

“Privacy Poor” vs. “Privacy Rich” in a “Digital Bastille”. The “Death of Privacy” under the Helm of the World Economic Forum (WEF)

By [Prof. Bill Willers](#)

Global Research, January 26, 2021

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Global Economy](#)

“Citizen concerns over privacy will require adjustments in thinking”. [-Klaus Schwab, 2016](#)

[The World Economic Forum \(WEF\)](#), the Switzerland-based NGO of “elites” noted for political power and extreme wealth, has taken it upon itself to dictate the future of the world. Each year, members have traditionally met in the small Swiss mountain town of Davos, hence the term “the Davos Crowd”, often used derisively because of the group’s unsolicited power. On any given day, the world should be prepared to wake up and find that the WEF’s society-changing “projects and initiatives” have been ongoing away from public scrutiny and are being realized.

[One of the sessions](#) taking place during the Forum’s 2017 gathering included the question of whether global society is moving toward an environment in which privacy becomes a “luxury item” with stark division between the “privacy rich” and the “privacy poor”. But then, someone queried, is it really germane any more? People being raised in the digital age appear not to care about privacy as did those of past eras. Based on behavior, humanity is demonstrating a willingness to trade away privacy for the greater convenience the digital world provides, and this is leading to the prospect (horrifying for some) that privacy may eventually cease to be available no matter how desperately it’s desired.

The key question of the session, proposed by the moderator, was never adequately explored, and indeed seemed to be carefully avoided: *When privacy has disappeared completely and is no longer a consideration, what exactly will have been lost?* The obvious answer to the question was avoided because those present knew the inescapable consequence of the death of privacy: In such a scenario, governmental power would necessarily become absolute, so that any protest by “digital citizens” against governmental overreach, no matter how outrageous, would be quickly discovered and neutralized. For discussants of the Davos session to acknowledge openly that fact would be to delegitimize their own existence.

Governments have interests, above all the protection and extension of their own power, and this inevitably comes up against the interests of citizens. In a digital world in which privacy has been snuffed, Thomas Jefferson’s vision of a society in which each generation has the ability to bring about the kind of revolution that is periodically necessary would be laughable. Complaint would be useless. With nothing to block government’s usurpation of power over its citizenry, “democracy” and “government of, by and for the people” would be nothing but hollow lies, perhaps kept on life support through constant repetition by a

thoroughly corrupted media, as we already have been seeing for quite awhile.

The likes of Tom Paine and Ben Franklyn wouldn't stand a chance in the Reset's totally digital environment. A first hint of discord would be immediately detected by algorithm. To suppress dissent, the authorities might initially [send agents](#) to reeducate the heretics by "cognitive infiltration", as proposed by [Harvard](#) legal monsters Cass Sunstein and Adrian Vermeule [Side note: Sunstein was recently tapped by the [World Health Organization](#) to develop programs to overcome growing "vaccine hesitancy" among the public]. And if non-violent cognitive infiltration is not sufficient, how else might the authorities deal with nonconformists?

In 1968, two of the West's greatest historians published a little tome, The [Lessons of History](#), in which they concluded that

"... the concentration of wealth is natural and inevitable, and is periodically alleviated by violent or peaceable partial redistribution. In this view all economic history is the slow heartbeat of the social organism, a vast systole and diastole of concentrating wealth and compulsive redistribution."

But scratch that bit of wisdom, because the digital world, as the saying goes, "changes everything", and that includes historical patterns. It was, once upon a time, possible for souls defiant against corrupt power to foment rebellion away from authoritarian notice. But the digital world has become one gigantic listening device that is always being refined and extended. Leaving one's country in an attempt to find a safer society is pointless now, because the digital world of the "Reset" is global. There is no longer any safe "away".

You might think it will always be possible to leave "mobile devices" at home, take a walk in the country, strategize in whispers with other malcontents. But invisible walls continue to close in, and if the electronic monetary system now planned becomes one's sole means of obtaining life's essentials via credit card-cum-chip (Government need only cease producing physical money altogether), it will be case closed. The simple act of electronically invalidating cards and [freezing accounts](#) would immediately render any potential dissident defenseless in the world. In such an environment — the one now being maneuvered into place by the WEF's strategists — we, all of us, would find ourselves trapped in an invisible, digital Bastille that is absolutely storm-proof.

*

Note to readers: please click the share buttons above or below. Forward this article to your email lists. Crosspost on your blog site, internet forums. etc.

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Prof. Bill Willers](#), Global Research, 2021

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Prof. Bill Willers](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca