybody else. Journalists create no rich people other than the family that owns them.”

Media's Exploitation Model

“Journals are not hired for their brain, they’re hired for the byline. You get a brain in, you get some young person, and you grind them down and you fire them after four years.”

“It’s literally labor versus capital on the journalist side... When the journal is attacking us, they’re literally biting the hand that feeds them because we’re the ones who actually are there... all their friends are making 10X over there for doing the same or sometimes much simpler stuff.”

The Philosophical Divide

“For them, the best thing they can do is to put a man out of work. And for us, the best thing we can do is we can put a man on the moon.”

“What they want to do is they want to exert authority over others... We want to build Google’s and Facebook’s and AI and giant companies, giant cryptocurrencies, and now internet communities.”

Decision Framework: State Vs Network

When evaluating any situation, ask:

1. **Innovation vs Regulation:** Does this create new value or protect existing gatekeepers?
2. **Permission vs Building:** Does this require approval or can you just build it?
3. **Credentials vs Results:** Does power come from titles or from what you’ve created?
4. **Centralized vs Distributed:** Who controls access and distribution?

Why the State Fights Back

Network innovations threaten the state ecosystem because they:

- **Bypass gatekeepers** who derive power from controlling access
- **Enable direct value creation** without institutional intermediaries
- **Create alternative power structures** based on merit and results
- **Allow exit** from state-controlled systems

“We can’t just take it, we can’t be like sheep to the slaughter. We have to push back again. Even now, even though we didn’t start the fight.”

The Competition for Talent

Every talented person faces the choice: join an institution or build something new. The state side offers:

- **Status and credentials**
- **Predictable hierarchies**
- **Protection from market forces**

The network side offers:

- **Equity and ownership**
- **Direct value creation**
- **Merit-based advancement**

“When someone goes from NYT to Substack, they’re moving from state to network.”

The Border Wars

“Now the network is actually taking parts of the state where all these tech guys are getting into government, getting into politics, getting into media, getting into finance, getting into the traditional niches that were for the state. That’s why they’re so mad because they’re share of the global pie and the local and the American pie is shrinking, and the network spy is expanding.”

“They’re like, stay in your lane. Why are they saying that? They ’re like, you should just be like hitting keys on computers and being a nerd and making like LED light bulbs that flash. You should not be like rewriting the code base of ... how like the world works.”

Applications

For Strategy

1. **Map any conflict** using state vs network framework
2. **Predict resistance patterns** based on whose rice bowl gets broken
3. **Understand regulatory attacks** as state defense mechanisms
4. **Choose your approach** - innovate or litigate, build or lobby

For Career Decisions

1. **Network side:** Higher risk, equity upside, merit-based advancement
2. **State side:** Lower risk, credential-based advancement, protected from disruption
3. **Border crossing:** Moving from institutions to networks or vice versa

For Investment

1. **Network-native businesses** scale without permission
2. **State-dependent businesses** face regulatory capture risk
3. **Platform shifts** always favor network over state solutions

Key Insight

Every major conflict of our time - from media vs tech to traditional finance vs crypto - maps onto the state vs network framework. Understanding this lens reveals the economic incentives, power structures, and likely outcomes of seemingly unrelated battles.

Related Concepts

- Chapter 1: Media Economic Collapse - How internet disruption created state vs network conflict
- Chapter 3: Social War & Platform Battles - The fight for control of network infrastructure
- Chapter 6: Cryptographic Truth Future - The ultimate network victory over state narrative control

Chapter 3: Social War & Platform Battles

Source: Tech vs. Media: Balaji Srinivasan on the Battle Shaping Our Future

Type: Podcast Interview

Mental Model: Digital Territory as Real Territory

Tags: #social-war #x-day #platform-control #cancellation-warfare #digital-sovereignty #trust-and-safety

The Social War (2013-2022)

“I call it the social war from 2013 to 2022... you had a massive amount of blues in SF and reds in like other parts of the country and in tech, and they were just constantly going at each other online. And people would get de-platformed and canceled.”

This wasn't metaphorical conflict - it was **actual warfare fought on digital territory** with real economic and social casualties.

X-Day: The Digital D-Day

“X-Day was the day that like when they pushed Elon out of the thing, it was basically like D-Day where... the Allied push down the Axis.”

“It took Elon's personal intervention to get rid of the wokes that had just infested Twitter.”

Elon's \$44 billion Twitter acquisition wasn't just a business deal - it was **the decisive battle** that ended a decade-long war for control of the global conversation.

Digital Territory Is Real Territory

“One way of thinking about it is if you get the person banned from social media, it’s like you conquer the territory... In the same way that once upon a time the map was the territory in the sense of if you took someone’s territory, you colored it your color on the map.”

“If someone was able to de-platform you... they had basically annexed that territory... It’s actually taking someone’s territory when you shut down someone’s account.”

The Conquest Strategy

Deplatforming isn’t content moderation - **it’s territorial conquest**. Every banned account represents captured digital territory, every shadowban is a partial occupation.

The Trust and Safety Regime

“Trust and safety were political commissars that all these big platforms had after 2013 ... They were pushing out their political enemies and installing political friends.”

The Bangalore Twitter Example

“My tweet on Bangalore Twitter ... went totally crazy viral... I was like the number one or two trend on all of India. But you couldn’t see it in the US because Jack had set up the thing where the wokes controlled distribution.”

The same content could be trending globally while being invisible in America - **pure algorithmic warfare**.

Conversation as Upstream Power

“X of Twitter is the most upstream thing possible because conversation is where everything happens... If you can snapshot Twitter at any given point in time, you know what the world will look like in one to three to five years.”

“If you just looked at sentiment on Occupy Wall Street, or on Uber, or on tech, it was starting there and going downstream to everything else in the world.”

Why Conversations Beat Elections

“Conversations elect. They’re more upstream than elections because conversations lead to people changing their minds and then going to vote.”

Control the conversation, control everything downstream: elections, policy, culture, economics.

The Cancellation Playbook

“When a cancellation happens, what actually happens? Well, you start losing followers... your distribution gets shadow band... people are afraid to hire you... you’re afraid to fund them.”

The Comprehensive Attack System

1. **Social destruction:** Follower loss, shadowbanning
2. **Economic warfare:** Unemployable, unfundable
3. **Psychological operations:** Isolation, harassment
4. **Network effects:** “It’s not even about the one getting canceled, it’s about the thousands of others who watch.”

Blue Tribe’s Platform Monopoly (Pre-X-Day)

“100% of social media companies run by Blues, 100% of like newspapers run by Blues ... They would just rig and de-platform.”

The Asymmetric War

“The wokes would de-platform, the deplatform would try to set up alt-tech and free speech alternatives... but Blues would take those down with a combination of media hit pieces, payment processor attacks, and state action.”

Every attempt to build alternatives was systematically destroyed through **coordinated multi-vector attacks**.

The \$44 Billion Liberation

“What happened was something that I don’t know if it was like anticipatable, which is the world’s richest man, who may be the... most competent executive... actually personally intervened.”

The Scale of the Battle

“Not only did Elon have to put out \$44 billion to do this and take an enormous amount of personal time as the CEO of like five companies... he had to fire 80% of them.”

“Those 6,400 people were not equally distributed across the political spectrum... This was a woke trust and safety censorship complex that was at Twitter.”

The Coalition Effort

“All the resource of all the centrist tech and finance guys... Elon to Ellison, that’s being made public... what are you in for like one or two?.. So many other people... put in a mill, whatever they could afford.”

It took assembling **every available resource** from the entire network coalition to retake one platform.

The Cascade Effect

“X-Day was also the liberation of meta and liberation of YouTube ... All the countries that these racial fanatics at the NYT had occupied... The networks they had occupied.”

“With X-Flipping, YouTube Uncensored, like meta-uncensored, everything Uncensored ... because X was upstream of the conversation.”

The Symbolic Warfare

“There’s one of many reasons... it’s just like them renaming all the schools and like tearing down the statues... Every journal had put years of effort into building up their profiles and all their blue checks were stripped and all their profiles got renamed and it was just X.”

Renaming Twitter to X was **digital statue removal** - erasing the accumulated status and network effects of the old regime.

Platform Sovereignty Recognition

“Twitter, Facebook, and Google have more power than most governments at this point because so many people are on there.”

Platforms aren't private companies - they're **sovereign digital territories** with more influence than nation-states.

The Seoul Analogy

“You think of X as being like soul during the Korean war... soul change hands for four times... it went back and forth.”

Twitter/X was the most contested digital territory - changing hands multiple times before the final liberation.

Applications

For Platform Strategy

1. **Understand territorial dynamics** - every platform is sovereign territory
2. **Recognize upstream power** - conversation control determines downstream outcomes
3. **Prepare for ideological capture** - build governance systems resistant to commissar infiltration
4. **Create redundancy** - single points of failure enable territorial conquest

For Content Creators

1. **Diversify presence** across multiple territories
2. **Build direct channels** independent of platform control
3. **Understand cancellation** as territorial warfare, not content issues
4. **Document everything** - attacks follow predictable patterns

For Strategic Analysis

1. **Map platform control** as geopolitical analysis
2. **Track conversation sentiment** as leading indicator
3. **Identify trust and safety infiltration** patterns
4. **Recognize coordinated attacks** across multiple vectors

Key Insight

The Social War revealed that digital platforms are the most important territory in modern conflict - more valuable than physical land because they control the conversation that shapes everything downstream. X-Day proved that territorial liberation is possible, but requires unprecedented coordination and resources.

Related Concepts

- Chapter 2: State vs Network Framework - The ideological battle lines in platform wars
- Chapter 4: Journalism as Psychological Warfare - The weapons used in social war
- Chapter 5: Strategic Response - Go Direct - Building defenses against platform dependency

Chapter 4: Journalism as Psychological Warfare

Source: Tech vs. Media - Balaji Srinivasan on the Battle Shaping Our Future

Type: Podcast Interview

Mental Model: Journalism as Intelligence Operations

Tags: #psychological-warfare #janet-malcolm #stalkers-spammers-scammers #zersetzung #media-tactics

The Non-Consensual Invasion

“The non-consensual invasion of privacy for profit is what legacy media is. That’s like a two-sentence description. They will invade your privacy without your consent for their profit.”

This isn’t hyperbole - it’s backed by journalism’s own self-assessment.

Janet Malcolm’s Confession

“Every journalist who is not too stupid or too full of himself knows what is going on, knows the way it does is morally indefensible. He is a kind of confidence man, praying on people’s vanity, ignorance or loneliness, gaining their trust and betraying them without remorse.”

This comes from Janet Malcolm’s “The Journalist and the Murderer” - **ranked in the top 100 nonfiction books of the 20th century** by the Modern Library.

The Justification Hierarchy

“Journalists justify their treachery in various ways according to their temperaments. The more pompous talk about freedom of speech, the public’s right to know, the least talented talk about art, the seamless murmur about earning a living.”

Stalkers, Spammers, and Scammers

They Stalk

“They stock, okay? They follow you around. They invade your privacy. They wait outside your door. They go through your trash.”

The stalking includes:

- Physical surveillance of targets
- Digital monitoring across platforms
- Harassment of family and friends
- Invasion of private spaces

They Spam

“They spam. They just send you like an email. Hey, I want to talk to you about this. Can you give, do an interview with X, Y, and Z? Why haven ’t you given the interview? We deserve a response.”

They Scam

“They scam... They pretend to be your friend. They get close to you, then they scan.”

The Historical Pattern: Journalist-Communist Collaboration

Venona Revelations

“Venona showed there are all these Russian cables that said, comrade, such and such as done his work for the revolution, signed, you know, handler.”

“Who were all those people that were named as like working for the Soviets? They’re all journalists. IF Stone, Walter Duranty.”

Modern Continuation

“This is actually happening again with what we’ve been told. Lots of journalists are now CCP state media, like they’re taking money from China.”

Zersetzung: The Decomposition Strategy

“Zersetzung was something that the Stasi, which is East German intelligence, used to do where basically they called it decomposition... The point is to decompose the life of somebody who is an enemy of the state.”

Modern Implementation

“This is what a hit piece is. A hit piece in the New York Times or any outlet is a piece of Zersetzung. It is not reporting. It is an intelligence operation to destroy the life of somebody.”

The comprehensive attack includes:

- Character assassination in permanent URLs
- Economic destruction through reputational damage
- Social isolation via public shaming
- Psychological torture through sustained campaigns
- Family targeting to maximize pressure

Case Study: Luke Farrar's Death

“There was an Australian podcaster who basically took his life called Luke Farrar. He's a very promising young guy. He was basically bullied to death by a Australian journalist called Cam Wilson.”

The Stalking Campaign

“Cam Wilson, despicable human being in Australia, basically stalked this guy Luke Farrar for many years. Sending him messages, quote, I'm not going to stop... This is like a case study in stalking, spamming, and scanning.”

The Tragic Outcome

“After many years of this, after being canceled, after Cam Wilson went after his family, after he taunted him, ‘Oh, you're in, you're going to therapy now,’ right after all of this, Luke killed himself.”

The Power Asymmetry

Who They Attack Vs Who They Protect

“Every journal is so courageous as to attack your boss, but never they’re on.”

“Bloomberg news, his pit bulls, they actually posted this amazing thing, which said, we will report on but not investigate Michael Bloomberg.”

The Protection Racket

“The guy who’s surrounded by thousands of journalists at all times is the only person in the world who has any privacy.”

“Zuckaburg deserves our respect because he’s the man, he really is the man in the rear. He’s taken the hits for 20 years... But Zuckaburgur doesn’t get good coverage. He gets no coverage.”

Strategic Defense

Recognition Is Protection

“Know their tactics. If you know their tactics, you have a chance.”

Documentation as Defense

“There’s so much other stuff like this is documented. You know, reams of this stuff about how the journalists are bad people.”

Building Alternatives

“We can replace all these people... We don’t even know their names in a few years.”

Mental Model: Journalism as Intelligence Operations

Traditional journalism claimed to “speak truth to power” but modern journalism operates as:

- **Surveillance apparatus** gathering kompromat
- **Psychological operations** using Zersetzung tactics
- **Character assassination** creating permanent damage
- **Social control** through fear of being next

The Moral Dimension

“It is evil. It is an ancient evil that has taken a new form. These are bad people.”

“It’s not journalism, it’s not holding powerful to account. It is evil.”

The evil hides behind noble language about accountability while **never attacking their own bosses** - only their bosses’ enemies.

Real-World Applications

For Public Figures

- Recognize journalist approach patterns as intelligence operations
- Document all interactions defensively
- Never trust off-the-record agreements
- Build direct communication channels to bypass media filters

For Companies

- Train executives in Zersetzung recognition
- Develop crisis communication strategies assuming hostile intent
- Create defensive documentation before attacks
- Build alternative media relationships with individual creators

For Citizens

- Understand media tactics as psychological warfare
- Recognize hit pieces as intelligence operations
- Support direct creator content over institutional media

- Demand consent-based journalism

Key Insights

1. **Journalism's Own Admission:** Janet Malcolm confirms journalism is “morally indefensible”
2. **The Intelligence Connection:** Historical pattern from Soviet agents to modern CCP influence
3. **Zersetzung Is Real:** Modern hit pieces follow East German intelligence playbooks
4. **The Human Cost:** Real people like Luke Farrar are driven to suicide
5. **Defense Through Knowledge:** Understanding their tactics provides protection

Related Concepts

This framework of journalism as warfare connects to Chapter 3's platform battles (the battlefield), Chapter 5's “go direct” strategy (the defense), and Chapter 6's cryptographic truth (the permanent solution).

Chapter 5: Strategic Response - Go Direct

Source: Tech vs. Media - Balaji Srinivasan on the Battle Shaping Our Future

Type: Podcast Interview

Mental Model: Strategic Defense

Tags: #go-direct #build-distribution #individual-creators #content-strategy #avoid-media-distortion

The Core Strategy: Go Direct

“Number one, go direct. Number two, build your own distribution to avoid distortion.”

The fundamental defensive strategy against psychological warfare journalism is to bypass the intermediary entirely. **“They called them the media because they mediate your experience of reality. When you’re putting anything through a media, it’s like an Instagram filter that makes you into a villain.”**

Why Direct Distribution Works

“Why would you do that to yourself? You’re basically, it’s like paying the journal with free content to make yourself look bad and get a permalink that’s attacking you.”

The Economic Reality

“Literally think of it as TechCrunch is a corporation. Why are you giving them something for free?”

Every interaction is a **zero-sum transaction**:

- **Their gain:** Click revenue, conversions, ad revenue from your content
- **Your loss:** Distorted message, reputation damage, permanent attack URL

“They do not care about the valuation or health of your company. They would literally light your house on fire and sell tickets to the place. That’s their business model.”

Individual Over Institutional

“We figured out the formula that works, which is individual over institutional.”

What Works: Individual-Led Projects

Examples of successful direct approach:

- **Mike Solana and Pirate Wires** - “That has a real style to it”
- **All-In Podcast** - “Obviously, all in has done very well”
- **Elon’s direct communication** - “Obviously, Elon has done very well”

What Doesn’t Work: Institutional Approach

“What I think has not done as well is the things that are institutional. Because if it’s too institutional, you’re playing it safe... There isn’t any conflict. There isn’t any opinion. There isn’t anything novel. It’s focus grouped.”

The Visual Metaphor: Portrait Vs Landscape

“The entire 20th century was the centralized century. And even the movement from the wide screen to the portrait size... The movement from wide screen to portrait size is visually the movement from institutional to individual.”

“A portrait... doesn’t have room for a panoramic shot of a huge crowd. It’s for like a person standing there... even the screen itself captures that move from institutional to individual.”

Content as Important as Code

“Don’t outsource your creation. Don’t outsource your engineering? Don’t outsource your creating. Don’t outsource your content. Contents as key as code. Content happens in the house.”

The Three Types of Founders

1. **Engineering Founder** - The “how” (implementation)
2. **Business Founder** - Traditional business operations
3. **Content Founder** - The “why” (distribution and community)

“The founding engineer is implementation, but the founding creator is the distribution. The founding engineer is the how, but the founding creator is the why.”

Building Creator Infrastructure

From Single Player to Multiplayer Creation

“GitHub allows a bunch of people to contribute to code at the same time. We take that for granted. How do you get a bunch of people to contribute to content at the same time?”

Tools and approaches:

- **Frame.io** for collaborative video editing
- **CapCut web interface** with shared accounts
- **Version control for big files** and reviews

“Start thinking about your content base like your code base.”

The Age Advantage

“The 20 some things are often very good at content and content is actually upstream of product... millennials are good at startups... But the 20 some things are often very good at content.”

Examples: **Mr. Beast, Aiden Ross, iShowSpeed** - **“they’re very talented at what they do.”**

The CIA Sales Email Recognition

“The journals are sending you sales emails. The difference is they’re scam sales emails. It’s like a Nigerian... scam.”

Recognizing the Pattern

“They’ll message you and they’ll put on their nicest kind of thing. They’re taught to flatter and sympathize in the email... it’s exactly like our SDRs. Our sales development guys... They send out emails that are really crafted, cold email... to make the sale. And it’s a completely calculated thing.”

The Crucial Difference

“At least when we’re doing enterprise sales, maybe it’s an aggressive sale at times or something, but the product has to work. They can cancel the subscription... It’s not like, ha ha, you bought the product. Now we got malware in your property.”

Don’t Talk to Blue Journalists

“Don’t talk to blue journalists is actually really what I’m saying.”

The Club Recognition

“What you kind of see that it’s a network of, it’s a club... like being an MD or a JD, where you have a formal state license to be a blue journal is to have an informal state license.”

The White House press pass serves as the informal licensing system: “It’s a press control state.”

Word Corruption Problem

“Tech journalists doesn’t count either, just tech journalists, like tech branches on that word has been, the problem is words have been tortured to mean the opposite of what they mean.”

- “Science” got tortured to mean “masks don’t work before they do”
- “Journalism” got tortured to mean partisan attack rather than neutral reporting
- “Tech journalism” means “anti-tech journalism”

The Source Depletion Strategy

“We did this thing intuitively by freezing them out, of course, not talking to them and posting that stuff ourselves. Now they’re just reduced to bloggers. Now they’re not sourced.”

The Economic Reality

“They can get another subscriber, but they can’t get another quarter. They can’t get another supplier of quotes... There’s only one A16Z and C. There’s only one Elon.”

When Elon emails Tesla PR: **“it just replies back with a poop emoji.”** When asked about Washington Post: **“He’s like, you know, send my regards to your puppet master... because he knows that basically like that they won’t criticize their boss.”**

Applications

Immediate Actions

1. **Build direct distribution channels** before you need them
2. **Hire content creators** as seriously as engineers
3. **Never respond** to journalist inquiry emails
4. **Post directly** to your owned channels

Long-Term Strategy

1. **Develop authentic voice** rather than corporate messaging
2. **Build community** around your content
3. **Create content infrastructure** for team collaboration
4. **Recognize and resist** the “club” mentality

Recognition Tactics

1. **Identify sales emails** disguised as journalism
2. **Understand the MICE framework** for why people leak
3. **Recognize ego manipulation** in journalist outreach
4. **See through** the false flag approach

Key Insight

The media landscape has fundamentally shifted from gatekeepers to direct communication. Those who recognize this shift and build direct distribution avoid the distortion filter entirely, while those who continue feeding the legacy system pay for their own destruction.

Related Concepts

- Chapter 4: Journalism as Psychological Warfare - Understanding what you're defending against
- Chapter 6: Cryptographic Truth Future - The infrastructure for verified direct communication
- Chapter 2: State vs Network Framework - Why networks win through direct value creation

Chapter 6: Cryptographic Truth Future

Source: Tech vs. Media - Balaji Srinivasan on the Battle Shaping Our Future

Type: Podcast Interview

Mental Model: Truth Infrastructure

Tags: #cryptographic-truth #bitcoin-consensus #ledger-of-record #ai-journalism #verification-systems

The Constructive Solution

“You can’t be a critic. You have to be a constructive critic... Ron Paul said end the fed and Satoshi implemented Bitcoin. So you have the criticism, then you have the construction. So we actually have to build something better. We have to build internet first media.”

The Ledger of Record

“The ledger of record... that replaces the paper record. We have to play to win, and so we have to essentially realize that that is the center of the whole thing, right? Truth.”

The concept originated in 2020 with the prediction that “GPT three would be able to summer, the next version of it would be able to summarize things.” The fundamental premise: “If you think about a sports article, it’s essentially... a wrapper around” raw data.

Bitcoin as the Truth Model

“Bitcoin is decentralized cryptographic truth. Like, essentially, the whole thing about Bitcoin that’s so hard is how do you get global consensus on who owns what BTC?”

The Global Consensus Achievement

“We have something now where whether you’re a Democrat or Republican, Japanese or Chinese, Indian or Pakistani, everybody agrees on the state of the Bitcoin blockchain. They have global consensus on this thing, which is worth trillions of dollars.”

The magnitude of this achievement: **“People who fight wars over billions of dollars, millions of dollars, they kill people are a thousand dollars sometimes. So to have global consensus on this with no police men or no military backing it.”**

“How many long divisions has the New York Times, right? They don ’t have any, right? Bitcoin has... So we actually have truth on our side, a more powerful form of decentralized cryptographic truth.”

The Primitives of Cryptographic Truth

“Much harder cryptographically verifiable guarantees. Proof of what, when and where ... Or proof of what when and who, what is the hash when it’s a timestamp, who is the digital signature? You can also do like proof of location, proof of where, and other kinds of proofs.”

The Technical Framework

“That stream of cryptographic proof is like a better Twitter in that sense, a cryptographically verifiable Twitter. Then you have AI referencing that to create articles.”

Components of the system:

1. **What** - Cryptographic hash of content
2. **When** - Immutable timestamp
3. **Who** - Digital signature verification
4. **Where** - Proof of location when applicable

Universal Access to Truth

“You don’t need a subscription to the New York Times to do math. I don ’t need to pay Salisberger to do math... Someone in India, someone in the Philippines, someone in the South, someone in the North, wherever you can do math. You don’t have to subscribe here for the truth.”

“The truth is actually everybody’s thing... Everybody should have access to the truth.”

Network Vs State Truth

“The network has to supplant the state as the form of truth. That’s what Bitcoin represents, the truth machine, and it gives a set of primitives.”

Case Study: The Brazilian Fires Deception

“The Atlantic published this crazy piece calling for invading Brazil because they saw a photo of the Brazilian fires... The Amazon fires are more dangerous to WMD.”

The Cryptographic Solution

The photo was “taken by a journalist who had died, photojournalists who died years ago. So it’s from like some stock.”

“There was a time stamp that showed that that photo existed many years ago... So it wasn’t of a current event... you have implicit cryptographic verification of the timestamp of that image that was going to be used to cause a war.”

This demonstrates “why control over truth is so important to them. Why did they put up the billboards there? Because once you determine what is true in false... you can cause wars, you can topple governments.”

AI-Powered Automated Journalism

The Robo Journalist Demonstration

From 2022: “I put out a call to use AI to generate NYT tier clickbait from tweets.” The result: “his app takes a tweet generation article, it’s already in the ballpark... It looks exactly like NYT or clickbait.”

“No journal, only robo. No journal, only crypto.”

Internal Contradiction Detection

“AI can find every internal contradiction than NYT ever... you could just have them NYT versus NYT, like, you know, they’re enslaving people, and then they’re pretending they’re on the side... there’s so many things like that.”

Examples:

- **Dual-class stock criticism** of tech companies vs. **protection of NYT's** own dual-class structure
- **Ukrainian coverage** contradictions over time
- **Historical whitewashing** vs. current moral positioning

The Verification Infrastructure

“Once you have the root feed of facts and think of it as like Twitter, but with decentralized cryptographic verification... imagine you have a bunch of checks, sort of like community notes, but a bunch of check marks at the bottom.”

TruGL: Truth Google

“Think of it as trugal, right? It's like Google, but for truths, and you just run every assert and all these models are saying whether something is true or not.”

The system would:

1. **Accept crypto payments** for model evaluations
2. **Fact check statements** using multiple AI models
3. **Provide premises and backlinks** for verification
4. **Store results on-chain** for immutable record

The Property Extension

“All property becomes cryptography... you can get consensus on who owns what stocks, what bonds, what Ethereum, smart contracts... you basically have consensus on who owns what property.”

Information as Protected Property

“Chain link and stuff like that, they've built essentially armored cars for information, sending it up and down to the blockchain, polymarket armored cars for information, where information on the internet that's commercially valuable can be protected by cryptography.”

Commentary Vs. Reporting Distinction

“What we’re doing with all the commentary is necessary, but not sufficient... We also need, because commentary is, it’s humorous, it’s opinion... We need reporting, we need news.”

“Commentary and summarization... is over here, but news is the update.” The system requires both:

- **Commentary layer:** Analysis and interpretation (current strength)
- **Reporting layer:** Verified fact streams (future development)

Applications

Immediate Development

1. **Prize for cryptographic truth systems** - “At NS.com, we’ll put out a prize... for decentralized cryptographic truth and forecaster”
2. **Multiple model verification** for fact-checking
3. **Premises and backlinks** for transparent sourcing
4. **On-chain storage** of verification results

Long-Term Infrastructure

1. **Cryptographically verifiable Twitter** replacement
2. **AI-generated journalism** with transparent sourcing
3. **Global truth consensus** mechanisms
4. **Universal truth access** without subscription gatekeepers

Defense Applications

1. **Timestamp verification** prevents historical revision
2. **Hash verification** prevents content manipulation
3. **Signature verification** ensures authentic authorship
4. **Location proofs** prevent false geo-attribution

Key Insight

The future of truth doesn't depend on trusting institutions but on mathematical verification that anyone can perform. Cryptographic truth creates a level playing field where facts can be verified independently of political or economic power.

Related Concepts

- Chapter 5: Strategic Response - Go Direct - The transitional strategy while building this infrastructure
- Chapter 2: State vs Network Framework - Why networks provide better truth mechanisms than states
- Chapter 7: Network States - The governance structures that emerge from cryptographic truth systems

Chapter 7: Democracy, Exit Rights & Network States

Source: Tech vs. Media - Balaji Srinivasan on the Battle Shaping Our Future

Type: Podcast Interview

Mental Model: Governance Evolution

Tags: #network-states #exit-rights #one-party-states #california-failure #starbase-prototype #voting-feet-wallet-ballot

The Democracy Paradox

“Democrats destroyed democracy in California. Deep point, this is why things got so bad there.”

The core insight: **“In California, elections are held, but the party always wins exactly like China.”**

This isn't about left vs. right - it's about **what happens when competitive democracy disappears**: **“With no Republican check with no multi-party competition, this is when the California train of \$100 billion, this is when the graft really got underway, the homeless industrial and complex explosion because there was no accountability at government level for all the Democrat abuses.”**

The One-Party State Pattern

California as Failed State Example

“They built a one-party state and started looting it just like the communist did, but I repeat myself.”

The consequences of eliminating competition:

- **\$100 billion** wasted on high-speed rail
- **Homeless industrial complex** explosion
- **No accountability** for government abuse
- **Systematic graft** without checks and balances

The Bipartisan Problem

“To be fair, it is true that many Republicans in response to this have started to build Florida, especially into their own party states. So the problem is that you have Democrats, Republicans and communists that have all created basically one party states.”

The pattern repeats across different political orientations once competition is eliminated.

The Corrupted Language Problem

Democracy Means Its Opposite

“Democracy, like for the Democrats, it means... California is a one party state.” Just as other words have been corrupted:

- **“Science”** tortured to mean **“masks don’t work before they do”**
- **“Journalism”** tortured to mean partisan attacks rather than neutral reporting
- **“Democracy”** tortured to mean one-party rule

“When a Republican is elected, that’s a threat democracy. But when a Democrat surveils or sanctions or de-platforms or unbanks, that’s... just democracy.”

The Three Types of Voting

“The only democracy then is going to be the right to exit. To vote with your feet.”

Vote with Your Wallet

Economic voting through choice of currencies, investments, and economic participation.

Vote with Your Feet

Geographic voting through choice of residence and jurisdiction.

Vote with Your Ballot

Traditional political voting - increasingly ineffective in one-party states.

Starbase as Prototype

“Star-based shows that you can combine all three. And... Elon was just two things.”

Starbase demonstrates the network state concept in practice:

- **Economic community** built around SpaceX
- **Geographic concentration** of aligned individuals
- **Functional governance** focused on mission achievement

Reclaiming Democracy Through Exit

“We reclaim free speech. We need to reclaim democracy... We cannot give up on democracy. Democracy is actually... it was not an abundance, but a deficit of democracy that resulted in California’s downfall.”

The Real Problem

“The Democrats built a one party state, destroyed all multi-party competition. They gerrymandered it. And that’s how they started to...” extract rents without accountability.

The solution isn’t abandoning democracy but **restoring actual competitive democracy** through exit rights.

Network States as Democratic Innovation

The network state concept addresses the core problem: **how to maintain competitive governance when geographic states become captured.**

Key Components

1. **Voluntary Association** - People choose to join based on shared values/mission
2. **Economic Coordination** - Shared investment and value creation
3. **Geographic Concentration** - Eventually acquiring territory for governance
4. **Democratic Competition** - Multiple network states compete for residents

The Governance Evolution

From Geographic Monopoly to Network Competition

Traditional State Logic: Born into geographic jurisdiction, limited exit options, monopoly governance

Network State Logic: Choose governance system, easy exit/entry, competitive governance markets

The California Lesson Applied

Network states prevent the California failure mode because:

- **Competition remains constant** - residents can always exit
- **Performance accountability** - network states must deliver value
- **No rent extraction** - residents leave if not receiving value for contribution
- **Innovation incentives** - better governance attracts more residents

Mental Model: Governance as Service

Failed State Logic: Citizens serve the state, exit discouraged, performance irrelevant

Network State Logic: State serves citizens, exit enabled, performance determines survival

Decision Framework for Governance

When evaluating any governance system:

1. **Can residents easily exit?** High exit costs enable abuse
2. **Is there competitive pressure?** Monopoly governance tends toward corruption
3. **What are the incentives?** Rent extraction vs. value creation
4. **Who serves whom?** Citizens serving state vs. state serving citizens

The Media Connection

The battle over information control directly connects to governance:

“Why did they put up the billboards there? Because once you determine what is true in false... you can cause wars, you can topple governments.”

Network states require **cryptographic truth systems** to prevent information manipulation that enables governance capture.

Applications

Personal Strategy

- **Develop exit options** across multiple jurisdictions
- **Build network connections** with like-minded individuals
- **Create economic independence** from any single state system
- **Participate in network state experiments** when available

Community Building

- **Start with economic coordination** around shared missions
- **Build toward geographic concentration** over time
- **Develop governance systems** that maintain competitive pressure
- **Preserve exit rights** as fundamental to preventing capture

Recognition Patterns

- **Identify one-party state formation** early in any jurisdiction
- **Understand rent extraction** vs. value creation governance
- **Recognize language corruption** in political discourse
- **See through false democracy** that eliminates actual competition

The Ultimate Solution

“You can vote with your feet and go to California, or go to Florida, or go to wherever.”
But ultimately: **“We want to combine these because star-based shows that you can combine all three.”**

The network state isn't about abandoning democracy - **it's about restoring actual democracy through competitive governance that citizens can exit when it fails to serve them.**

Key Insight

The network state represents democracy's evolution beyond geographic constraints, restoring competitive governance through voluntary association and exit rights, preventing the one-party capture that has destroyed actual democracy in places like California.

Related Concepts

- Chapter 6: Cryptographic Truth Future - The information infrastructure necessary for network state governance
- Chapter 2: State vs Network Framework - Why networks provide better governance than traditional states
- Chapter 5: Strategic Response - Go Direct - Building direct relationships that enable network coordination

Tech Vs. Media: Balaji Srinivasan on the Battle Shaping Our Future

Channel: a16z

Date: 2025-08-01

URL: <https://youtu.be/cBFbXRjTVLc>

Transcribed: 2025-08-07

Transcript

We want to build Google's and Facebook's and AI and giant companies, giant cryptocurrencies, and now internet communities.

What they want to do is they want to exert authority over others.

For them, the best thing they can do is to put a man out of work.

And for us, the best thing we can do is we can put a man on the moon.

Balaji, another day, another Jerino hit piece, we were sort of talking offline about, you know, we're talking about the marks and bends evolution of the media episode.

And, you know, you know, I've been friends with collaborators for the last 10 years.

And one of the topics we've spent a lot of time talking about is the media.

Sort of the state of the media wouldn't need to be fixed about the media and how to do that.

And we, and with your leadership, have actually been a part of that trend and that evolution.

And so I wanted to take the opportunity to talk to you, kind of reflect about that evolution and talk about where we still need to go.

Yeah, well, okay, so there's so much I can say on this.

I'm going to show one graph that, of course, it wouldn't be of all the podcast that we didn't start with a graph.

Yeah, it's exactly.

This shows that essentially newspaper revenue rose to like \$70 billion in the year 2000.

And then right after the financial crisis, it just suddenly collapsed over, of course, like four or five years.

And Google went vertical and Facebook went vertical, right?

And the thing about this is this was the internet disrupting blue America.

Okay, there's a similar graph for manufacturing that shows China disrupting red America.

Almost exactly the same time, right?

So once you kind of, just to focus on this one though for a second,

once you see the internet disrupting blue America because media is like a core thing for them,

this is actually what led to wokeness because it was, you know, you've heard the saying go woke, go broke, right?

But in their case, it was actually go broke, go woke.

Okay, not my original coinage, but applied to this graph.

It's relatively original because wokeness was what happened was they just fell off a cliff like this.

And for from 2008 to 2012, tech was just part of the Democrat party.

It was like, you know, Steve Jobs is there and, you know, there's actually this article from 2012

on the Atlantic, like the nerds go marching into tech, helping to reelect Obama and

Facebook was helping.

They're spraying.

Yeah, exactly.

All that stuff was basically solidly on the Democrat side up until 2012.

After the 2012 election, right after Obama's inauguration, you can did to right after that because even

in 2012, like New York media and so on was saying, there's no such thing as a programmer.

Okay, Google that article.

So 2012, tech was part of the coalition.

So there were no reason to attack.

There's no reason to attack them.

After the inauguration 2013, and it's literally that spring and summer, the knives came out.

And media started attacking tech.

Okay, and there are these articles, you know, would you just look at all these rich people where it's actually in slate?

That was a before, you know, they got radicalized.

And they're saying, oh, you know, it's actually bad to attack people just for the sake of English.

It was before all media had updated to actually tech as our enemy now, right?

And so, but unless you understand the economics of it,

I don't think one can understand why the journal suddenly went crazy.

Now, the thing is, we're now in 2025, right?

It is now 17 years after the collapse in media revenue, right?

So somebody who is born, then, who is 18 years old, you're playing like multiplayer,

video games, like Quake or whatever, you know, all the new stuff, you know, MOBAs, right?

You know, you can get spawned into the middle of something where everybody's shooting at each other,

right? That's what, like, the Gen Z kid is today, right?

For a kid who's just getting warped into the arena, the Luke Farrad, or, you know, for example.

Yeah, exactly.

That's right. They're just, like, warped in like this.

And it's like, you know, that thing where there's a meme of the guy he's walking into, the apartment after he's been gone for 10 minutes, everything's on fire, whatever they're going back.

Exactly, right?

Okay, so from the perspective of someone who's 18 years old, the war with the journals has basically been a feature of their entire existence. Okay. But it actually wasn't like that, because in the 90s and the 2000s, the journals were secure enough in their economic position,

because you could write, like, four or six articles for Time Magazine a year and get paid a nice salary and travel around the world. So they didn't, I mean, did they kill? Yes, they killed, but they didn't feel the need to kill all the time. You know, it's funny because, the way I'm putting it, Nelly Bowles actually did a thing for Barry Weiss a few years ago, and it's like learning how not to kill.

Well, it's funny because she's one of the few converts. You know, she made the transition. She was able to get to the other side.

We look at that where we look at, there's another one. There's one by Hamilton Nolan at CGR,

okay, which is basically like the powerful don't need the media. Journalism, particular, at its highest level is about raw power. See the admit it, right? Go ahead.

I remember you had this old quote. Was it some journalist who was like our profession?

We know our profession is kind of like immoral. That's an old quote.

Oh, yeah, yeah, that's actually a great one also, right? That is the journalist. All right, this is a book report. Anybody who has read this book cannot look at the journals the same way.

So, Janet Malcolm, you know, talks about this and her opening line, this is a great book called the Journalist of Murder, and her opening line is this famous famous thing.

Oh, let me find this. Every journalist who is not too stupid or too full of himself knows what is going on, knows the way it does is morally indefensible. He is a kind of confidence man, praying on people's vanity, ignorance or loneliness, gaining their trust and betraying them without

remorse, like the credulous widow who wakes up one day to find the charming young man or all her savings on, sold the consenting subject of a piece of nonfiction writing learns when the article or book appears his hard lesson. Journalists justify their treachery in various ways according to their temperaments. The more pompous talk about freedom of speech, the public's

right to know, the least talented talk about art, the seamless murmur about earning a living, okay?

And now this is actually a very important thing because this is what a, this is by the way, read it on the top 100 nonfiction books of the 20th century by the modern library. This is like Wolf of Wall Street where you know how like there's some like finance guys who I think incorrectly are like, yeah, we are actually like boiler room, you know, pumpers or whatever, right? Like Wolf of Wall Street guy. This is, this is like that for the journals, okay? They're like, yeah, we actually, the journals actually are, they're like, we are defamers and yeah, it's just like

a mercenary thing or, you know, so this is a great book to read. There's another book you shall

also read The Great Lady Winked by Ashley Rinsberg, okay. So those prerexets, let's talk about

the specifics. First is, um, there's like 10, 15 things I can say, let me just go kind of point by point,

the first is, what is the reason for the hostility between media and tech, right? It's actually that

the master framework on the whole thing is at state versus network, right? This is basically from

my book The Network State. I think it's useful frame, which is like, for example,

Elon versus mainstream media is network versus state, right? Social media versus mainstream media

is network versus state. Or when it says, what is this whole article that was attacking Luke Farrater, it's like, why did this programmer attack the institutions of the US government, network versus state, right? Like this tech programmer attacking the state institutions, right? And it's a people on social media that tech people who are mad at the fact that this state aligned institution is attacking our tech people. Once you apply that framework, that applies to

everything. For example, SpaceX's network, NASA state, Uber is a network, taxing medallions are

the state. Bitcoin is the network, the Fed is the state, and so on and so forth, right? And those

are two different organizing principles for how you think about the world. Basically, the state is,

someone should pass the law, and the network is, someone should write some code, right? The state

is everybody who is directly or indirectly paid by essentially either the US government or a government more generally, and the network is all those people who are directly or indirectly monetize and make their living on the network. So when someone goes from NYT to Substack, they're

moving from state to network, right? And now the network is actually taking parts of the state where all these tech guys are getting into government, getting into politics, getting into media,

getting into finance, getting into the traditional niches that were for the state. That's why they're

so mad because they're share of the global pie and the local and the American pie is shrinking,

and the network spy is expanding, right? And we're getting into, they're like, stay in your lane.

Why are they saying that? They're like, you should just be like hitting keys on computers and being a nerd and making like LED light bulbs that flash. You should not be like rewriting the

code base of, you know, how like the world works, right? And as I'll get to, there's a deep question

of legitimacy, right? The network is new money, the state is old money, right? And when I say the

state, by the way, there's like the literal state in the sense of the US government, and there's the unelected institutions that surround the US government in a ring that give it instruction. Example, the newspapers tell the state what to do, the universities tell the state what to do, the philanthropies tell the state what to do, and so on and so forth, right? But they're, they're also in turn funded by the state. So universities obviously directly get federal funding, right? Some of them are literally federal, you know, public colleges, but they're very dependent on

tax exemptions and so on and so forth at the state grants, and they only exist because of that.

The philanthropies also did, oh, NGOs, they have compounding, you know, foundations, or they're

their foundation endowment compounds because they've got favorable tax treatment, which normal companies don't get, but they're a state affiliate. And finally, the media, that's the least obvious, how are they upstream of the state? Well, obviously they quote, hold somebody

accountable by publishing a negative article on them. Of course, they never hold themselves accountable

because, you know, like, they're always like, we're speaking truth to power. I'm like, obviously they're not. Why? Every journal is so courageous as to attack your boss, but never they're on. Okay? That's basically, whenever you're talking to a journal, you're not talking to the journal, you're talking to their boss, right? Basically, who is ultimately, for example, Bloomberg when Bloomberg was running for president? Actually, Bloomberg, you know, Michael Bloomberg

is one of the better of them because he's actually like a tech entrepreneur. So, you know, I'm not

like completely anti-Michael Bloomberg, right? But Michael Bloomberg, when he was running for

president, Bloomberg news, his pit bulls, they actually posted this amazing thing, which said, we will report on but not investigate Michael Bloomberg. Amazing, amazing phrase. Report on,

what an amazing phrase. So what it means is we will basically, if somebody else says something,

we will reprint in Bloomberg. So you can't say we didn't report on him. Okay? But we're not going to go and dig through his trash. We're not going to do it adversarially. We're not going to stalk him. We're not going to spam his family like they did to our, our boy, Luke Farrer, right?

That's a good report. Well, so that's the thing is they didn't ask her because he's got, he's got

our support, right? But I'm just referencing the meme. Yes, I know, I know, I know, that's right. Yeah, but the thing is they, they don't do that because if you are Bloomberg journal and you went after Michael Bloomberg, that's what's known as a CLM career limiting move. In fact, actually,

the entire journal establishment, that's all nepotist. That's all old money, right?

They project on to us what their lifestyle is. They like, Salisberger, who inherited the New York Times, you know, Murdoch, the guy who inherited Fox News down and the new houses,

who inherited Wired and CondiNast, basically CondiNast was a parent company of that. Basically,

they're all heirs, right? They're not self-made. And the journals don't have equity. See, old money treats the journalists much worse. Tech people, we treat our employees so much better

because we give them equity, right? They level up. The journals is a complete two-tier system,

where there's the publishers, the owners of these papers, and then these serfs, the journals. So how do they compensate them? They compensate them in status, where the journal is meant to

made to believe that they're like some, you know, independent, you know, like free-wheeling attack

dog. Of course, they can't actually attack true power, who is their bosses, right? They'll never even mention them. That's the thing is solid. Like, if I say Zuck, right? If I say Zuckaburg, Zuckaburg, whether you like him or not, Zuckaburg deserves our respect because he's the man,

he really is the man in the rear. He's taken the hits for 20 years, right? And he has survived so

many things, and crucially, he's CEO, he is founder, he's out there, and you can criticize it by name.

And if I say Zuckaburg, everybody can summon a face to the name, they can summon all this by

and so on. If I say Zuckaburgur, it's a blank. 99% of people don't even know the guy exists, right? He's like, you know, the usual suspects. Yeah. He's like, guys are so is it, guys are Salisberger, okay? Right? This guy, who is the guy, put him on screen so you can just see,

okay? I honestly, I've heard his name a million times, but I don't even know what he looks like.

You don't even know what he looks like, but this thing is basically, Zuckaburg is somebody who,

again, for better or worse, he runs a major communications channel, and so he's covered, right? But Zuckaburgur doesn't get good coverage. He gets no coverage, right? That is actually

really interesting, right? The guy who, you know, so let me show you this, put this on screen, ready? Who's holding him accountable, right? And they're, I'll tell you what,

yeah, journalist journalism for the privacy for me. Exactly. The guy who's surrounded by thousands

of journalists at all times is the only person in the world who has any privacy. Okay? That's good.

You've never seen this guy's face, right? Who is this guy? Yes, he's on the New York Times, and people say, oh my god, he's on the New York Times, New York Times. But the point is, if you did word-face association in terms of a number of impressions, this is a quantitative thing, right? If I use AI, I could quantify it. How many people can sum in the face of Zuckaburg to,

you know, but with it word, like millions, billions probably, right? How many, even know that Salisberger

exists? Basically, nobody. Why? Because it's Zuckaburg's company, he is considered a person who is in

charge of the company, and people don't just say, oh, Facebook has some policy issue, Facebook has

this policy issue, meta has this policy issue, they go after Zuckaburg personally. But the NYT, they're granted the enormous shield of calling it the NYT, calling it the institution as opposed to Salisberger's paper. It is just Salisberger's paper. It's his blog, right? There's nothing that is printed there without his approval, right? So he inherited it from his father's father's

father's father's father. Okay? It's like five generations. Here's a big one. Okay? And then let's get

back to Luke. Okay? So Duranty, okay, Walter Duranty. So let me show you, there's basically, you know, as said, Jernos never hold themselves accountable, right? So here's a great, great, great tweet

by Paul. Actually, Paul Graham, and then I think, you know, here's my reply to it. So look at Paul,

one of the biggest surprise of my adult life is how unethical reports are. And movies are always a good guys. Everyone in technosaries like this. Now, by the way, this is actually a deep

point. Why? Paul is saying this in movies, they're always the good guys. So this is a concept I call Jurassic Ballpark. And Paul has said something like this many times, right? Jurassic Ballpark

is like, you know, the movie Jurassic Park. And in it, they are missing some DNA for the dinosaurs.

They use amphibious DNA. And of course, that leads to issues because then they can reproduce and so on and so forth, right? Okay. So in the same way, when you have a missing segment of history or culture, you just ballpark it with what comes out of a movie, right? Jurassic Ballpark, right? Just ballpark it. But that could be really, really wrong or fake because it's a movie after all, right? Unless you have personal experience of something, your impression of it is the movie version. And this is a non-obvious point, right? So like, how else could it be because visuals are very persuasive, right? And your brain video is a high bandwidth pathway to the human brain, right? And it's not like your brain was like built in maybe in system two versus system one, you know, system one is like instinctive and system two is like logical, you know, kind of thinking, right? Like maybe your system two can distinguish true and false with video, but your system one can't do, right? Okay. So essentially, people see all these things like, you know, journals are the good guys. And so we just saw the journalists in the murderer, right? We just saw once you actually understand the space, they're more like Kaiser Soze, Kaiser Salisberger, where they are the unreliable narrator, right? They write the story and everybody else dies and they're the good guys. And you never actually hear the story of how the story is written, which is actually much more important than the story. Like whenever you see the New York Times has obtained, how did they obtain it? Oh, they got some stolen documents. Oh, you know, or they told a source, give me this and then I'll write favorably about you and don't give me this and I'm going to name you and the thing and you're going to lose your job and get attacked. They do all that kind of stuff and go ahead. I remember your definition of journalism, invasion of privacy. Yeah. Exactly. The non-consensual invasion of privacy for profit is what legacy media is. Let's take that definition. Okay. Non-consensual. Can you opt out? Can you say, journal, stop stalking me? Can you say, journal, stop spamming me? Can you say? Don't mention my family. Don't mention my family. So see, the thing is, in normal English, we have words for this. When journals go through your garbage, like, there are somebody who's like stalking people online and looking at all the facts. Like, you know, if Luke Farrider had had somebody going and spamming all of his friends and contacts and whatever and they were just like some, you know, like drug addict or crazy person, he could say, okay, that stalking that's spamming, you could get a 50 foot restraining order. I actually want to see, by the way, today's court system. I want to see people use anti stalking, anti spam kind of things because can't spam. It's an unsolicited message, right? Like, you can try and use that on the journals and maybe there's a sympathetic court system now, right? Like, basically, they get one warning, go to F away and the second is, they've got money. So go after them on that, right? Okay. Fine. So now, I'm sure there's some like, you know, um, process where basically there's all your terms were solved and there's various things where, you know, they, they have, they've had historical presence to protect them. But basically, once you think of them as spammers, as stalkers, as scammers, because they are scammers, the journalists of murder, what, what was the definition she used? A con man, right? The journals of con man, because they'll always write this email to you, which is like, fluffing you up and flattering you and saying how great you are, blah, blah, blah, and pretending that they come in under Flag of Parley, they get their quote, if you're dumb enough to talk to them. And then they stab you in the article. That's why, you know, Janet Malcolm said, the consenting subject of a piece of nonfiction learns when the article appears his hard

lesson,

because you talk to this person, they present to themselves as a human being as like a person

you're having a conversation with and actually they twisted every word to try to stab you, right?

Okay. Coming back up. So, uh, so point being basically, they're actually the stalkers, the spammers, the scammers. That's what the journals are. You can't get them to go away. So that's

a non consensual part, the non consensual invasion of privacy for profit. So there's this saying

that sometimes journals use a self-defense saying this is like, um, journalism is printing, but someone does not wish printed. Everything else is, you know, advertising or something like that,

right? It's like, I'll, I'll find the exact quote. Journalism is printing something that someone does not want printed, uh, everything else is public relations, right? Now, what does that mean?

Why does someone not want to print it? Usually because private information, right? So the non-consensual

invasion of privacy for profit, let us not forget that these are multi-billion dollar media corporations, right? People, it took a long time in the 2010s for people to finally, like, realize the New York Times, the journal, they're just.coms, right? They have absolutely, they're not referees. They're not neutrals. For some reason, people give them the imprimatur of like an institution. We need to save our institution. But what's the difference in New York Times and Facebook, the companies? Exactly. They're corporation, fair game, fair game, right? And in fact, that's why they got so mad at us because we actually believed in what they said that we had freedom of speech and that free markets existed. Actually, until really the early 2010s, there's no actual practical freedom of speech, you know why? Because, you know, it's saying, like, never argue with the man who buys ink by the barrel, right? Basically, freedom of press belonged to those who own one. So think about how expensive it

was to get a radio license, a TV license to own a newspaper and send trucks to people's houses

with, you know, all the ink and the printing press. That was like this super high capital cost, right? These are guys who basically own like essentially factories that cranked out papers. And you at home could say something to your friend, but you don't have distribution, right? And we understand what distribution, now, you know, Teal talked about distribution years ago before was quantified with social media. Now, very roughly, distribution is like number of followers,

number of people in your email list, but also quality of them, right? I just quantity of quality and quantity of your follower basis is roughly distribution. So you didn't have distribution. And I mentioned this before, but in like the early 90s, you know, the unibomor. Yeah, of course.

Yeah. Why do you kill those people? You kill those people so you can get an op-ed in the Washington

post, right? Now, why? Because distribution was so scarce back then that, you know, he wanted to

get his manifesto out so he could literally kill people for the distribution, right? That was just within our lifetimes just 30 years ago. That's a scarce distribution was today. He'd be a crazy person on the internet, right? He'd get his message out there. But if you realize unibomor is willing to kill to get his message out, you also realize why there's some people who are like crazy

trolls on X because they might not be able to kill, but they're certainly willing to attack somebody

else, attack their character or reputation assassination. And now you get to the journals, right?

So journalism as the non-consensual invasion of privacy for profit really captures what it is these critters do. Now, up until about 2020 or so, there was no force that could resist them.

They were just like rampaging, right? I mean, we could resist them economically, but especially

in the 2010s, they were so mad at us taking their money, right? And what did that mean? By the way, it just meant that like you refresh NYT.com, you see a Rolex ad or whatever, you know, you see a like some car ad, you see some clothes ad. And if you refresh meta.com, right? Facebook.com, Instagram, what do you see? You see an ad for the exactly the same company, right? Yep. And so that means the sales account executives at both of these organizations, right? What they are, you know, what they're doing is they're competing for literally the same customer, right? And obviously the Facebook, Google, et cetera ad has much more scale and has much more analytics. It's built internet first and so and so forth. So the NYT just starts bleeding at it. But essentially, at point being, we're being them economically. They couldn't code search engines or social networks, but they could write stories and shape narratives. I know the difference between like a drop box product announcement and NYT story. Their stories have villains, right? Our product announcements are all basically really making the world a better place. It's like, guess what? 10 gigs more storage or whatever, right? Guess what? You know, now you can like, you know, do, you know, like like comic book style AI or whatever, right? All that stuff doesn't hurt anybody. That's just essentially, you know, this is adding cool things to world. Oh, here's a new robot. Here's, you know, like that's who we're doing. And what are they doing? They want to like the highest award in journalism. What's the most precise you can think you can do? They want to catch the thoroughness. Well, even higher than that is water game, right? So they like basically, whereas for us, it's like SpaceX, right? So for them, the highest, the best thing they can do is to put a man out of work. And for us, the best thing we can do is we can put a man on the moon. Okay? So literally, the number one thing that they can see, and this again, state versus network, right? We want to build Googles and Facebooks and, you know, AI and all this kind of stuff drones. And we want to build giant companies, giant cryptocurrencies and now internet communities. What they want to do is they want to exert authority over others, but they want to do so in a deniable way, right? Because if you go to the Pulitzer website or something like that and you look at these prices, they'll all say something like our reporting held, you know, these so-and-so accountable and led to an FTC investigation, blah, blah, blah. So they're really willing to take credit when their words on the page lead to the state, golem going and animating and smashing somebody, right? It led to an FTC investigation. It led to, you know, a new FAA regulation led to this, led to that, right? Leading to some person getting fired, some program getting set up. And the ultimate thing, obviously, is to get the president of the United States fire. That's why they wanted to get Nixon fired, right? We would watergate, right? It was just showing that they had told, they were essentially like, think of Wall Street Journal, NYT and Washington Post as the three board of directors seats on top of the presidency. The president was like the titular CEO, but the journal, the Times and Washington Post, if they all put their multi-sec key in the lock, they did their board of directors vote, they'd get him fired, right? So that was actually the state of affairs. That's what it meant by holding the government accountable. Nobody in the government was really in power. The journals could write negative stories and they were out of power, right? So the thing is that when it comes publisher time, they will admit that their stories led to something. But when it comes BLM time, they deny that their stories led to America, you know,

half American can burn down, right? So it's a one-way ratchet where they take all the credit and

avoid all the blame. Because could you actually show the trace of like that image coming into somebody's

eye and then them setting fire to this building? Once in a while you might be able to show it, right?

They publish a manifesto saying, I read x, y, and z and that's why I burned it down. But that causal effect, right? The cause and effect and basically showing demonstrating that is, you know, there's an impression of page view that comes in over here through the eyes and the

ears. And then there's a burn down the building kind of action on their side. And then they just

like, you know, go ahead. It's funny because they're quick to use causal in both direction.

They're quick to say, hey, Facebook is causing people to be depressed or to whatever turn right

wing or, you know, yes, that's right. So, so tech, there's a causal effect for everything negative.

Yeah. Sure knows. There's a causal effect for everything positive. That's amazing. Wow.

What an amazing, right? Like everything you do is bad. Everything they do is good. Amazing

flipping. Once you see this though, you can basically be like, neo, you know, in the matrix, to just like block everything like this, right? And, you know, another big piece of this, they stopped doing this. But one of the things they were doing years ago is they're like, oh my guy,

everybody in tech is so white and blah, blah, blah, right? And obviously it's like so much more

international than the journals. If you go and take that famous photo of Elon in the conference room

and you compare the people there versus the NYT editorial boat photo, right? And you'll see they're

like well dressed, you know, essentially mostly European ancestry people. And again, I'm not the kind of person who thinks like white as an insult, but they do, right? So it's all projection, right? The journals themselves have these tyrannical, evil, meritless nepotists as bosses, right?

The journals themselves can never actually make it anywhere. And it's all favoritism and glad handing. And there's no merit. And it's all luck and connections. And the journals themselves

essentially are these envious people who exist to harm you to increase their career prospects.

And they project that all that out into everybody else, right? So once you kind of see that, like every, every accusations of confession or whatever, you realize, oh,

this is how the world works in their stupid Brooklyn side of things. And they think of us as a rival tribe that acts the same way, right? Okay. So now that's like part of the macro.

Now, bad news for them, which is to say that bad news for us and also bad news for them, but a lot of sort of bad news for them. The bad news for them is that they in the in the gigantic

war between the internet and blue America, right? And by the way, we didn't actually intend to start that war. We were just building great stuff. And it became so popular that we took away

all of the customers of these guys. But it's not like you set up Twitter or Facebook or Google to go and blow up the times and the posts and the journal, right? That was just something like,

you know, Bezos got the post out of petty cash, right? Like it was just something where we built

a valuable enough business that it generates so much wealth that, okay, he could just go and acquire

this thing, right? And, you know, of course, I understand why they got mad. But what they should have

just done is rather than try to beat us, join us or whatever, you know, like had part of it is also there's like three or four different things. There's a scenario where if Steve Jobs had lived

that when Bezos bought the post, Jobs buys the times and Larry Page buys a Wall Street Journal

and we'd be on Mars by now. Yeah. Okay. So like the thing is, at the end of the day, there's actually, you know, as much as I think there are like evil twin in some ways, there's a deep sense in which there's a similarity, which is we're all about the collection, dissemination and presentation of information. That's the similarity to the tech and media. The collection of information like the raw, you know, data, whether it's a user-generated content

or so on, dissemination, which is a distribution, the posting, circulation, and presentation, user interface. They do think about their charts or infographics. They also obsess about copy and so

and so forth, right? So we're a fork of them. In the same way that like Yale was a fork of Harvard

or America was a fork of Britain, then it's a fork of the East Coast culture and it goes deeper. People like Paul Graham, Catherine Boyle, Mike Moritz. Yeah, yeah, yeah, exactly, exactly.

That's right. So in another life, right? Yeah. Mike Moritz was a journalist, became an investor, Catherine Boyle also a journalist, became an investor, right? Peter Till would have been probably,

they'd been more than 20 years earlier, probably would have been a Supreme Court jurist, right? Probably would have been like, you know, Chief Judge of the Supreme Court or something.

Paul Graham would have been a professor, Larry Page, a professor, Sergei Breen, a professor.

Mike Salana in Brooklyn, probably. For sure, but you'd probably be a book publisher or something

like that, right? I probably would have been a professor and so and so forth, you know? And that's

true for, you know, Andrew Yang, Daphne Kohler, you know, many many people, Martin Casado, right?

Dickson, you know, and so many of us would have, because the thing is with computer science,

there is a amazing connection between the word and the deed. Actually, AI makes that, you know,

even closer, you write it down and it's done. It's this amazing thing, right? So ultimately, what we're doing is we're also writing all day, right? We're writing all day to see an impact in the world, right? So the difference is their impact because of doing it through the state and a failed state at that is almost invariably negative, right? And because we're doing it through

the network, we have feedback loops where, for example, when we type something in and it's actually

factually wrong, like the compiler throws up on it and it just doesn't compile. Like there's fact checking like on the page when we type something. They have no such thing. Their only fact check

is actually crucially, not by the world, but by their peers. Like that is to say, it's only when they lose data among other journals that they actually ever course correct, right? Ever. And that's like very rare, right? So long as within their tribe, they're not losing status, there's nothing.

Okay. Now, basically what happened is once you see this kind of model by they're going back to

the original point, the internet disrupting blue America, China's disrupting red America, you can understand essentially the last 18 years in the following way. Blue America was disrupted

by the internet. And so they began wokeness to take a piece of red America's pie and the tech

lash to try and take back control from the internet. Red America was disrupted by China. So the trade war

was against China and Trump was against blue America, right? Because both their pies they felt

they were shrinking. And so they launched two front wars on blue America and red America and the

internet. Red America and blue America and China. Okay. We'll do the China bit later. Okay. But blue America versus red America the internet after, you know, a massive push has lost. Right?

I mean, it was close, but basically Elon and X day, it's like literally D day. This feels like Eons ago, it was only three years ago, literally three years ago, X still hadn't been a part. Twitter was still Twitter. It's like, we're in like wartime speed of things happening and saying how

quickly things are right. Okay. So X day was something where, by the way, it wasn't just Elon. \$44 billion, even Elon, as amazing as Elon is, that's like at the right tail of what even Elon was capable of actually having as a race. That's a big, that's a big race for anybody, right? So it took, but the richest man in the world, the wealthy, he's doing, he's launching rocket, he's doing ships. He's all this other stuff and he decided to take on this enormous extra thing and he somehow managed it, which is actually crazy to think about because everything

else, Elon is the end of one because every other, you know, whenever I talk to a founder, I'm like, focus, focus, focus. Okay. After you have your first whatever billion dollar company and it's 10 billion, that's 100 billion, then you can do your next or whatever, right? Fine.

But so Elon's end of one point is in 222, where it looked like the free world was just completely on the ropes by these like, ratio obsessed woke psychos, just having us, you know,

like pinned like this, you couldn't even say whether men and women exist, like we're generally

talking about like a permanent midnight, like descendants, really, really bad stuff, right?

How evil they were. They just burned down half America. They were just getting psycho more and

more and more psycho, right? And so amidst that, basically, all the resource of all the centrist

tech and finance guys, because that's what the 44 billion, there's that famous message of like

Elon to Ellison, that's being made public right now, he's like, what are you in for like one or two?

Okay, but okay, Ellison could put in one or two, but like so many other people who's like Avengers

assemble put in a mill, whatever they could afford, a mill, 10, 20, I mean, 50 is a big investment

for almost anybody, right? Like 50 is like, you know, it's a serious LP meeting. So Elon, being Elon, was able to pass the hat and assemble this gigantic coalition of 44 billion dollars, all of our remaining forces for X-Day, right? And so the landing was extremely contested, right?

They basically wanted whatever the opposite of what he wanted. Yes, that's right. Anyway, point is X-Day was the day that, and the thing is like, you know, X-Day was also the liberation of

meta and liberation of YouTube, right? All the countries that these racial fanatics at the NYT had occupied, right? The networks they had occupied. That was like, you know how like the Nazi

empire was at like its peak and they thought they were going to win and then D-Day and then they

just kind of collapsed like this, right? So Salzburger and Soros, they thought they were going to win

and then X-Day boom came in and just there, like, you know, with X-Flipping, YouTube Uncensored,

like meta-uncensored, everything Uncensored and so on and so forth because X was upstream of

the conversation. Anyway, point is, it took Elon's personal intervention in June 23, see his first round of firings hadn't done it, his second round hadn't done it, it was like the third round of chemo to get rid of the wokes that had just infested Twitter, right, to actually you know, change things. And by the way, you know, again, Elon's intuitive, you know, more than a philosopher per se, just his philosophy is his execution, right? But there's actually a real

logic to why you've renamed it X, you know why? Among other things, there's one of many reasons.

Why? And I'm not saying this is why he did it, but it is an implicit aspect of how he did it.

It's just like them renaming all the schools and like tearing down the statues and so on, right?

Every journal had put years of effort into building up their profiles and all their blue checks were stripped and all their profiles got renamed and it was just X. I know the example is fake news,

right? Trump, fake news had actually been used in 2016 for a few weeks in the context of all that social media news is fake, but the New York Times is real news. And Trump turned it on

them and it's like actually the NYT is fake news, the fake news media, right? Which is perfect, right?

So in the same way, the blue check went from something that was something the journal's valued,

something that just Elon just stripped from all of them, right? He just stripped their status, stripped their distribution. I don't know whether the ban on outbound links, again, whether it's intentional or not. I have no personal information, just what I'd just speculate, or again, and even if it wasn't intentional, this is just like part of the effect of it.

The ban on outbound links meant that suddenly X became the place you just go for the information,

you don't go to the journals anymore, right? So he stripped their status, he stripped their control

over the central stream of media, he stripped their traffic from links, he renamed the whole thing

to show that he had root control over it, because you know what a pain in the ass is to do a rename,

right? This X.com was, in a sense, techs revenge for making every fucking GitHub renamed from master to main. Okay, now is Yale renaming its master's degree?

No. Okay, of course not, right? Is master class, whatever. Like anybody who's at the end of New York Times, are they saying I've got a main degree now rather than a master's in journalism?

I think Columbia says a master's in journalism, right? So the whole point was, again, these journalists have a double standard. They would impose that on us, right? You, one million GitHub repos after a rename from master to main, whatever, 100 million GitHub, do you know what a pain in the ass that was? This huge pain in the ass. Every single dev had to go

through some stupid exercise on this, which was just a demonstration of their power over us at that

time. That was what renaming means. It means you cause a massive inconvenience for everybody to

show that you have institutional power. So now, Elon returns a favor and does it at even much greater scale, right? Okay. So now what that is is network overstate where we fought in the

demand, which we were stronger. And in a sense, also by the way, taking back X and renaming X,

you know, there's like a hard fought city in some countries or some wars. Like, um, gosh, there's a, there's a city. I think how many times its soul change hands during the Korean war?

It was like several times, right? So, yeah, but it's a soul, soul change hands for four times. Okay, it went back and forth, right? And so you think of X as being like soul during the Korean war.

Okay, because it's a social war, it's a digital war where blue and red tribe and actually just to make that really explicit, um, this is a good visual, right? So this is from 2017 and the interesting thing is it's the same on both Twitter and Facebook, right? Since from eight years ago,

you can see they labeled notes as blue and red based on, um, whether they had said, I'm voting for

Clinton or Trump, just parsing the text, right? And they looked at their connections and blue people were connected to blues and reds were connected to reds. And the only large red

media

outlet was Breitbart. And blue was over here. And the hill was one of the very few outlets at both sides tend to link because it just gave neutral political news like so and so was running, so and so results, you know, one neutral, truly neutral argument, right? And so here you could

actually see that this was a social war, right? And you know, I've made this point in the past in 1861, like when it was in North versus South, we take for granted that the ideological and the geographical coincided, right? The North was, you know, the union and the South had the slaves

and slavers legal here and illegal here and the geographical and ideological coincided, right? But by 2016, the geographical and ideological did not coincide. You didn't have a clean red states and blue states, very fractal. You do have, you know, red states and blue states do exist,

but it's a preponderance as opposed to something that's as clean as this. Now, to be clear, it wasn't, you know, if you had, if you showed ideology here, it also looked more fractal, but it was more distinct ideologically back then. And here, it's much more geographically overlapping with me so far. Yep. Okay. But there is a domain where these two factions are completely

distinct and that is the domain of the cloud, right? So on the land, red and blue are higgledy-piggledy

right next to each other. They can't invade each other's territory, like what you're going to invade,

like, you know, the cities or the cornfields or something, you can't invade the lands. So instead,

the social war is fighting over the mines, invading the mines, right? Now, once you see this at, like,

you can actually understand a lot about the last 10 years, right? We've basically been in the middle

of this gigantic social war. And the goal was for blue, like, how do you win a social war against red?

Their goal, you're playing the game with Thela? No, I know the game, but I never played it.

It's like you flip tiles, you know, it's like, you've got black and white tiles and you surround other tiles and you flip them from black to white or white to black, okay? And so, essentially, the goal for blue was to win ideologically and flip every red node to blue.

Now, you can, now, one way to think about it is, you know how an ant colony, individual ants, they don't actually know what they're doing, but the colony has an intelligence. So even if the ants don't know what they're doing, the colony has an intelligence, right? This is same for, you know,

a flock of seagulls or a school of fish, right? There's colony intelligence that insects in particular are like this, right? So once you start thinking about ideologies is like that, right?

Think of woke as, like, blue, right, or like radicalized blue. It's like, you know, laser eyes, right? Like, basically, go broke, go woke. They lost all this money as the interesting disruptor them. Blue laser eyes come online and they start going to their old religion because they

don't have the money anymore. So go back to the old civil rights rhetoric and so on. It's like, basically when countries got blown up in, you know, the Middle East, other places, when countries

go on hard times, that's when fundamentalism returns, right? Because they don't have the economics

anymore. So their economics went away. Laser eyes glowing blue. So the eyes glow blue of these

sure-nose and they basically were like, okay, it's life or death for us. And they started going and

trying to capture as many institutions as possible in the social war. So that's why they were just

going after random seeming nodes and forcing, canceling them. They were forcing, remember how they

wanted Amazon to put BLM on it? So they did get Amazon to put BLM on some page. Like for a long

time, you'd load Google and it would have some BLM thing on there, right? You know what I'm talking about, right? Yep. So everybody, you know, Brian Armstrong during, during the 2020, you know, BLM rights, like people were like, trying to force them to say, Black Lives Matter on Twitter, what was the point of that? It's like the Shahada in Islam, right? The point of that was to show you're a convert to blue, right? To flip a red node blue because they can get, it's sort of like, it's a check mark over your head to show you, they flip that node. Now that's part of blue tribe, and now they can turn attention on the next one, right? And so all of the cancellation, all of this censorship, all the de-platforming, all of the unbanking, all of the insane ideological fervor, you can conceptualize as an attempt from blue to reunify red versus blue on blue terms by turning every internet company into something that was paying tribute to blue versus worthless DJ jobs, and every red into somebody who is paying tribute to blue by essentially not just giving up the presidency, but assuming the position, like for example, they want to defund the police, they want to fund their NGOs, right? That's what it was all about. They wanted to redirect the budget from, that's why there's like 200 homeless NGOs in San Francisco alone. The homeless industrial complex set shows that the NGOs, as their budget rises, the homeless population rises with it. They're basically paid to get people addicted to drugs. It's the Department of Dependency Department, and so the point is that basically all of this stuff with defund the police to fund the NGOs, all of that can be conceptualized as this broad social war of blue against red to flip all red nodes blue, right? And what was our main weapon? Your racist, your sexist, your homophobic, your this, your that, transog blah blah blah blah. And with this language, it was the same way that that same language they could use to force you out of their institution because they'd fire you for having any of, you know, being accused of any of these things. And they'd also say your institution, they'd bust your borders and they would swarm you with unqualified hires or else you'd be accused of this. So the same language they'd used to strengthen their borders and deport reds and they'd used to bust your borders and import blues. You see what I'm saying, right? It's actually because you're, you know, if you're a racist, you get fire from a blue organization and you're a racist unless you hire blues. Okay. Now, of course, today we see they don't actually care about brown people or black people, only blue people, right? Since more clear in 2025, it's less clear, it's fine. Okay. So now coming back up the stack. So once we realize that it was a social war, now we can actually understand why the journals want to kill you. Like basically, you know how at various times in history, France and Germany have traded and France and Germany have fought and France and Germany have traded and France and Germany have fought, we are in wartime mode with the journals. So it is like extremely stupid for anybody to now let's go to concrete brass tax. What should technologists do and what should we, you know, do specifically do generally, right? So first, just at individual level, right? Number one, go direct. Build your own distribution to avoid distortion. Okay. That is to say, any content you have, it should be posted on your feeds. Why would you go and feed it to some journal? You've got some scoop. You don't need them for distribution anymore. It's more obvious

that they need your content to build up their channel and they will distort it in the process because, like, remember, they get credibility within other journals by being hostile to tech guys.

If they write a positive story, then it's like, well, you write out, you're a flack, you're eroding a press release. Also, by the way, there's another point, which is conflict is interesting.

Right? Like any movie, if you're writing a screenplay and it's just somebody sitting on the grass

enjoying a fine sunny day, that's boring, right? But if a meteor hits, suddenly you've got attention,

right? So it works in a movie setting is not what works in real life, right?

So the journals want conflict. And so our concept of, hey, it's 10 gigs for Dropbox or whatever,

that might be helpful to the public, but it doesn't tell a story and they want a story. So they're always going to take what you do and put it through some distorting lens to get to the other side

and they will get more page use at the expense of your company that you worked on so hard, right?

So number one, go direct. Number two, build your own distribution to avoid distortion. Now, the thing about that is higher creators, there's two kinds of creators. There's those who are at the storyline level. And you probably only need like one of those per company, you know, because

if you have too many very strong willed personalities in a company, like you can only have one

Steve Jobs in Apple, basically, right? However, you could have a lot of people assisting with production,

right, with making content with scaling that creator or what have you. So usually you're going to

have a founding creator. And I don't think it's 100% by the way, sometimes you can have, once you get

to a certain scale, it's good to have like some personalities like, you know, for example, actually

Jesse Pollock is doing a great job at base for Coinbase, right? And he's got his own distinctive style

that's complementary to Coinbase's style and so and so and so. So at a certain scale, you can have multiple personalities that are driving certain product lines or what have you. And so

that's fine, right? But at least for the start of getting up to a build, you probably only want to have

sort of one storyline, one main creator, and you have a lot of production support behind them,

right? And that can really work. You can get very far with that. Video, images, all this kind of stuff, right? So a, go direct. Be, build your own distribution to avoid distortion. And by the one way of thinking about that, you, they called them the media because they mediate your experience

of reality. When you're putting anything through a media, it's like an Instagram filter that makes

you into a villain. Okay, why would you do that to yourself? You're basically, it's like paying the journal with free content to make yourself look bad and get a permalink that's attacking you.

I remember our, our good friend, Flo Covello was launching his, what was a kind of remote office

startup during COVID and he gave TechCrunch the exclusive and they criticized it. They basically

didn't make it look good. And he's like, why would I give you my launch announcement? I'm here to,

you know, advertise my, my company. I gave it to you guys. I gave you the exclusive and you made

me look stupid. Like, why would I ever do that? And the fundamental thing is it's a business development relationship. Literally think of it as TechCrunch is a corporation. Why are you

giving them something for free? Right? Literally, it's at. It's like that journal has a spreadsheet, whether it's them or their manager who's looking at it and there's a row in the spreadsheet for that URL and it's got the number of clicks and the number of conversions and the ad revenue on that article. And that's the only thing they care about. That's the only thing they care about.

They do not, you know, it's not there. The valuation or health of your company. Obviously, they don't care. They would literally light it on fire. That's what they did during BLM. They would light your house. The journal would light your house on fire and sell tickets to the place.

Okay. That's their business model. Right? And so, obviously, it's like the dumbest possible deal.

I just don't, I mean, people still still do this stuff. And I'm like, I mean, Elon Uncensored Twitter, you can post whatever you want, right? YouTube's Uncensored. Like, everything's Uncensored now. Get good, right? I will say one thing. This is very important. Over the last several years, when we've done like the tech and media kind of ecosystem, there has been something that's worked and there's something that didn't work. What worked?

Individual led projects, right? Mike Sloan is Pirateriars. That has a real style to it.

TVPN, right? Which exists to, I think, make Ramp get more conversions. This is very funny, right?

It's very funny. Of course, Ramp is our main sponsor. They've got them on the hats. They've NASCAR to it. It's funny. Ramp's a good product, by the way. And so, so TVPN, great, right? Cougan,

he stuck with it. He did a lot, you know? And other, obviously, all in has done very well, right? Obviously, Elon has done very well. And I think, you know, I think, you know, you did the Maz and now, you know, as you can see, I think that's right. But what I think has not done as well is the things that are institutional. Because if it's too institutional, you're playing it safe. And you're playing it safe. And there isn't any conflict. There isn't any opinion.

There isn't anything novel. It's focus grouped, right? Certain things benefit from averaging, right? Like, you know, for example, the velocity of a plane or something like that, you don't want large deviations. You want it to be within an envelope, you know? Right? So there's certain kinds of phenomena where you want averaging. Opinions and DCs are usually not

like that, right? So one way of thinking about it is, you know, the entire 20th century was the centralized century. And even the movement from the wide screen to the portrait size, you know,

like, like a phone is, you know, like nine by 16. The movement from wide screen to portrait size

is visually the movement from institutional to individual. Because a portrait, you know, kind of think a tick-tock cell thing doesn't have room for a panoramic shot of a huge crowd. It's

for like a person standing there, right? So it's amazing that even the screen itself captures that

move from institutional to individual, right? And you see this also on X and other platforms, like, you know, these journalists, I don't know what they were doing if they're faking numbers or whatever, they had like 20 million followers or whatever, and they have three likes on their tweets now, right? So something, you know, something happened there where either it was all fake or

there's just low engagement or just boring, but people just don't trust those institutions anymore,

right? So that's another really important lesson. Individual over institutional. If you're doing social media, it should be the amplified voice of your founding creator, right? And the founding creator is as important as a founding engineer, because a founding engineer is implementation, but the founding creator is the distribution, right? The founding engineer is the

how, but the founding creator is the why. Because a founding creator has a community that they're tapped

into, and they're saying, why should this product exist, right? And so you can often start by understanding your community and building a product for them, and then hiring the engineer, you know, that it's actually like a third kind of person, right? Normally, it's been like, there's like the engineering founder and there's like the business founder. This is like the content founder, right? And actually, this is where, you know, Carlson and, and, and, and Altman have observed, where are the Gen Z, where are the younger founders or not in tech? They're in content.

Right? Because actually, that's where extreme leverage is. That's the Mr. Beast. That's the, the guy who actually looks kind of like you, Aiden Ross, kind of looks like you, right? A little bit, yeah. A little bit, right? Yeah. Yeah. And, you know, some of some of the younger guys are, are there, right? Speed, you know, I show speed is like that, right? And they're very talented at what they do. And that's actually, it's just not something that we thought of as a thing, you know, because like, you know, there's still like the startup kind of thing, but that's actually now a, I shouldn't say it's a game for 30 and 40 some things, but millennials are good at startups, and we're still good at startups, and, and we still are, you know, partners doing a new thing, Altman doing a thing, you know, obviously not a new thing, but you know, like, like, we keep doing stuff, right? But the 20 some things are often very good at content and content is actually upstream of product. There's, there's a room for a lot of collaboration there potentially where they're doing the marketing. It's kind of like beats by Dre, but you start with Dre rather than Apple, you know, right? I'm not saying anything people don't know, but right now those have been, I think, doing things that are relatively low tech, like Mr. Beast Feastables or T-shirts or stuff like that. Brian Johnson, I think with Blueprints, starting to get higher tech, where you start with the creator, and then ideally, you can distribute, like, quantified self-suff through that. If that makes any sense, right? Human could also do something like this, we said to get into that area.

Any biotech company, genomics company, secrecy company could do deals with human, for example, for distribution, right? Okay. So this, by the way, is starting to make the case for why, like, don't outsource your creation. Are you outsourcing your engineering? Don't outsource your creating.

Right? Don't outsource your content. Contents as key as code. Content happens in the house, right? Content, you have to sweat over it, and actually, so for example, here's a few things that, I'm like half implementing, partially implementing, but I actually, or I am implementing, but I want to implement more, right? And this is kind of the thing you want. I've see, you know, come to Asixx or come to network school, come to NS.com, come to network school, come and work with us, you know, but for example, you know, GitHub allows a bunch of people to contribute to code at the same time. We take that for granted. How do you get a bunch of people to contribute to content at the same time? Something like frame.io is pretty good, you know, frame.io. You can put all these clips in there, all these images in there, and then you have something for people to work with, or a cap cut, web interface, right? You can log into that and just basically load stuff in there, and you have a few accounts that are shared among, you know, team members, right? So now you actually have something where creation was a single player app. You start making it a multiplayer app, and now, you know, internet connections are good enough that you can do versioning on big files,

and you know, reviews of big files, and so on and so forth. Start thinking about your content base like your code base, okay? And obviously, you know, AI is a big part of that, though it's not the only thing, since I think AI is, you know, any new tool, people use the tool and they overuse the tool, and you bring it back and you're like, okay, it's a percentage of my thing, but it's not everything, right? Like if we did this whole podcast as AI, and we had like computer-generated us, it wouldn't be as interesting or would have you, right? Because it's generic, AI is necessarily it's almost like a search engine, it pulls like the, it's funny, I was saying this our day. Midwit writing used to be woke, now all Midwit writing is AI, like it's not this, it's that, right? So it's like a super intelligence yet midwit, right? But that's because it's building the average from the whole interest. It's useful when you prompt it. Anyway, point is, so that's another piece on media is, so build your own distribution to avoid distortion, go direct, if you have something to say, higher creators, and the problem is, this is another big piece of it. Like a lot of people, you know how the journalists get them, is they get them on ego, okay? So it's actually very similar to like the CIA, do you know what I'm saying? Yeah, exactly, see most people can understand this, like much of what the NYT and what these guys do, and they're so much weaker than they used to be, like so, so, so much weaker, thank God, they've lost the center, right? They've lost much of, you know, what what happened is they just piled up the subscriptions, and they got all the wine moms and lost the Anderson. Amazing trade for us. Oh my God, they lost Glenn Greenwald, they lost Mark Anderson, they lost Nate Silver, they lost Barry Weiss, right? I mean, amazing trade for us, right? Like for the center, you know, because they actually got tech envy, and they just optimized the money, and they lost actually all influence and power over the center. Thank God, right? Fine, you know, and actually, you know, that's a good trade, all the ones who are not haters eventually leave. Let's say when, when dealing with them, is there like a private, a for-profit CIA or FBI, should I explain this point? Actually, especially, see, okay, so the thing is most people think, from, again, remember that Paul Graham think about, you know, you learn from the movies of Jurassic Barbara, so most people think that what the CIA does is like assassination, but a lot of what it does is actually character assassination. It plants stories, isn't that much cleaner to just have somebody, you know, plant a story, and then they're, you know, discredited, and that's so much cleaner than bullets and blood and so and so forth, right? In fact, they did this in East Germany as well. By the Wikipedia is actually just as bad as the media because Wikipedia, it's garbage and garbage out. What happens is you can only cite articles from legacy media, you can't cite social media directly, so it could be a rehash. So anything that's contemporary, anything that's political, they're really terrible, nevertheless, they've some articles from when they didn't get corrupted. So, a psychological warfare used by the Ministry of Security, it served to combat alleged through covert means. Basically, Zerzetsang was because the communists were also fighting a similar social war. They had conservatives, they had libertarians, they had non-communists on their territory, they didn't want to kill them, they wanted to convert them, just like the blues flipping the reds to convert to blue, right? It was, you know, they were targeted to stop activities of

political dissent and cultural incorrectness, right? And one of those kinds of things they did, right? Like, they would do things like go and mess up your sock drawer to make you think you're

insane or tell people you're having an affair, right? So it's like subvert and undermine an opponent,

right? So, disrupt the target's private life, so I'm able to continue their hostile negative activities toward the state. This is what they did to Luke Farrater just now. Exactly this. The aim was to disrupt the target's private or family life so they're unable to continue their hostile negative activities toward the state. Do you see that? What they're mad is that Luke, they didn't care

when Luke was just analyzing some old, you know, museum pieces or whatever, right? But once they're

going after the state, when does going after state, that's their bread, right? That's their power center. That's their golem, the FTC investigated this after our articles, right? So anything that's

upstream of that, they don't want us to be upstream of that. They want to be upstream of that.

Makes sense? So there's that song, you know, like the communists and the journalists are the same,

but I repeat myself, right? You know, and the reason, by the way, I say that is all, you know, I may have mentioned this, but like John Reed, Walter Duranty, Herbert Matthews, like David Halliburton, Edgar Snow, just take all those names and those are all the journalists who did the PR for the communists, like it's literally the reason that Castro's in power, you know, for example, there's this book, The Man Who Created Fidel, right? The Man Who Invented Fidel,

Castro, Cuba and Herbert Matthews of the New York Times. You see that one, right? Or here's another

one, which is Duranty, Ukraine, Amazon, like basically Stalin's Apologist. Isn't that amazing? Stalin's Apologist, worked at the New York Times, Castro's Apologist, worked at the New York Times,

crazy stuff. Actually, there's another one, Perfect Spy, right? Which is the Vietnam one, right? The incredible story of a double life of Phomzwan on a Time Magazine reporter in Vietnamese

Communist Asian. Isn't that interesting? See, when I say journalists and communists, but I repeat myself, I'm like being completely literal. We just pulled up three books in 30 seconds that were about journalist communists. So Dylan Matthews from Vox talking about the Luke Faraday argument. He says the negative reaction to this is wild. If you join the government and your

primary legacy is helping to kill millions of people through aid cuts, you can handle them criticism. If you can live with yourself. The Salzburg Primary Legacy is killing, not just not like through aid cuts. The Salzburg Primary Legacy is killing millions of Ukrainians.

Where's their criticism, huh? Again, Dylan Matthews is too much of a coward to do that, right?

Like, you know, these people, go ahead. The logic is just insane. It's claiming that by Dylan Matthews not giving all of his money to aid, he's killing people or by not making more money,

he's killing people. I mean, just to accuse his 23-year-old of killing millions of people.

One of the things about what they're doing here, they're like with the hall de mor, there's actually a very clear cut case where Duranty wrote 13 articles that basically said, Stalin wasn't liquidating the Ukrainians. He just meant it metaphorically. They're literally covering up like a murder and progress, okay? So that was like a very clear cut case. Here, you're talking about, okay, this is the Fee the Pigeon Society argument, by the way, right? Like, essentially, as a number of the population grows as dependent, any cut to budget whatsoever

for the blues is equated with murdering their dependents. And they probably believe that, right?

So it grows to the sky and everybody gets arms that, of course, the blues get nice paid non-profit jobs out of, right? And of course, you have more and more depend. And by the way,

guess what? He's absolutely completely wrong here as well. You know why? Go to Easterly and Levine.

Easterly and Levine said, stop the aid, right? Why? Because all the aid is used for these warlords

in Africa, right? Actually, there's something where in Nigeria, there's a business plan competition

that was the most successful quote aid project ever because they're making businesses.

Like,

the thing is, I saw this myself in India, guys like these effective altruists or these guys, they don't want peers. They want ponds, right? Brown people in India, like we're starving in the 80s

or whatever. And they were ponds of these NGOs who sent the aid. Now, India doesn't need aid.

India is actually number three in unicorns. It's landing on the dark side of the moon. I'm not saying everything is perfect, but it's rising for it. So the fundamental premise of his point that aid helps is incorrect. Aid actually hurts because aid, it's like, you know, it's kind of like testosterone supplementation and biosynthetic pathway. If somebody takes too much of an exogenous

hormone, it cuts off their natural production, right? Like, basically if people take too much of the way steroids, you know, it can cut off your natural hormonal production. You have to get

it exactly right. The actual charity is investment. This is actually a deep point, should I explain this point? Right? So imagine you've got two, quote, rich guys, okay? And one of them is

like, you know, Soros or, you know, USAID, it's kind of like a rich guy, it's a recent solution, or somebody who's handing out aid, okay? Grant, seeming grants. And another person is an investor.

So the, for the people who are queuing up to write those grants to seek aid, okay?

They are making themselves as sympathetic or as pathetic as possible. And in the limit, it's like the movie Slumdog Millionaire, right? Where you see, you know, it's dramatized, but, you know, the limbs of the, the kid are cut off to make them more sympathetic. It's almost like learned or caused helplessness to try to present a, to either become, to pretend to or become

as helpless and pathetic and sympathetic as possible. So you get the maximum amount of money. You

win the competition for being the biggest loser, in a sense, the most the biggest victim, right?

That's what openness is, right? By contrast, you think about our culture in tech and VC, right?

When we respect more than the details, else is strength, right? Essentially, you come to us, you come to us for a check. And when we respect the most, in a sense, is if we didn't put a check

in you, but you still win and you, you raised from someone else or you do it on your own, you bootstrap, and then a year later, we're like, I respect you, I was wrong, you were strong, enough on your own. And, you know, the bad, not bad way, one way of talking about this is like,

fake it till you make it, but another way of putting it is, rather than the Slumdog Millionaire, people chopping off their limbs and thinking about how depressed and pathetic they are to compete

for grants and aid. Instead, imagine a bunch of people who are all running a race, like a, a mile or whatever, right? They're running a mile and 20 people compete, only one wins, but the

other 19 at least got to work out, right? So everybody who's in the process of trying to raise venture or, you know, not that you have to raise money, obviously, you can, you can just totally

bootstrap it yourself now. It's the single person startup as much easier than it's been. But anybody who's in that process becomes stronger as a consequence of it because you, you know,

you constantly want to keep giving updates to the investor on all the stuff you're shipping.

And that means, like, sometimes the easiest way to do that is to actually just ship, I mean,

most of the time these wait, right? So in the process of proving yourself to others, you prove yourself to yourself, right? So that's why a small amount of capital when 20 people compete for it,

strengthen the whole ecosystem, but a small amount of aid when 20 people compete for it, weakens the entire ecosystem. So, and another way of putting this also is, like, take, you know,

these, these wokes, you know, who purport to believe in equality, okay? The Soros types or whatever.

Are they walking down the street? And they're saying, oh, here's some guy in the street. I'm going to give them half my fortune. Now we've achieved equality. Are they going to knock it down? So

what, let's say they've got a billion dollars, are they going to find like a 100,000 people and each give them a thousand dollars or 10,000 dollars? So they've all got 10,000 dollars in their

down to 10,000 dollars, they're all equal. It's within their power to do so. They could literally hit a button to do so. If they actually believe in equality, they could instantly achieve a quality right now, okay? And indeed, I actually do believe in registration for every self-proclaimed socialist, just for them to take their fortunes and redistribute them, opt in to socialism, we'll take all their money, all the wokes, right, redistribute it. Yeah, exactly. That's right.

Like, we, we basically opt in to that, right? What they actually want, of course, is to take your money and do something with it. But like, you take them at their word, they actually believe in equality. What they mean by equality, by the way, is equality between themselves and the people

that are looking up at, they're not thinking about all the people who they're wealthier than or whatever in that sense, right? Okay, fine. Point is, and in a way of putting it is, if somebody's walking on the street and they see somebody and they're down their luck, they might give them a

dollar or 10 dollars. They're not going to give them half their salary. So charity decelerates. The more somebody rises, the less sympathetic and pathetic they are. And in fact, people have

talked about like how once somebody gets out of the total underclass into the working poor, they actually sometimes make less money from all the grants and stuff because all those cut-offs

and sounds are considered self-sufficient, right? So it's like, you actually can earn your way into a local valley before you earn your way out of it. Okay, it's a, it's a disincentive to work.

Okay. On the other side of things, for example, take Teal and, and Zuck, this is a very famous example. There's many more like this. Zuck started out much in a sense poorer than Teal. Teal put

in 500K. Zuck is down much richer than Teal. But Teal also became much richer in the conspense.

Right? So that's an example of investment actually achieves redistribution of fortunes or creation

of fortunes or greater equality in a way that charity never would. Right? So capitalism is the ultimate socialism. And the same way like the phones that got to everybody in the world, the billions of phones, capitalism did that. Aid didn't do that, right? You know, like all this USAID stuff is just like it's aiding blue NGOs. What he's actually mad about, go ahead.

You know, there's laughing at the truth of it. That's the truth of it, right? So the fundamental premise of his point is exactly wrong. So, you know, you're taking away their pets, you're taking

away their ponds, you're taking away their, you know, like reason for existing. And of course, they'll pathologize that, right? But actually they're doing harm to them, right? They're not helping

them. Helping is investment. I mean, it obviously goes to the old saw of like teacher man to fish,

you know, versus give a man a fish, right? But give a man a thousand fish forever. They become

completely dependent. And that's actually the goal of it. Really, what's happening is the cut off

of USAID is rolling up blue empire. So it's killing the blue business model. That's what they're

mad about Luke. Okay, keep going. Yeah. Well, I think going back to Luke, what's our, what's our advice

to him or how do you sort of react to the situation? Which, yeah, what should he say now? I don't know

how they got that photo of him. Did he sit for that photo? No, I don't think so. Yeah, so

point is I think overall he didn't talk to journals, which is good. Look, Luke will be fine.

Why will it be fine? Because his tribe supports him, right? And the journals ability to impact somebody's with that said, the reason they do this stuff now is, and this is unfortunate part, they do this stuff. And they post this like take this Dylan thing, like by his logic, oh, then someone would be justified in Luigi type stuff, right? This is, this is really the very dangerous thing about what these journals are doing. They're trying to essentially form an hatred

against tech guys. Well, I mean, what have we done besides make things cheaper, faster, better? Right? Like, wow, I can now communicate with anybody anywhere, anytime, for no money.

I can find all the rules of information on my fingertips. I can do math and computer science.

I can do simulations. We can launch rockets. We've got electric cars. That, oh, we're the bad guys,

right? First of the people who are just like stalking and spamming everybody all the time, right?

So, so the point, so the first thing is just to have incredibly strong moral bedrock frame, understand that everything the journals are doing is projection. There's a decision rule.

Don't take the bait. The journals only get traffic for their articles when they get rage views from us. And guess what? They got 700k views or whatever for this tweet. And they got conversions

because they sold ads, right? You know, and so that's a, that's a dub for them in a sense, right?

I mean, look, it's not, it's not like a total dub because it's certainly not getting very fired or anything like that. So it's much less of a dub, but it's some kind of dub. The most valid, so okay, a while ago, there was some journal who was like doing some like converse stories or

like that. And they put people on a tech guy for like 15 months or something. And he just completely

ignored the entire thing. And it got no clicks and it got no views or anything. The opposite of, you know, love isn't hate. It's indifference, right? The fact that like, I don't know what we're putting

it is, um, we have to, so we've built up much of this supply chain, but not all of it, right? So we have replaced the most important thing is we've gotten X and we've de-platform. We've, we have reestablished control over the platform because they had gone deep into our territory

and actually had, you know, crazy blue stuff at, at, and some of our Citadel's, right? Like our VC firms. So one of the things they were doing is they're trying to target the stuff that's upstream,

the platforms, the venture capitalist and so on to try to hit the, you know, why they go after Uber,

right? They didn't want to know the trillion dollar company, certainly not in the libertarian one.

Why they go after VCs? They're the ones distributing capital. If they go after these Nexus points,

these critical nodes, they could try to hit those if you're in a social war. It's like taking a, a capital city or a town. These are important Nexus points, right? You don't want to go after a desert.

You go after Nexus points, right? So they're deep in our territory. So now we took back the platform.

That's good. And we've got actually we're flanking mainstream media with tweets and podcasts, right?

Ultra short form and ultra long form content where they don't have as much establishment oomph,

right? We figured out the formula that works, which is individual over institutional.

Now the next step, and this is the big, the big story for the next five years or so,

the ledger of record, right? Ultimately, you can't be a critic. You have to be a constructive critic,

right? Like, all right, you can't be like, you know, Ron Paul said end the fed and Satoshi implemented

Bitcoin, right? So you have the criticism, then you have the construction. So we actually have to

build something better. We have to build internet first media, right? So that is, you know, that whole talk I gave on the ledger of record. So the ledger of record. And that by the way, that talk was originally from like 2020. And I actually feel pretty good about that essentially predicting that GPT three would be able to summarize, the next version of it would be able to summarize things. It happened faster than I thought, but like I think the projection was correct,

right? And the fundamental premise is, if you think about a sports article, it's essentially, now we'd use it and I phrased it slightly differently then, but it's essentially a wrapper around a box score, or you take a financial article, it's essentially a wrapper around stock ticker symbols,

and you take a political article and it's a wrapper around tweets. That's a raw feed. It's the numbers that underpin the letters, right? So now, if you think about what a blockchain is, it's a cryptographically verifiable feed. That's in a sense what Bitcoin is, right? What a blockchain

is, it's a stream of events similar to Twitter or any other event-based feed, except it's got much harder cryptographically verifiable guarantees. Proof of what, when and where, right? Or proof of

what when and who, what is the hash when it's a timestamp, who is the digital signature? You can

also do like proof of location, proof of where, and other kinds of proofs, right? So that stream of

cryptographic proof is like a better Twitter in that sense, a cryptographically verifiable Twitter. Then you have AI referencing that to create articles, right? That's the that's a high level concept ledger of record that replaces the paper record. We have to play to win, and so we have to

essentially realize that that is the center of the whole thing, right? Truth. And actually, we have a better format truth. You know what that is? It's a form that is native to us.

Crypto. Yes. And specifically, there's a there is a good book actually by a reformed journal or, you know, to somewhat reformed journals. These are like the ones who are not here,

right? They're like some of them I assume are good people, as they said, you know?

So the, no, actually, big name case, they're okay. But the truth machine, the blockchain, the future, I think this is like seven years ago. And the thing is this just basically puts in book form a concept that existed for a long time. So I've just got a citation for the concept, right? So essentially, the point is that Bitcoin is decentralized cryptographic truth. Like, essentially, the whole thing about Bitcoin that's so hard is how do you get global consensus on

who owns what BTC? And we have something now where whether you're a Democrat or Republican,

Japanese or Chinese, Indian or Pakistani, everybody agrees on the state of the Bitcoin blockchain. They have global consensus on this thing, which is worth trillions of dollars.

People who fight wars over billions of dollars, millions of dollars, they kill people are a thousand dollars sometimes. So to have global consensus on this with no police men or no military backing it, right? Like, you know, that's saying like how many divisions has the Pope, which Stalin would say, right? How many long divisions has the New York Times, right?

They don't have any, right? Bitcoin has, you know, right? So we actually have truth on our side, a more powerful form of decentralized cryptographic truth. It's not headquartered in downtown Manhattan. It's on the internet, right? Let me wait for a second. It's all sounds compelling, but I also just want to celebrate our, you know, right now we have John Cougar and

Mike Salana and us and lots of other folks doing such a great work without without sort of the

crypto elements and so why is that, why is that necessary? Like what's, what's, yes, great question. So what we're doing with all the commentary is necessary, but not sufficient, right? We also need, because commentary is, it's humorous, it's opinion, right? We need reporting, we need news. You need reporting exactly. That's right. So commentary and summarization, right, is over here, but news is the update. Now, the thing is Twitter is obviously a feed of raw facts that people are putting out there in decentralized way. Bitcoin increases that because it actually

says once you can get consensus on who owns what BTC, you can also get consensus on who owns what

stocks, what bonds, what Ethereum, smart contracts. And actually, as I, as I, you know, I did an article

that day, all property becomes cryptography that we can do that in a different, a different, you know, session, you basically have consensus on who owns what property. So all valuable things you

can get cryptographic consensus on, right? And, you know, chain link and stuff like that, they've

built essentially armored cars for information, sending it up and down to the blockchain, polymarket armored cars for information, where information on the internet that's commercially

valuable can be protected by cryptography and set there. So, so let's take, let's take the case of,

you know, like, you know, pirate wires and TPN, that's great. But let's say there's some dispute

over whether a photo is real or not, right? Like a great example is the Atlantic published this crazy piece calling for invading Brazil because they saw a photo of the Brazilian fires, okay? And it's like, you know, here, it's like this crazy piece. That was the photo not real? Yes, exactly,

right? That's a very clear example, okay? The Amazon fires are more dangerous to WMD, okay?

This is a great example of when I said, they'll literally kill you for clicks, right? This was something they're calling for the invasion of Brazil on this basis, right? Because they're like, oh, you know, the Amazon fires are burning. And it was all on the basis of a fake photo that actually Macron had tweeted out, which turned out to be a photo that was taken by a journalist

who had died, photojournalists who died years ago. So it's from like some stock. So there was a time

stamp that showed that that photo existed many years ago, right? So it wasn't of a current event,

okay? And so is that amazing, right? That's something where etiology, right, crypto, in a sense,

cryptographic, why? Because you load the website, you see that it's HTTPS, right? That means there's

actually a cryptographic authentication that it's like getty images or wherever it was. It was basically

get some stock photo thing as we could see the old time stamp. You might hit archive that is, right? So you have implicit cryptographic verification of the timestamp of that image that was going

to be used to cause a war, right? So that's a concrete example of why control over truth is so important to them. Why did they put up the billboards there? Because once you determine what is true

in false, like did Russia, you know, collude with Trump, right? No, it's all fake, right? It took a massive court process to adjudicate that and forcing the court system wasn't corrupted enough that,

you know, that like that went through. But the New York Times collect all these polyesteries for this for basically false information, right? One way that's interesting though, and this actually helps give some insight into it. There's a there's a there's a tech person who's

a lib, okay? Who I won't name. But basically during the whole investigate thing said, oh yeah, I know this is just as good as like this game of thrones or something. And I realized, oh wow, remember that Paul Graham think about the movies? These people were treating this as if it

was like an entertainment show with Trump as a villain with the Times or with any legacy media. And this is very obvious say, but you know, it was obvious in the past. You can predict what they're going to say about somebody before they say it. They have very low information content on each thing, right? It's like Trump bad, you know, blue America good. And it's like, it's like a cast of characters almost like Seinfeld, or the same cast of characters, the good guy and bad guy appears on the page. And you could just auto do it, right? In fact, did I show you the robo journal from three years ago? No, I don't remember. Oh yeah. So this was a bounty. I just put up a prize I put up where as soon as AI came out and we can do a lot more with this, by the way, but I'll show you this. So I put out a call to use AI to generate NYT tier clickbait from tweets. Remember my thing? So yeah, the theoretical article was in 2020, or I'm like, you know what? We could have a feed of data and all of these journals are just a wrapper around that feed. And the reason I knew GPT-3 might get there is there's a company called Narrative Science actually. Have you ever seen them? No. So Narrative Science, it went bust. It was a good company just a little too early, okay? So this was a few years before the chat GPT moment, okay? And Narrative Science, what it did, which was the time was really cool, is it took your financial reports, right? And it would say like, you know, revenue was high in the Northeastern segment, 65K, four years, you know, so it would basically generate a narrative from your raw data. So it's like a readable narrative. Make sense? Yep. So because they saw that I knew that it was probably possible as this technology advanced to take raw feeds of data and summarize them in essentially story form, right? Let me so far? Yep. Okay. So that was the kind of, you know, theory in 2020. And then the practice by 2022 was once the chat GPT came out, right? Let me find the... So I put out a call to you say I had to generate NYT-T or clickbait from tweets. One brave engineer answered a call student who learned how to code and wrap it, starting to say, his app takes a tweet generation article, it's already in the ballpark. And you can see from this video the GPT times, right? You see this, right? Yep. Okay, so let me just, I'll remind this, okay? So here it takes the Elon thing, right? Elon tweet, it goes here, paste it in, it churns a little bit, okay? It calculates. And he's showing all the other articles he'd look at in the generative of the aesthetics. It looks like NYT, right? Yes, so good, oh my god. All right, this was three years ago. We can do so much more with this. All right, now, boom, putting the cocaine back in Coca-Cola. And look, it looks exactly like NYT or clickbait, right? No journal, only robo. Okay, no journal, only crypto, because we can also have these be, look, see there's a code and so and so forth. You know, there's a saying system administrators have, you know, be careful while replacing with a very tiny shell script. We can just automate, right? It's automate and completely obviate. And the thing is actually all the journals have these unions where they're against AI, they're against AI, they're against AI. This is by the way similar to, I think the US imposing tariffs or the red American imposing tariffs on China, it's like blue American imposing tariffs on AI. I don't think it's going to work. But basically, blue American imposing tariffs on AI is a protectionist, late breaking thing where they think,

okay, we can protect our revenue from this. And, you know, like, there won't be any AI-based disruptors of us, but there will be. And they're going to be interesting at first because there's a

lot of English speakers online and most of them don't live in the US. And so there's a lot of talent

online. And so one piece of this is what I just showed. And the crucial thing about that is those stories there can have all the backlinks and citations, right? So they show the raw tweets

that are underpinning it. And if you click, you can just change the style. I want this conservative,

I want this liberal, I want this this. You essentially now have turned all of the massaging and rustle conjugation, you know, the rustle conjugation concept, right? Like, you know, I dox, you leak, but the New York Times investigates, right? Like, I sweat, you perspire, but she glows,

right? Okay. So, rustle conjugation is, you're, you know, you're doing a bad thing, but I'm doing

a good thing. Like, you know, Zuckerberg has, you know, they're a great one, you know, they attack

Zuck for having dual-class stock. You know, here's, here's just to show you how just evil these

guys are. You can't fire Mark Zuckerberg's kids. That's a problem with tech companies using dual-class

stock schemes, right? So it's all like, you know, presents are not kings, right? So now this, you know, maybe you'd believe this argument on its own, okay? But the next day, what do they do?

Or the previous article, it's like, how punch protected the times, right? So here, the solution was to give that, so dual-class is good when they do it, and it's bad when tech doesn't.

Right? Now, the thing is, you have to have a long context window. Like, I have a long context window, because I remember this article from 2012, and I remember this one from 2019, right? So you

have to have a long context window. And until recently, I didn't know how to like, show somebody

else to find all these internal contradictions. But guess what? AI can do that. AI can do that.

AI can find every internal contradiction than NYT ever, okay? And so you could just have them

NYT versus NYT, like, you know, they're enslaving people, and then they're pretending they're on the

side, you know, like, there's so many things like that, right? The Ukrainian pro and con, right?

Okay, so coming back to your point, we need to have a stronger form of truth,

because if we don't have that, then you're just doing, you're essentially accepting their premise

that this event happened, right? Right. And I guess what I'm curious is, yeah, but the crypto stuff I buy, but even before that, we haven't been able, we've been able to build commentary,

but we haven't, to your point, had enough sort of protect reporters or, or, or, or, or. So the ecosystem had to be there, right? The ecosystem has to be there. Things had to work. Block space had

to get there. AI had to get there. Like, we needed the, the field clear for what we're going to do,

which is decentralized cryptographic truth, right? Decentralized cryptographic truth, where it's free.

It's verifiable on your computer, right? That's the thing about the Bitcoin blockchain you can verify. Now, one of the things I should be more clear about exactly what I mean by true or whatever.

When a statement is posted on chain, what you can verify is the metadata, right? You can say,

it is very hard to falsify the time at which this was posted. It's very hard to falsify the hash because of properties of cryptographic hashes. And it's very hard to falsify the digital signature

of what entity posted it, right? Each of those three things has certain cryptographic guarantees

that I can get into why they're hard, but they're hard to falsify that. That doesn't mean that it could be an AI image that you posted on chain. But it would have been hard to five years later

to say that that AI image never existed before when I can see proof. It's like the Brazilian Fires photo was a great example of that, right? Another example, in a Chinese court actually, blockchain evidence was used to show that someone had a patent that was invalid because somebody had posted something very similar to it many years ago. So it could use the hash to show

they had priority. Does that make sense? Right? So there's enough stuff that we've done in crypto

with proof of location, proof of this, proof of that, proof of solvency. There's many kinds of attestations and proofs that you can put on chain that are pretty hard to fake. That is a fundamentally new set of primitives that journals aren't equipped to deal with because we're talking

about math, right? And they can't do math. You know, they're anti-selective. If they can do math,

they'd be in tech usually, right? And so, but math is a universal property of humans. You don't need a subscription to the New York Times to do math. I don't need to pay Salisberger to do math,

right? Someone in India, someone in the Philippines, someone in the South, someone in the North,

wherever you can do math. You don't have to subscribe here for the truth, right? Like the truth is

actually everybody's thing, right? Everybody should have access to the truth. So it gets a very

fundamental thing where tech guys are sensing there's something here, but ultimately the network has

to supplant the state as the form of truth. That's what Bitcoin represents, the truth machine, and it gives a set of primitives, as I mentioned, the who, the what, the when, and then with other

things, we can send that to the where that we can actually have a feed of facts. So once you have the

root feed of facts and think of it as like Twitter, but with decentralized cryptographic verification,

that's one way of thinking about it, right? Like imagine you have a bunch of checks, sort of like community notes, but a bunch of check marks at the bottom, like a continuous integration with GitHub, right? Where you have a bunch of checkers green or red with the site is deploying properly, your bunch of assertions on it, think of it as trugal, right? It's like Google, but for truths, and you just run every assert and all these models are saying whether something is true or not, right? And there's some computation there, but if it's valuable enough,

you know, I should put out a prize just for this, by the way, you know what? Actually, at NS.com, we'll put out a prize, good NS.com, process your earn, actually, we'll put that up on

screen. I'll send that link to you right after this. I'll put out a prize for decentralized cryptographic truth and forecaster, right? Where essentially you can maybe pay a little bit of crypto for model evaluations to just fact check something, sort of like ActRock do this, but I think a better way of doing it is to have multiple models do it, give like the premises, give the backlinks and so on and so forth. And then eventually those things should be on chain where it links to. And by the way, you know, who agrees with me somewhat, I think, on this is Salana, where he's like, we need to do more reporting, not just commentary and so on.

Totally. And a good version of that is Nick Carter's work on operation choke point, right?

So that's a great example of something which is reporting, and not just summary, right? Not just commentary. Another example of this, and what's interesting, by the way, is notice that our first party testimony, see, when we give first party testimony in aggregate, that's actually reporting. So we're doing things like, you know how like someone who has

like raw talent in basketball or football or something can do things and they don't necessarily have great form, but they can just somehow get it done with just raw athletic talent there. There's a lot of things we're doing that are good that are done on raw like intuition because when you have a bunch of people who are posting on X and not talking to journalists, then the quotes get pulled because you know, people would use to say like, I'm canceling my subscription. And that was always fake and stupid, right? Because who cares? They've got a million subscribers. That doesn't do anything, really, except on moss. See, they can get another subscriber, but they can't get another quarter, right? They can't get another supplier of quotes, right? Because there's only one A6 and C. There's only one Elon. What is Elon? When you email like PR Tesla or something, it just replies back with a poop emoji. What do you reply back to Washington Post? He's like, you know, send my regards to your puppet master, right? Because he knows, right? He knows that basically like that they won't criticize their boss on the yours, right? So we did this thing intuitively by freezing them out, of course, not talking to them and posting that stuff ourselves. Now they're just reduced to bloggers. Now they're not sourced. See, that's another thing, by the way, like an important concept is like, how did the good journalists operate? You'll see some of them. They are almost like a CIA station chief. They'll post in their Twitter for tips, email, you know, message me at signal this side and the other, right? They're literally saying, it's like a CIA bureau chief who's set up their office there in this country. And like some weak country can't do anything about that, right? It's like a KGB officer who's there in the country and they can't be deported or because they're like some embassy rights, right? So they're like spying on Facebook. They're spying on meta. They're trying to solicit leaks. And why do people leak at these companies? If they leak at these companies, it's for the same reasons, you know, I think it's like M-I-C-E, you know, that is in the CIA. Money, ideology, compromise, and ego, right? So why do people leak to journals? Why do people talk to journals? Sometimes it's money where there's like, you know, for example, at Uber, like the VCs there wanted money and Travis didn't want to sell or IPO. So that's why they did it, part. Ideology, why? Because sometimes they're far left within an organization and they want to attack that organization. Compromise. Well, that's interesting. That's often, sometimes the journal will have something on somebody and they'll say, I won't print this if you give something else. That's on economic transaction, but that's a very, you know, dastardly thing. So it's like, yeah, don't talk to journals. Everybody what happens is the NYT or WSH or whatever they'll message you and they'll put on their nicest kind of thing. They're taught to flatter and sympathize in the email. You know what it's like? Actually, you know, it's exactly like our SDRs. Our sales development guys, our sales guys, right? They send out emails that are really crafted, cold email, blah, blah, blah, things, right? To make the sale. And it's a completely calculated thing, okay? Go and look at, I don't know, Mark Cranny stuff on sales. If you need a filter and analogy to understand the journals, the journals are sending you sales emails. The difference is

they're scam sales emails. It's like a Nigerian, you know, whatever, you know, it's like a scam or even, right? So at least when we're doing enterprise sales, maybe it's an aggressive sale at

times or something, but the product has to work. They can cancel the subscription or whatever.

It's not like, ha ha, you bought the product. Now we got malware in your property. You're going

to destroy your company. That's actually what the journal sales emails like, okay? So there's an analogy. You can only go so far, right? And the point being that the ego part, MICE, just like the CIA, the beer chief, people will do it to get their name in the press. They'll do it because they think, oh, it'll work for me. I'll be the one. I can charm them. Everybody has to,

you know, learn this lesson somehow, right? But I do want to call out that there are some, you know, we had named some of them, but there's some other new media folks who are sub-stackers,

et cetera, who are doing journalism, but are not the same journal. Okay. So now let me get to very, very, very, very, very important point. Okay? Many words have been corrupted in a certain

way. So when I say journalism, I mean blue journalism. Okay? Because if they, if you were to ask

some journal, is Ben Shapiro a journalist? They'd say, no, of course not, right? If they say, if you ask them, is, I don't know, is a Nate Silver-Silver journalist, is Glenn Greenwald-Silver journalist? Is, you know, they'd say, wait, yeah, Barry, are they, no, they're just running a blog, you know, right? Obviously, NYT is Salted Brothers blog, and the same way free press is

Barry Weiss is, you know, outlet, right? Okay. So this is a very important point. Let's say that take, you know, a Zuck competes with TikTok, right? Zuck would never say TikTok's not doing technology, right? Yeah, that's Chinese technology versus American technology, but they're

still doing, they're, they're recognizing we playing the same sport. You might say they're like, you know, it's under the Communist Party surveillance, you, whatever, you can make all those points

and argue all that and Trump is flipped on, whatever. Leading that aside, the point is that you wouldn't say they're not doing technology just because they're adversarial, they are doing

technology, they're just doing it, you know, on the Chinese side, right? Versus, they will actually,

the blue journalist will actually deny that sub-sac is journalism, right? That Ben Shapiro's journalism, because even if Ben Shapiro has like millions more followers than they do in a much

larger audience and so and so forth, even if he's smarter than they are in many ways and, you know,

in like a better complex, certainly he's better than like their opinion editors and so on.

And you have the sub-sacres by their report, doing original reporting. What they say when they

say journalism, they mean he's not in the club, right? So remember the social network thing with

the blue and the red, once you think about it as a network, right? Where the borders are fuzzy,

but no less real for being fuzzy, a network of blues, right? So like Glenn Greenwell, it's on the boundary of that, right? Seymour Hirsch maybe arguably is on the boundary because on sub-sac and

so and so forth, like Barry Weiss, arguably is on the boundary in some ways because she was

formerly in the club and so and so forth. So it's a little bit like being an MD or a JD, where you have a formal state license to be a blue journal is to have an informal state license, right? Why is it informal? Because if they were formally state licensed, they could say

that it's a state control press. So instead, what they get is a White House press pass and, you know, it's a press control state. The point about that is that the, what you kind of see that

it's a network of it's a club, right? That's when you realize, oh, don't talk to blue journalists is actually really what I'm saying, right? So that's an important clarification. So talk to and when I say, see tech journalists doesn't count either, just tech journalists, like tech branches on that word has been, the problem is words have been tortured to mean the opposite of

what they mean, right? Like science. Yeah, it's anti-tech journalists, right? Exactly. Like science

got tortured to me and masks don't work before they do, right? So you actually have to have like

some prefix or something, which is like science in the form of independent replication, not perceived citation, right? Yeah, we're trying to coin new media, like something new. That's right.

And you know, another example, this is democracy, like for the Democrats, it means, you know,

California is a one party state, right? Like here, let me show you this on just to just to show you.

So Democrats and Communists have both built one party states, right? So here is Newsom taking lessons from she and he's explaining.

This is an amazing, amazing visual, right? Where total Democrat party control, right? Democrats

have communists have both built one party states, right? This is more than just like a one-liner.

It's a deep point when just like when they said science and they turned to the opposite of science,

right? Which was, masks don't work before they do. Just like they said media or they said journalism and they turned to opposite journalism, which is basically, it's not neutral reporting on anything. It's reporting on the enemies of blues and protecting blues, right? Here, they turn

democracy into the opposite democracy where they destroyed competitive multi-party elections,

right? In California, elections are held, but the party always wins exactly like China.

Okay, Democrats destroyed democracy in California. Deep point, this is why things got so bad there.

Because with no Republican check with no multi-party competition, this is when the California

train of \$100 billion, this is when the graft really got underway, the homeless industrial and complex explosion because there was no accountability at government level for all the Democrat

abuses. They built a one-party state and started looting it just like the communist did, but I repeat myself, right? So when a Republican is elected, that's a threat democracy. But when a Democrat surveils or sanctions or de-platforms or unbanks, that's, you know, that's just democracy,

right? Now, the thing is to be fair, it is true that many Republicans in response to this have started to build Florida, especially into their own party states. So the problem is that you have

Democrats, Republicans and communists that have all created basically one party states where the

only democracy then is going to be the right to exit. To vote with your feet, right? Go ahead.

That's, yeah, there's a perfect place to wrap this episode in terms of it gets to your the network state. The network state. Now you can vote with your feet and go to California, or go to Florida, or go to wherever. That's right. And we want to combine these because star-based

shows that you can combine all threes. And, you know, Alan was just two things. So essentially,

this is a really important point. We reclaim free speech. We need to reclaim democracy, right? We cannot give up on democracy. Democracy is actually, first of all, that's an important interpretation. I just said it was not an abundance, but a deficit of democracy

that resulted in California's downfall because the Democrats built a one party state, destroyed all multi-party competition. They gerrymandered it. And that's how they started to

all the looting, the hundreds of billions of dollars in looting, right? But we can have a rebirth of democracy. And maybe we can do our next, you know, talking about democracy is creating startup cities, right? Why? They voted people vote over their feet to move to star-base, they voted their wall to build up star-base, and then finally, they incorporated star-base by voting with their ballot. That's the future democracy, not a two-party system with the illusion of choice, but a thousand city system with a reality of choice. 97% for Elon, right? This is essentially a precursor to what's coming next, where you vote with your feet, your wall, and your ballot at the same time. And that's the only way that you can vote against the Democrats or the Communists. The only remaining vote is that vote. That's where true, the true vote is. And what we need to do is reduce the barred exit to give everybody that practical franchise, right? Reduce lock-in, make it possible for people to actually have choice over the government that rules them, right? And this is also, of course, you know, basically we need to become the largest funders in the world of media, of democracy, of science. And we actually mean it in the uncorrupted versions, because I actually do believe in those things unironically, right? I do believe in media in books, in writing, and all this kind of stuff. As I said, remember, we're a fork of the East Coast, right? We're a fork of that assessment. So, you know, we basically, with technology, we can have a new birth of media science, democracy, equality, on the internet, because that's what the internet is. It's a peer-to-peer network. We're all equal on the internet. And truth is everybody's property. It is not self-property. It's cryptography. So that's a great place to wrap. Bology always a pleasure. Thank you so much for coming to the podcast. Thanks.

Transcribed using OpenAI Whisper (base model)