

Title: Welcome To The Machine: Part 2, The Matrix

Author: disoriented_llama

Created 2022-08-03 10:58:43 UTC

Permalink: /r/TheGloryHodl/comments/wf3k9w/welcome_to_the_machine_part_2_the_matrix/

Url: /r/Superstonk/comments/wdr1j6/welcome_to_the_machine_part_2_the_matrix/

Linked Post Content:

This is a continuation of [Part 1, Finkle Is Einhorn](https://www.reddit.com/r/Superstonk/comments/owpfc3/will_the_real_gme_bbemg_please_stand_up_part_1/). A revision is [available here](https://www.welcometothemachine.co/index.html). Please see intro post below. I ran out of room. Damn character li

#

<https://preview.redd.it/0qfp9kwxq5f91.png?width=1200&format;=png&auto;=webp&s;=3c23a4e4e3eddaf53d76fc0c4741e0dea16ba24e>

Section Four: MegaMedia

#

Section 4.0: Preamble, Part 2

4.0.1 The Truth Of It

In this Report I will not be telling you the Truth.

I know, that's a helluva hook. It isn't that I am avoiding telling you the Truth, or that I don't want to; I can't tell you the Truth because I don't know what the Truth is. What I will be doing is showing you the evidence. This evidence comes from my investigation into who owns what, how they got it, and *what is this "ownership" thing anyways?* (both legally and practically). Since everything in the world is owned by someone, and that ownership was achieved somehow, this Report has a rather broad scope. The breadth of that scope becomes more clear when you realize that almost all of our decisions in life, at least on some level, are economic in nature. Our economic decision making processes tie directly into who owns what and how. While I don't know if this Report accomplishes its goal in its entirety, it at least shows a whole lot of evidence that puts at least a few of the answers (for the really big questions), for me at least, beyond a reasonable doubt. YMMV.

The evidence I will be presenting is largely what specific people have said, either formally (official government documents, reports, laws, etc.) or informally. By "specific people" I mean natural persons, governments, corporations, laws, court cases, etc., hereafter collectively referred to as "people". I will be showing you what these people say in their own words and in full context (to the best of my ability). The sourcing of this evidence can't be overstated.

I can't tell you that what these people are saying is the truth. I can't tell you that they believe what they are saying. I can only show you exactly what they say, who exactly is saying it (within scope, which I will elaborate), and the context in which it is said.

#

4.0.2 Look Who's Talking

<https://preview.redd.it/c10n9r60r5f91.png?width=400&format;=png&auto;=webp&s;=b22d43532897e1c30aa55fc25a263bc6ad53bf54>

The sources I will be showing you are essential pieces of the evidence itself. It will seem that I am being overly cautious here, or that I am being pedantic, but the main driver of this Report is evidence. Here I will be talking about my sourcing, because the topics that I will be discussing will be ***completely

unbelievable*** unless you fully understand exactly who is doing the talking.

The evidence will be presented in the following way (any exceptions will be noted):

****1.**** I will be naming the source.

This is usually done as part of the flow of the report.

****2.**** I will be presenting a quote.

The quote format will be obvious. If there is a specific part of the quote I will talk about, I often highlight that part. If nothing is highlighted, the whole quote is likely to be commented on, or the whole thing is something I consider to be important. This is not a hard and fast rule. I may talk about non-highlighted parts, for example, and really all of this evidence is important. It is best to read the entire quote, but that is up to you. This report is the evidence though. If you read nothing but the quotes, that would be a better way of reading this report than reading only my words which are far less important.

The context of the quote is incredibly important. I have striven to produce the quote in context and to supply necessary surrounding context to the quote in my narrative (this is a potential point of issue as will be discussed later). A lot of my investigation has led to what I consider to be “Contextual Lies” (or if unintentional, “contextual non-truths”) that come from out of context quotes, or slight misquotes, or narrative overlays that do not match with what I think has really been said. That doesn’t mean my estimation of what has been said is correct, it only means I personally don’t think the primary source I am quoting meant what someone else is saying it meant. I make explicit when I think this occurs.

Because using your own critical thinking in any investigation is essential, I also provide a link to the ****full source**** so that you can look for yourself to determine if you think I have presented the context of the quote correctly.

****3.**** I will be providing a link.

The links I provide go to the source; who is doing the talking (unless otherwise noted). Many of the links go to archived documents, but the archive itself has the original link text contained in the “archived” url. For example: when a web page is archived at archive.org a new link is created such as:

<https://web.archive.org/web/20170722135335/https://www.fda.gov/ICECI/EnforcementActions/FDADebarmentList/ucm139627.htm>

This url, from archive.org has two parts. The second part is the original source:

<https://www.fda.gov/ICECI/EnforcementActions/FDADebarmentList/ucm139627.htm>

Note that it goes to a website on an fda.gov server.

This particular link goes to a 404 ([Page Not Found error](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/HTTP_404)). This means (in this case) that the page once existed on the fda.gov website, but has been removed.

The archived link adds the prefix to the original FDA site when it saves it:

<https://web.archive.org/web/20170722135335/>

Note the number at the end of the url (20170722135335). I’ll get to it in a moment.

This saved website is created by the archiver to store on the archive web server. Think of archive.org as “saving” a part of the internet at different points in time. The archived page link itself goes to a stored version of the fda.gov web page from a specific time in the past.

The important point is, this website should be considered the same as the FDA having said something at the time that it was saved. In the case of the first link above, this time is encoded in the url itself:

20170722135335

Separating by bar “|” gives:

2017|07|22|135335

This part of the url says it was saved in 2017, on 07/22 at 13:53:35 UTC.

Not all sources are from the archive server. When they are still available on the web I will often use the current source. In all cases it is essential that you note the source (contained within the url). When it has a url of .gov, it means it comes from a government run server. You can't get a .gov domain name unless it is sanctioned by the government. This .gov website is just an example. I consider all sources as primary unless explicitly noted otherwise. In other words, who is doing the talking is contained within the url, unless noted otherwise (some books I quote e.g.).

You must understand that these are [primary sources](<https://library.shu.edu/primarysources>) to understand the evidence. It is essential.

#

4.0.3 Did You Just Wiki Me?

In this report I will also use some non-primary sources. I use these often to elaborate on something non-controversial, i.e. for subjects that are considered to be *Generally Accepted as True* (GAT), and which I am not contesting. Alternatively, in some cases, I will use these sources to present what is GAT (the common, or consensus beliefs) before I contest the assertions contained within. These non-primary (or non fully vetted secondary) sources are really just used as a “showing you what is GAT” machine.

Many people believe that wikipedia is the worst source to use. The reasoning is that wikipedia can be written by anyone (which is only sort of true) and other sources are signed (which is also only sort of true). I will present evidence in a later section that such reasoning is flawed, but for now, understand that my use of wikipedia is strictly for things that are GAT (generally non-controversial, or low controversy topics). I like wikipedia because they provide so many sources for their statements. Many of the “accepted” references (MSM, encyclopedia's, etc.) do not provide the level of external (non-wikipedia) source referencing that wikipedia does.

One of the problems with wikipedia is that their sources are usually secondary (a major flaw, or at least a nuisance), but at least there is a well referenced source there, very often one that I can find. From those secondary sources I have been able to find clues to track down many primary sources. In other words, wikipedia is a very useful tool.

The main flaw in the reasoning of why one “shouldn't” use it, is that there is an implicit assumption that because it is semi-anonymous it is *less trustworthy*. The problem comes in the word trustworthy, or rather the word “trust”. I do not in any way *trust* wikipedia to be telling me the truth. As I will show evidence for in a later sections, using “trust” in any investigation is a flaw. There is *no source* that should be “trusted.” Instead, we should listen to their argument, on the merits of the argument itself. From the presented argument of any source we can then dig deeper, find corroborating, or contraindicating evidence and present supporting or counter arguments. No where in there does “trust” help in the process. In fact, it does the opposite. I will elaborate this concept later.

I will be providing evidence in this report that may be controversial. None of this controversial evidence will rely in any way on wikipedia (or any other unvetted source), and in each case that I use wikipedia I have done a search on google to make sure the results are generally corroborating (which is really the definition of GAT, AKA consensus AKA conforms to the “official narrative”). I strongly encourage you to do your own investigation into anything I present, whether it is primary or stated as GAT. I am most certainly not

believing that something is true just because it is GAT, I am only *not contesting it* (at this time).

For these reasons I assert Wikipedia is a good resource.

Just don't *trust* it.

At all.

#

4.0.4 The End Of The Beginning

Don't worry too much about the title "The Matrix." I'm not going to present evidence that your brain is plugged in to an all powerful machine that is controlling your views and beliefs of the world, nor that your body is used as the power source to run it.

I promise.

#

Section 4.1: The Ministry Of Truth (Intro)

<https://preview.redd.it/pu9jze1r5f91.jpg?width=1500&format;=jpg&auto;=webp&s;=7fb8292fd352217619bad4960eba7cc86af6af2c>

4.1.0 The Company You Keep

Just in case you thought maybe Megacorp didn't own the media companies, this is where we pull out the book on Super Advanced Fuckery and, with some sucus citrum (lemon juice) and our super secret lucernam arcanum (arcane candle), we'll take a look at the blank pages at the end of that book.

<https://preview.redd.it/yjr67fg2r5f91.png?width=242&format;=png&auto;=webp&s;=f37f0423d200d072266932aa941d982572bea949>

In order to gain a deeper understanding of our "modern economy" as the evidence this report suggests it is... in order to even *look* at the evidence I will present, there must be an understanding of the Media chapters in the Super Advanced Fuckery book. Some of this is going to seem a little off topic from the economics of ownership, but I feel this information is essential to understanding the evidences I will present on those topics.

Outside of our immediate sphere of experience, what we perceive to be "really going on in the world" is completely dependent on the mediums we use to view the information. If those mediums are manipulated, even a little bit, our view of reality is manipulated commensurately. I will be presenting some evidence here that suggests such a manipulation of our view of the outside world. This isn't just evidence that it happens. Most people realize it happens. This is an exposure of the scope, both in the past and present, and in product space. It also gives evidence of the actors involved, and their motivations.

This evidence, as it pertains to the media specifically, will be scattered throughout this report. It will gain more specific focus towards the end of Part 2. Before we get to any of that though, I want to look at who owns the media; Megacorp style.

#

4.1.1 The Information Dealers

In [section 1.0](https://welcometothemachine.co/index.html#_1-0-0) I picked many of the companies I did specifically because if you look, you can find a direct connection of ownership between the last few companies I listed and every single form of information exchange. All of our media is owned by these companies (e.g. CNN (AT&T);, FOX (Split up into News Corp and Disney), MSNBC (Comcast),

Marketwatch (News Corp), etc.).

Note: to understand what these ownership heat maps represent, please read [parts 1.0-2.1.2 of Part 1 of this report](<https://www.welcometothemachine.co/index.html>).

<https://preview.redd.it/knaimed5r5f91.png?width=1270&format=png&auto=webp&s=bc3d8d82939ea8d03336640435961110ce6d0508>

You have probably heard it said "[only six companies own all the media](<https://www.businessinsider.com/these-6-corporations-control-90-of-the-media-in-america-2012-6>)". They're wrong. It's one. All of these companies have as primary shareholders the same investment groups and thus are all owned by Megacorp. While what I will be showing here is far from enough evidence to support the statement of a "single owner for all of media," a great deal more evidence will be forthcoming when we get closer to the relevant conundrum of Part 2.

It's not just the news websites and stations that are owned by Megacorp. Its also social media (Facebook, Twitter, TikTok, LinkedIn, etc.), Google et al (which provide "personalized" search results and are the gatekeepers of all information):

<https://preview.redd.it/el1lq7n5r5f91.png?width=920&format=png&auto=webp&s=d9cc3a45cb79995ca26aacf66e827fea0899221a>

Hollywood, and all entertainment:

<https://preview.redd.it/jt0ibk76r5f91.png?width=630&format=png&auto=webp&s=dc51f24041a40bac485f5ddf0596d80c21c66cc6>

It's even the "fact checkers".

#

4.1.2 International Fact Checking Network

<https://preview.redd.it/g9vq24u6r5f91.png?width=678&format=png&auto=webp&s=569b086dafcb4caf93c75bd2f3ce37ca988fa753>

I will show a funding money trail for just one of the Fact Checkers to provide evidence for Fact Checker Fuckery. This one leads directly to all the others, so it will be sufficient. I think understanding the Fact Checker web is essential to an appreciation of the potential scope of the media problem. It's easy to get lost in the weeds in these investigations but I encourage further independent investigation if you think I must be incorrect or if you are just curious. (I recommend digging into Snopes' weeds if you are curious). I will admit that I have not checked every single fact checker, but I have investigated the money trail for a few. They all lead directly back to Megacorp paying their salaries. As you will see below, they are all fundamentally connected by other means as well.

The parent organization for PolitiFact.com is the Poynter Institute for Media Studies. The Poynter Institute is a "non-profit" journalism school that gets its funding from a [who's who of billionaire's foundations](<https://web.archive.org/web/20210713120448/https://www.poynter.org/major-funders/>). An abbreviated list:

* **Funders**

* Charles Koch Foundation

* Democracy Fund

* Environmental Defense Fund

* Facebook

* Foundation to Promote Open Society

* Gill Foundation

* Google News Initiative

* Institute for War and Peace Reporting

The list goes on, all in the same vein.

There's also the list of their "Largest custom training partners:"

- * **Largest custom training partners in 2019-2021**
- * American Society of Business Publication Editors
- * Charles Koch Institute
- * ESPN
- * Facebook
- * Huffington Post
- * Marketplace
- * MRC Media
- * Middle East Broadcasting Networks
- * National Public Radio
- * Newsweek
- * New York Times
- * Pinellas County School District
- * Southern Newspapers Publishers Association
- * The Washington Post
- * TikTok
- * USA Today Network
- * Vice
- * Voice of America – Broadcasting Board of Governors

These are, according to [a more recent page](<https://www.poynter.org/major-funders/#1632843520043-6f2a5e92-fdef>), the organizations that Poynter's trains on how to give facts.

[Here you can find](<https://www.poynter.org/major-funders/#1632843888743-52666069-9ec9>) the institutions that give Poynter's the facts ("collaborate"), ensuring that *everyone* has the same facts. Here are a couple examples from that link:

- * **Democracy Fund:** Granting PolitiFact unrestricted support to sort out the truth in American politics.
- * **Google News Initiative:**
- * Enabling MediaWise and PolitiFact to launch independent media literacy and fact-checking initiatives
- * Collaborating with the International Fact-Checking Network to help fact-checkers uphold the principles of truth and transparency in their verification efforts
- * **Meta:**
- * Helping MediaWise and PolitiFact in the fight against mis- and disinformation to help people sort fact from fiction online
- * Empowering the International Fact-Checking Network to support fact-checkers, climate organizations and solution providers working to combat false and misleading information about the environment
- * Enabling the International Fact-Checking Network to foster mentoring partnerships between seasoned professionals and fact-checking organizations worldwide
- * **TikTok:** Helping PolitiFact continue to fact-check elected officials and hold government officials accountable

We will be seeing the real ownership of quite a few of the organizations above as the Report unfolds. Not because I went looking per se, but because in the course of other investigations, the information came up and was relevant to something else. All of the ones I found are surprisingly more interesting than they appear on the surface.

Through Poynter, they don't just contribute to PolitiFact, but to many (likely all) Fact Checking organizations through [a central control structure](<https://www.poynter.org/ifcn/>) for "best practices":

#

>The International Fact-Checking Network is a unit of the Poynter Institute dedicated to bringing together fact-checkers worldwide. The IFCN was launched in September 2015 to support a booming crop of fact-checking initiatives by promoting best practices and exchanges in this field.

Does that sound like fact checking organizations are “independent” to you? Look at the top two bullet points of the IFCN’s intentions (in the link above):

>* Monitors trends, formats and policy-making about fact-checking worldwide, publishing regular articles in the section below and in a weekly newsletter.

>

>* Helps surface common positions among the world’s fact-checkers.

They do everything they can to make sure “Fact Checkers” are all saying the same thing. No “fact checker” has to investigate the facts themselves if they can simply go to a fact checker *source*, or get the predetermined “facts” in a *newsletter*.

Here’s the crazy thing about actual facts. If something is a fact, all truly independent, honest sources will come to the same conclusion. If there are nuances, or questions, then debate will occur. An independent path of investigation, followed by debate (which never officially ends), is foundational in the scientific method. Indeed, I assert the only path to the Truth using our methods of reason (e.g., logic, science, etc.) is through debate and consideration by many minds, taking on that goal in earnest. Why would it be any different in any other report of observations?

From the “Fundors” list above, many of the organizations who contribute to Poynter are also deeply invested in and/or owned by and/or funded by Megacorp (i.e. Fact Checkers are also Megacorp by ownership and funding money trail). Looking at the funders listed above there are some real doozies. Each NGO, NPO and Foundation is a deep dark rabbit hole itself. I will delve into potential fuckery involving Philanthropic Foundations in another section of this report.

Rather than go through the whole list of funders (to save time), just notice two of the contributors to the IFCN: Facebook and Google News Initiative.

That PolitiFact is used to fact check for two of the largest information sources on the planet does not prove lying or deceit. That Facebook (Meta) and Google also contribute to their “journalistic endeavors” (i.e. “collaborates” with them on the facts, that they turn around and check) does not prove anything nefarious either. This only shows a direct line of funding and information contributions between two of the largest sources of public information consumption and one of the large fact checker websites that “fact check” them. This evidence shows clear conflicts of interest (though nothing more at this point). The same exact types of monetary paths can be found for every single Fact Checker that I looked at. The phrase “Independent fact checker” is a provable oxymoron (at least through proof of monetary dependence) in each and every case.

It isn’t just funding that asserts a lack of independence with the rest of the Fact Checkers. The IFCN also has a “[code of principles](https://tinyurl.com/5cks7nnt)” and an “application and vetting process.” (The link to the application is about middle of the page of the Code of Principles page.) At the bottom of the first link is a list of “approved fact checkers.” It contains all the sites you would think of: Associated Press, Washington Post, Snopes, etc. I don’t know for certain if that list is comprehensive or up to date (no date goes past Aug 2, 2017). Any wannabe Fact Checker has to pass this vetting process (and pay its dues) or it isn’t allowed to be a part of the Fact Checking network.

If you’re not a part of the Fact Checking Network will you show up on a Google search? What about one of the bajillion sites that use a Google search function? Will you show up on Facebook or Twitter or anywhere? Lets try Google:

Using a mostly random, but likely controversial topic, I selected the search term, “fact check do masks stop covid.” I got the following [list of websites](https://www.google.com/search?q=fact+check+do+masks+stop+covid):

1. factcheck.org (approved by IFCN)
2. factcheck.org ("")
3. reuters.com (partnered with Associated Press (AP) (see below), approved by IFCN)
4. reuters.com ("")
5. politifact.com (approved by IFCN)
6. usatoday (at the bottom of the page says: "Our fact check work is supported in part by a grant from Facebook.")
7. covid19factcheck.com (A UCSF medical school site. Almost every single "fact check" on this page is a copy/paste from the WHO or CDC, which are also cited often in all other Fact Checkers. Nevertheless, maybe this is the "exception that proves the rule?" I will return to this question in another part of this report.)
8. wionews.com (This page does its entire debunking in a few sentences and cites FactCheck.org twice as an authority.)
9. factcheck.afp.com (AFP, like Reuters is also a part of AP)
10. wcvb.com (This begins its "debunking" with "We are collaborating with FactCheck.org" with a big link to their website.)

Note: due to Google's personalized algorithm and the date of the search (around Aug 2021), you are not likely to get the same results I did, though I suggest the end result will have all the same direct ties to the IFCN.

#

4.1.3 Oh What A Tangled Web We Weave...

Let's look deeper into the connection between some of these sources.

According to [this report](<https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000073446/PDF/073446eng.pdf.multi>) from the United Nations in 1952 titled, *News Agencies, Their Structure and Operation*, AFP (formerly Havas), AP, and Reuters are the primary "World News" sources.

On page 15 of that document it says most of the National News agencies from all over the world became part of the Reuters Trust. This ensured that all news came from one source. It says:

#

>it is true to say that in 1952 world news is disseminated mainly by six agencies: the US agencies (AP, INS and UP); the British agency, Reuters; the French agency, AFP (formerly Havas); the Russian agency, TASS.

UP is the United Press. It was the competition to AP in America as a World News source. At the bottom of page 12 it says:

#

>Once the new Associated Press had concluded an exclusive contract with Reuters, which provided it with the services of Havas and Wolff as well as with its own (a contract, moreover, which in practice gave AP the monopoly of all European news in the United States), the first United Press agency was gradually pushed out of business and ceased operating.

This was apparently around 1892, though the exact date is not made clear. By this time it appears the UP was not a player, so I am not sure why it was included in their statement about 1952 above. Perhaps it gets into more specifics at some other point of the report. I didn't read the entire document. I only used it to try to figure out who AFP was in relation to the others. It may be a treasure trove of other useful MegaMedia info and I should get into it more at some point. Nevertheless, I read enough of it to get some useful info.

#

>The geographical spheres of activity covered by the four world agencies which came into being between 1835 and 1851 were fairly circumscribed and were determined in the main by political, economic or ethnic affinities. The four agencies' limited resources inevitably restricted their expansion. **It was natural that they should co-operate and "ally" themselves by contracts** for the exchange of services, so as to be able to cover the news in the greatest possible number of countries.

>

>The history of the "treaties of alliance" signed by the agencies in Europe and the United States may be divided into four different periods: the alliances take shape from the beginnings to 1870; the reign of the "grand alliances", from 1870 to the first world war; the alliances disintegrate, from the first world war to 1934; the present time.

So there were contracts that gave this "alliance" of World News sources effectively one news voice from before 1870.

Sometime around WWII there may have been a falling out (page 19) of this alliance (no big surprise), but at some point all World News sites were brought back under one roof (from which *all* MSM news sites world wide, **by contract**, get their world news). There have been several contracts and alliances formed between these groups over the past 150 years. As of now, their joint *Trusted News Initiative* (TNI) ensures all reporting voices and all fact check voices are one voice world wide. No dissension happens within the framework of the MSM.

This latest contract, the TNI, apparently [started with the BBC](<https://tinyurl.com/2bapkph9>) getting together with all its MSM buddies to "stop the spread of disinformation:"

#

>The TNI is an industry collaboration of major news and global tech organisations working together to stop the spread of disinformation where it poses risk of real-world harm.

>

>In the month leading to polling day, partners will alert each other to disinformation which poses an immediate threat to life or to the integrity of the election so that content can be reviewed promptly by platforms, whilst publishers ensure they don't unwittingly republish dangerous falsehoods.

Who assesses what is "disinformation" or a "risk of real-world harm"? They do. The same single organization that is allowed to tell you "the truth" also determines what that is. The above paragraph, and the start of the TNI was for the UK election in 2019.

#

>This new expansion to the US follows the TNI's success in tackling disinformation during the UK 2019 General Election, the Taiwan 2020 General Election...

To be clear that this was not the first or only such partnership:

#

>The Trusted News Initiative (TNI) was set up last year to protect audiences and users from disinformation, particularly around moments of jeopardy, such as elections. **The TNI complements existing programmes partners have in place**.

Its members are, well, everyone (MegaMedia):

#

>The partners currently within the TNI are: AFP; BBC, CBC/Radio-Canada, European Broadcasting Union (EBU), Facebook, Financial Times, First Draft, Google/YouTube, The Hindu, Microsoft, Reuters, Reuters

Institute for the Study of Journalism, Twitter, The Wall Street Journal.

And just in case you thought the big American boys were left out:

#

>The TNI is also expanding its global network. New organisations joining the TNI for the US Election include The Associated Press and The Washington Post.

Just in time for the U.S. election.

Right before the *v-words* were deployed they also [made sure to include](<https://tinyurl.com/y3xchzdm>) a censorship and fact check of disinformation about them (please see note below on "v-word"):

#

>With the introduction of several possible new Covid-19 *v-words*, there has been a rise of 'anti-*v-word*' disinformation spreading online to millions of people...

>

>TNI partners will alert each other to disinformation which poses an immediate threat to life so content can be reviewed promptly by platforms, whilst publishers ensure they don't unwittingly republish dangerous falsehoods.

One voice is good right? It makes sure that no "harmful misinformation" occurs. The fact that the CEO of Reuters which leads the TNI is also on the [Board of Directors for Pfizer](<https://tinyurl.com/37apn3rx>) might be a conflict of interest when it comes to fact checking information on their products, but I'm sure nothing untoward is happening there.

The whole idea of a one voice world wide media also sounds a little bit like one of the ten planks of the [communist manifesto](http://www.slp.org/pdf/marx/comm_man.pdf) (page 28):

#

>6. Centralisation of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the State.

The "Ten Planks" are the steps necessary to bring about Marx's ideal utopian world. Of course this is centralizing the means of communication into the one voice of MegaMedia and not "The State," so there's really nothing to worry about.

Unless The State and Megacorp are less distinct than they appear? Then it might be exactly as Marx envisioned it. Not that I'm saying that *at all*. I'm just saying **if** there were some fundamental connections, then it would look a lot like Marx's Utopia.

I would also like to add one thing about the name "Trusted News Initiative." Anytime you have to tell someone you are trustworthy, there's a fair chance you might not be. A complete lack of independent investigative journalism and a requirement to pass their own built in Fact Checking Network to be allowed to "fact check" (debate a point), doesn't seem very "Free Press"y to me. As I will show in other parts of this report, there are organizations that incorporate under names that are provable as the opposite of what their name suggests. Such names have pulled the wool over the public's eyes for a very long time. It won't make a lot of sense how big of a deal that is until Part 3, but when you see what I mean, remember this part. Corporate names that are designed to make you believe the opposite of the truth are a very, very big deal. I'm not saying the TNI is an example of that. Maybe it is, maybe it isn't. Maybe it's totally the bestest most trustworthiest Ministry of Truth Media Conglomerate ever conceived. I am only suggesting that you remain suspicious of anyone who is named one thing (Trusted), but their actions suggest the opposite (no independence in journalistic endeavors).

I don't know if it's fair to call this mess The Ministry of Truth. I am not trying to prove intent. I am looking at how they define themselves, and following their money and ownership trails. Plus [the name is already taken](<https://tinyurl.com/ysa7j2x3>). Instead I call all well known media, MegaMedia. There appear to be

multiple voices and opinions proffered by MegaMedia to various demographics, but this evidence (and a great deal more to come) suggest that there may be ultimately only one source.

Again, I'm not suggesting you believe that statement (or anything I say). I'm really just trying to report evidence, my words are inconsequential in comparison. I really haven't even gotten to the good stuff yet. I'm just saying it kinda is looking like that might be the case; a single voice, giving lots of different opinions to different demographics.

I do not want to come across as discrediting fact checkers or news just because of a lack of independence. In any argument or rebuttal, it is essential to address specifically **what** they say; the arguments they make. Within "what they say," it can be useful to look at the rhetoric they use, their narrative overlay on top of their "facts" (i.e. what are the facts they present, and what are their opinions pretending to be fact), whether or not the context of their facts match with the primary sources intent, and whether or not they use other parts of the larger media narratives and devices to tell their story (i.e. are their corroborations primary sources, or are they basically using themselves to fact check themselves). I will address questions of the validity of certain "fact checking" arguments in later sections, with specific examples on a few very important topics.

#

4.1.4 The Reute To The truth

The UN report shown above suggests that Reuters was the start of this "single voice" in media (or at least in "world news"). It is also currently the main "Trust" (Reuters Trust) that manages it (and I assert always has been). Where did Reuters come from?

According to [historical record](<https://www.investopedia.com/updates/history-rothschild-family/>), in the late 18th century five Rothschild brothers were sent out by their father, Mayer Amschel Rothschild to establish a paneuropa banking empire, by creating family banks in five cities; London England, Paris France, Frankfurt Prussia (Germany), Vienna Austria, and Naples Italy. Since this story on the Rothschild banking empire is generally accepted as true (GAT) and neither I, nor anyone else is disputing it, I will not be looking too hard for a primary reference source (although I will be showing you one in about three seconds).

In 2011 [Sir Evelyn de Rothschild](<https://tinyurl.com/2h7yjr3>) gave a talk at Peking University at which he was speaking about his families banking empire in the 19th century (@7:20 in that video link):

#

>We covered Europe. We covered the European Union that we have today. From that grew a business which was successfully built upon an understanding between the five brothers. The five brothers used to talk to each other through writing. That was one side. They were also the first client of a man called Mr. Reuter. Mr. Reuter made his name by flying pigeons around the world, and if you couldn't send messages, you used a pigeon. ****And that's why we were the first client of the great house of Reuter. Which as you know became the most important messaging company in the world today. And from that it grew, over a period of time**.**

His speech continues and says some interesting things that I will get back to in Part 3. For now I want to focus on the founding of Reuters.

Evelyn de Rothschild is here proclaiming that the five brothers were the first clients of Reuter, which is to say, they gave him his first business, and his first dollar (pound sterling, whatever). The Rothschild's fully understood the value of information. In fact their entire empire was built upon it. Nathaniel Mayer Rothschild used both information and disinformation to effectively ****buy England**** after his family funded both sides of the Napoleonic war and he performed the greatest short sale of all time. This was a very important event from which an avalanche of fuckery began. I will provide all the sources and evidence for this in Part 3. These aren't really controversial statements though. All but the "owned England" part [are GAT](<https://www.businessinsider.com/the-rothschild-gang-shadow-conspiracy-or-rumor-2011-6>) ([part 2 here](<https://tinyurl.com/ycxyd474>)). The GAT sources suggest they "saved the Bank of England from

collapse with their own money." For now I'll call that tomato/tomahto. As we'll see later, the details are important.

There is evidence that shows a pattern of behavior by the Rothschilds in the 19th and 20th centuries of providing seed money for some entrepreneur, and effectively owning (controlling) their company (or in some cases entire countries) through sometimes stock or bond ownership, and in some cases through leverage. Note here that I'm making statements without any evidence whatsoever. Please keep that in mind. I try not to do that too often, but in cases that I do, it is merely to connect the dots. The evidence and sources will be shown in later sections. I can't show all of the evidence at the same time, and some things require substantial corroboration to be appreciated. I am introducing the Rothschilds here only because they come up in trying to understand the beginnings of our modern media. The details of all of these things are important, and the original sources are important to see. I will elaborate quite a bit further on all of these topics later.

Given my assertion of the Rothschilds above (which I promise to get back to in a big way), is it too much of a stretch to think that perhaps such a thing happened with Reuters? Perhaps it was further funded, and indeed even founded by Rothschild, with Reuter as CEO, but also merely a frontman when it comes to actual ownership AKA top level decision making. At this point that is speculative, but I will provide substantial evidence (most of this report) that this behavior is common. Indeed, this report will make the case that this "frontman" relationship is almost ubiquitous, at least for the larger corporations, i.e. the "owner" is not exactly the person who it appears to be. While I certainly have not made the case for such a situation at Reuters, at the very least, in the beginning, the Rothschilds almost certainly had substantial influence. The only other "concrete" (set in stone?) connection I have found (as of the time of this writing) between Reuters and the Rothschilds is this:

#

<https://preview.redd.it/6lc0t7b9r5f91.png?width=768&format;=png&auto;=webp&s;=c2c7dba8a48b3877d74384e7e0f67c6eff44ed7a>

>The supply of information to the world's traders in securities, commodities and currencies was then, as is now the mainspring of Reuters activities & the guarantee of the founder's aims of accuracy, rapidity and reliability. News services based on those principles now go to news papers, radio & television networks & governments throughout the world. Reuters has faithfully continued the work begun here to attest this & to honour Palullius Reuter. **The memorial was set here by Reuters to Mark the 125th anniversary of Reuters foundation & inaugurated by Edmond L'de Rothschild td 13-10-76**

By Sir Evelyn de Rothschild's own admission, Reuters began life as the information lifespring for the Rothschild's Banking Empire. This 125th Reuters anniversary plaque at the Royal Exchange London was inaugurated by a member of the Rothschild Dynasty suggesting there is still a substantial connection.

It would seem that I am grouping all members of the Rothschild's together as if they were a single entity. I will explain why this is, to an extent, appropriate, even necessary (legally speaking) in a later section.

I will return to the media at several points as the report progresses. There is a great deal more to be looked at here, but the evidence that supports the topics must be presented first, to set up the context for the evidence of the media itself.

End Sec. 4.

[Section five continues here](https://www.welcometothemachine.co/index.html#_5) if you would like to read ahead.