

What We Do Now Will Determine the Future: Throw Away the Masks

By [Miguel Iradier](#)

Global Research, November 27, 2020

Region: [Asia](#), [USA](#)

Theme: [Global Economy](#), [History](#)

First things first, and rather than speculate about what may happen five or ten years from now, we need to look at the present. What is being tested now is to what extent the powerful are able to shape our perception of reality at will, and were we to believe mainstream media, it seems they are getting it.

We can only trust our instinct, and what my instinct tells me is we have to throw away the masks and go on general strike. Act in unison, not in that social distancing that they want to enforce to its last consequences. Everything else is calculated ambiguity, mediocrity and delirium, a worthless attempt to escape from what is happening right now.

This would be truly cathartic, and the crossing of supposedly contradictory gestures would short-circuit power and the ideological divisions that are at its service.

The future will depend on what we do in the present and not the other way around. Today what we observe is general subjection; each mask is the most effective vote for the party of the technocracy, fear and the multiple levers of repression. We will return to this at the end. But it is also necessary to pay attention to the medium and long term and not give a few the additional advantage of being the only ones capable of playing a long game, since they already have too many.

It has almost become commonplace to put populism and technocracy at opposite poles, and so it is on a superficial reading. What is less appreciated is how they participate in the same lie, and this is always the essential thing if one wants to see beyond banana politics.

Everything encompassed under the umbrella term “populism” has the common denominator of claiming to represent “the people” as opposed to an elite; the unitary character of such a people may be a myth, but the overwhelming reality of a tiny kleptocracy is not, which ends up endowing populist claims with undeniable strength and truth.

On the other hand, it is crystal clear that technocracy is at the service of these minute elites and their facilitators, which exposes a myth much more unfounded and false than that of populism: its legitimization in the name of efficiency. Since the aim is to optimize benefits and structural advantages for a minimum percentage of the population, it is absolutely impossible for technicians at the service of power to work for the benefit of general efficiency, but for a very particular efficiency that is not only different but so often in stark contrast to the former.

No technocracy is more consolidated today than that of the central banks whose archetype and keystone is the Federal Reserve System, a mere consortium of private banks with the official blessing of the Government. And it is clear that the Fed does not work for the general

efficiency of the economy —not even that of its own nation- but for the financial interests of global banking with the hegemony of the dollar as instrument.

It is also clear that the economic theory that technocrats force on us is garbage economics at the service of the debt trap, so their alleged technical superiority is simply ridiculous: it is just counter-demagogy at the service of the economic elite.

It is in the interest of this pseudo-elite that everything is, or at least seems, way more complicated than it really is, so that no one but them can be in charge. The best example is the convoluted fractional reserve system, which is ten times more complex than a hundred percent legal money system and incomparably less fair, since it is at the service of and intimately related to the inverted pyramid of inequality.

So-called “right-wing populism” claims to be sovereignist, but today it is impossible to seriously consider sovereignty without a way to guarantee an economic autonomy which begins with monetary independence. In this way any claim to sovereignty is a dead letter from the outset, and national-populism is a neutered cat that is only allowed the mewing, or rather the screaming, of cheap demagogy.

Trump is the textbook example: the base that support Trump is that of the impoverished white worker, but all he offers is more tax breaks for the rich and inconsequential measures against China. His feeble invectives against the Fed are a very small matter because we all know that the consortium has much more weight than the chief executive —he is there to assume quick decisions, distract the attention, and take the hits and the slaps.

Populism could only be something more than demagoguery if it had a place to grasp the question of monetary sovereignty, but this cannot even be posed in the current correlation of forces.

Populism as a “fourth political theory”, whether right or left, is an option neutralized beforehand by the prevailing system as long as it is incapable of proposing monetary sovereignty: it continues to be on the same plane and turns within the same wheel as the rest of the parties and ideologies, each with its own ambiguity and indetermination, each with its own demagoguery.

But is it not also demagogy to raise economic sovereignty when it has been totally hijacked and is impossible to access? Demagogy, it is not; it is a vital and elemental question, but totally beyond the reach of modern democracies. After all, democracy itself has been emptied of real content because the usurpation by private banks of such a fundamental public prerogative has also emptied it of effective power.

Geoeconomics and Geopolitics

Except for China, no country today has monetary sovereignty: certainly not the United States, despite what appearances might suggest. And it is this situation that really determines the hostility of the globalists towards the eastern giant, a hostility that they try to transfer to the masses that support them.

The media does a great job, and so we see the corner shopkeeper complaining about the Chinese next door and his fellows, “who are taking everything,” instead of looking at the bank to whom he pays the mortgage and who happens to be the engine of globalization.

The Empire's hostility towards China will not be tempered, but rather the contrary, since it is an existential threat. And it is here that the wires of geoeconomics and geopolitics will cross.



The Chinese government never had global hegemonic aspirations and would be content with having a voice in international affairs commensurate with its weight. Understandably, the real hegemon is not willing to yield a single portion of its present power. By increasingly harassing China, it is forcing her to defend herself in all spheres —and today attack is an integral part of defense.

The more hostile the West is to the Sinosphere, the deeper her reaction will be. Previously, Western decision-makers believed that these attacks would leave no wounds and would be reversible since the ultimate goal was to assimilate the Chinese economy into global capitalism. Thus, anything that would weaken the dragon would be good for gaining bargaining power and obtaining concessions more easily.

But, reached a certain point, the hostility begins to take on an irreversible character and the rival moves further and further away from the negotiating horizon, even if it never loses sight of it. It is forced to move deeper. And that is the point we are getting to, because, unable to solve their own problems, Democrats and Republicans alike need to blame China to get returns from both the electorate and the deep state.

In the United States, the fallacy of Chinese guilt becomes the only “floating signifier,” the only remaining space left for powerless politicians to the point of pathetic.

But what is a floating signifier in the jumble of lies of the West could end up being a meaningful token for China, and for this very thing that liars cannot meddle with.

There is a much more pressing technological race right now than that of coronavirus vaccines. It is the race for control of the cryptocurrency space, in which China seems to be in the lead.

Digital currency is the ultimate phase of capitalism in the final stage of the liquefaction of money: both a technical culmination and a critical step in the enslavement of the masses and the closure of the system. This step poses a great danger both for those who run it and for those who suffer from it.

It is only natural that in this phase neoliberalism takes a sharp turn towards technocracy and global governance until it is no longer recognizable. But technocracy itself is only a screen to disguise as neutral the unusual power of a plutarchy that also uses the oligarchy to hide.

In previous works we have detected a “double contradiction” at the crossroads of the main monetary decisions. We have seen that there are two basic attitudes of the states with respect to the digital currency, as well as two types of private crypto-currencies, the speculative and corporate cryptos, and the alternative cryptos for all sorts of communities. The latter seem to be a residual option but may tip the balance in the very plausible case of a generalized currency war.

China has no pretensions to monetary hegemony —its currency is still pegged to the dollar—and would be content with some sort of equilibrium; but it is the aggressiveness of those who want to impose the rules that will force her to undertake incursions in the global market even reluctantly, and precisely to preserve the equilibrium.

The coming crypto-currency war can be a great test to find out the truth of monetary theories. The globalist elite wants to impose a “global governance” of the digital currencies so that the subjects have no escape from their system, even if it means the end of the dollar’s hegemony, now replaced by a new design and a new consensus. This is something that Mark Carney, ex of Goldman Sachs and former governor of the Bank of England, put frankly at the Jackson Hole meeting in 2019.

But efforts to reach international agreements may come late and badly, at least with respect to a player as important as China; and if agreements were finally reached, today it could only be at the expense of the US dollar, or more precisely of the people of the United States, which would have to submit to a new international discipline for which their internal market is not even remotely accustomed.

Today the different currencies do not have real autonomy because if they turn their backs to the dollar system, the response, whether financial or military, is almost immediate, as we have seen with relatively modest countries like Iraq or Libya. If the monetary hegemony is transferred to a global crypto-currency, blessed by the Bank for International Settlements, they must be certain that the US army will continue to be at its service, or else the always decisive resource of force will be lost.

On the other hand, if the dollar is abandoned, the Americans will see with painful clarity something they should have seen long before: that the United States has always been an instrument and nobody gave a damn about the people. To speak in such circumstances of betrayal of the American people would be ludicrous; but a new kind of humiliation, of plundering and derision, can still await them if they don’t wake up. Not everyone will accept it.

The question of the transfer of monetary hegemony, which until now had nothing to do with Chinese initiatives, is a very delicate one and reminds us of a blanket too short for the bed—one has to choose between the feet and the head.

American populism is not going to die with Trump, that could represent only the beginning of a somewhat comical but more than understandable struggle for self-determination. The division in American society is deep and has a dual but unique origin: in the external opposition between globalists and isolationists, and in the internal division of the elites themselves.

It may well be the case that global banking will reach an agreement with China to the detriment of the American people, but this would only further fuel populism and neo-

isolationism: one can even imagine soon the vindication of the dollar as a symbol of the lost sovereignty... even if it was through the dollar that sovereignty fled to the Empire.

But on the other hand, a monetary hegemony dissociated from military hegemony and force will never get very far. Add to this the fact that the American stock market bubble is the greatest in history and is yet to pop, and we can begin to imagine the chaos into which the old models and behaviors will be plunged.

Smaller economies and currencies always look for another reference currency to be backed for. After the Last Great Bubble pops, it will be really difficult for the dollar to be the main reserve currency —because the Fed is the Last Great Bubble itself. What is broken, is broken. Hence the urgency to “reinvent” the hegemony by the Great Financial Siphon.

This will make the impending digital yuan, better supported by both a more robust economy and a more solid and balanced state, even more attractive. If the American bullying disappears, the flight to the eastern currency will be much easier —but here we are not only talking about national currencies, but also private crypto-currencies, whether speculative or alternative.

From Chinese dual circulation to the Tao of Judah

Just this fall of 2020 the Communist Party of China has revealed its new five-year strategy of “dual circulation” to reduce dependence on foreign markets and technologies from 2021 to 2025.

It does not take much insight to realize that the dual attitude is a deeply rooted feature of Chinese idiosyncrasy: from yin and yang to the “one China, two systems”, to this brand-new dual circulation that admits more levels of interpretation than what commentators have so far discovered.

One of these levels, and a vital one indeed, would be the imminent new digital currency. Let us remember in passing that our own fractional reserve monetary system is also a dual circulation system, with legal money issued by the central banks, barely a five per cent of it, and endogenous money created out of thin air by bank credit, which is the bulk of the total: the debt-money for which we all work, even if we have never asked for credit in our whole lives.

But the “dual circulation” of the Chinese digital currency would have very different implications. The Chinese government could be extremely restrictive about the use of its crypto-currency in its huge domestic market, while adopting a much more “liberal” approach in foreign markets in order to attract long-awaited capital while harvesting new support and a new kind of soft power.

It sounds very attractive, both to the Chinese government and to a growing sector of the foreign population that feels increasingly destitute, not to mention the flow of capitals that ignores ideologies and is always willing to sell out its mother.

This explains why guys like Carney are stressing once and again that “governance is the core pillar of any form of digital currency” —global governance, of course; because it is not easy to empty the sea with a sieve.

China would in no way want to play hard the card of a dual monetary system unless it is

strongly provoked, that is, as a defensive countermeasure; but this game, which would disrupt the global financial corral, would be easily interpreted as an incursion into someone else's yard or "aggression" in other words. Put another way, if China is winning the economic war, the Western countries will intensify their offensive in the other sectors of the hybrid war, from opinion to military pressure and attempts of destabilization.

It can be assumed then that China will evolve in this arena with great caution and according to the behavior of its rivals, because after all, the official approach to double circulation is to decrease the dependence on foreign markets and to come closer to the Chinese ideal of self-sufficiency, which will never cease to be the ultimate goal of its movements.

The Chinese government would also have an additional reason for concern: the difference in treatment for users of its currency in the domestic and foreign markets could lead to growing discontent at home. It is not easy to harmonize the state-directed economy with navigating the markets, but the Chinese technocracy already know something about it. And they are not alone, because the Fed and the other central banks are familiar with this issue too.

However, this contrasts sharply with the attitude of the Western powers, which still believe they have a special right to rule the world and impose their wills on others. But we should not blame the "West" for what is basically a matter of the plutocracy and its lackeys.

Elite comes from elected, the chosen ones, and it is known that some are more Chosen than others. We have spoken repeatedly of the 80/20 law in the distribution of wealth and its successive powers, and we have also spoken of the x-ray of that x-ray, that informal "law" of 50/50 that affects the share of the booty and the most intimate physiology of accumulation, that special relationship within AngloZionism between leaders in the exercise of violence and deceit.

This share seems insufficient to one of the parties given the notorious advantage they enjoy; the financial elite wants the United States to serve the Empire and not the other way around. The disappearance of the dollar would not at all imply the retreat of the interests of those who manage the Federal Reserve, but its protection against the growing instabilities of the nation and loss of consensus —of which they are the main cause.

This transfer or succession would imply an internecine war that can only be read between the lines, and this conflict is the invisible cause of a social division that is but the ultimate consequence of the projection of power with its control of means and minds.

The transfer of the coercive mechanisms of financial control can leave a vacuum of power and authority that will be favorable to the monetary sovereignty of countries, collectives and peoples, and right now it is impossible to say what will tip the balance, since many of the consequences will be unintended.

China may favor that spring, but so may the United States if it throws off the yoke of empire and creates the first one hundred percent legal tender, as already proposed in the 1933 Chicago Plan. And only in this way they could set a positive example and have the only moral leadership, involuntary, that may be worthwhile.

Social Democrat Roosevelt did a great job for the Fed at the time, which should not be surprising. But it is in the destiny of the United States and of all of us that this

unprecedented option —which will not fail to come up at the critical moment of “change of phase” in the state and reality of money. And this will completely disrupt the props of the political spectrum, which, as we see, can no longer stand.

Today there would no longer be globalism or a will to continue with this project were it not for the weight and power projection of “Jewish” money, which is the only will that continues to give a direction to the multiple divergent interests of the oligarchies. The West itself would be dismembered into a heap of disperse interests without this element of cohesion; there is nothing easier to demonstrate, if the question is the fate and concentration of capital. It is good to understand this, and he who ignores it miss the thread of the plot.

Not even the Jews themselves have exhausted the meaning of this reality, since censorship of public opinion must also have a profound effect on involuntary mechanisms of self-censorship. Only at the very end can instinct attain self-understanding.

Too many confuse loyalty to the West with loyalty to Netflix, and there is a point to it, since the West is above all the imaginary of the descent in search of its unfathomable bottom.

As the couplet goes, *‘cause the Tao of Judah, neither is tao nor is not nah*, the anonymous poet complaining that the sharp-edged rigor of the Law has little to do with the harmonious roundness of reciprocity. But surely our coplero, whether Benjamin of Tudela or not, had an understandable bias that prevented him from seeing the issue more objectively.

Because yes, there is a Tao of Judah; and it is true that it does not have to do directly with the Law, but with its reversal: we are talking about the dialectic between the Jews and the Goyim —the nations and their peoples. The “tao of Judah” is literally the winding road and tortuous way of the Law among the nations.

Jewish scriptures continuously emphasize the outstanding status of Israel over all peoples and nations; China, on the contrary, was the popular civilization par excellence long before the People’s Republic, since there the ideal is not to stand out. The Tao of Judah seeks the extremes with full intention, turning everything into gold included, while the Chinese people, in their instinctive search for the invariable medium, aspire to the golden mean or *aurea mediocritas* by carefully avoiding the extremes.

So the archetype of the Jew and the Chinese are like the scorpion and the frog of the fable: one is always looking for soft parts to nail the sting to the heart, while the other, all defensive instinct, is always ready to avoid it.

Of course, we are talking of a big frog. And if we are dealing with how the digital liquefaction of money is going to affect the balance and legitimacy of nations —water and earth, after all- it is not hard to spot a curious fight between Behemoth and Leviathan. And in our upside-down world, the earth has to use the liquid element of money to defend itself, while the plutarchs who accumulate the bulk of the wealth seek to poison all the levers of politics to prevent it.

Those who like enigmas may wonder where the Ziz is today —that mysterious creature of the air capable of covering the Sun with its wings.

To avoid being fried in the pan, China would have to combine the three mythical creatures into a single entity: a full-fledged Dragon with brand new claws.

Israel's extremely close ties with the national-populist movements are telling: from Trump to Bolsonaro, Johnson, or the European populist parties. It is as much about controlling their movements as it is about ensuring that their leaders are unpresentable enough to discredit their most legitimate claims. And so far they are having great success, because even if they win, and especially if they win, the expectations about a real sovereignty wear down more and more —especially when they have control of the media and can round out the caricature of these already cartoonish characters.

The current national-populist leader appeals on the one hand to healthy instincts against globalization, while on the other appeals to the most dull and stupid selfishness. Lacking real power, he is a movie loser doomed to ridicule.

The only game changer here would be the new (digital) monetary balance. If sovereignty is able to regain control of money for nations and do so successfully, the myth of the efficient technocracy would be forever discredited.

But this requires not only a window of opportunity, but also another sense of goodness and justice. There should be much more coherence and integrity in speaking about the common good and the ways to achieve it.

There is the erotics of power and there is the necrotics: but now they are barely distinguishable for both politicians and technocrats. The true erotics of power is being able to awaken in the people the desire for good, and the present national-populist has no idea what that might be. If he gets so many votes today, it is only because many people know what they hate. Adherence by negative reaction is already guaranteed by the system; the question is if there is a real offer beyond demagoguery.

Given the nature of the forces at play, the time to rise this question will come.

Saying no

In the coming monetary war we can distinguish three axes: the horizontal axis, linked to the most purely commercial, civil and liquidity factors, the vertical axis, to the political-legal environment of the states and the agreements between states, and a temporal axis in depth encoding the scope of the reversibility and irreversibility of the debt, and of the uses and changes in monetary technology.

As we have already said elsewhere, this third axis is as important or more than the other two, and it is present in all orders and not only in the economy. In fact, it defines the extremes of our sense of temporality, and maybe one day analysts will understand its relevance. Today it is beyond their estimations, and even their ideas, which makes it even more interesting.

The things now being discussed are at a very different level; issues such as basic income, which, by the way, will be one of the star products to gain the assent of the debt-serf without costing the elites a penny. The same people responsible for all this situation have to present themselves as saviors; what less not to end up hanged.

And this brings us back to the beginning of our article, and how to respond to those who care so much about saving us. And for this we do not need to ponder or analyze; we only need to have guts.

They say fear is free but nothing is further from truth. Surely those who seek to frighten us 24/7 are trying to free us.

Many people who often talk about the Revolution and taking over the Winter Palace not only put on their masks but also launch diatribes against the “deniers”. It is well known that “fascism” must be fought —but operetta fascism, not the real thing we know so well. Perhaps, by attacking this paper fascism they believe they have fulfilled their political consciousness, a truly revolutionary one. They are the necessary counterpart of all those who say that the Democratic Party is communist.

I am not going to tell anyone what to do, but there is no need to wait for the revolution, or the taking of the Winter Palace, or anything like that. If you wanted a chance to do something against this system, to make a real gesture for once, the time has long since come. It never will be easier for you, because you don’t even have to start by doing something, but simply decide *not* to do it.

Not to wear a mask. Not to close your business. Not to submit to disgusting and unnecessary tests. Not to be vaccinated with completely experimental and unnatural vaccines. Not letting them muzzle you or inserting icky sticks and needles in your body, you insert them something bigger by the best place possible, without no need to stain yourself with their shit.

It is way better to die alone than suffer their special treatments, because anything is better than owing them your life. Show yourself you don’t depend on them. If there is a time to prove it, this is it.

You don’t need to be their guinea pig, let them graciously experiment in their own flesh —this are the only experiments worthwhile. You don’t need to back up with actions what you don’t believe in. If you stop doing and consuming certain things, you will soon find room to do and assimilate others; if you stop giving in to the all-pervasive pressure to isolate yourself, you will soon find unexpected companions, because you will also be busy looking for them.

Whatever happens, in spite of everything and with all our actions included, I am convinced that this is always the least bad of the infinite possible worlds; but no one can imagine how the others might be. We have enough with just one.

*

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 author writes on his blog site where [this article](#) was originally published.

Featured image is from the author

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Miguel Iradier](#), Global Research, 2020

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Miguel Iradier](#)

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