

Was the Tucker “Take Down” a Deep-State Hit?

By [Mike Whitney](#)

Global Research, May 05, 2023

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Law and Justice](#), [Media Disinformation](#)

All Global Research articles can be read in 51 languages by activating the Translate Website button below the author’s name.

To receive Global Research’s Daily Newsletter (selected articles), [click here](#).

Click the share button above to email/forward this article to your friends and colleagues. Follow us on [Instagram](#) and [Twitter](#) and subscribe to our [Telegram Channel](#). Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

“When honest people say what’s true ... they become powerful.... That’s the iron-law of the universe, the truth prevails.” — Tucker Carlson

Can we stop pretending that Tucker Carlson was fired because of the Dominion lawsuit? That’s a bunch of baloney.

Carlson was fired because he used his prime-time platform to expose the crimes and illicit goings-on of the most powerful men, corporations and agencies in the world. That’s why he was fired, because he revealed the truth about big pharma’s toxic injections, Fauci’s deranged lockdowns, Brandon’s police-state surveillance, the expansive deep-state censorship program, CRT, BLM, ESG, George Floyd, drag-queen children’s hour, the oddball cult of transgenderism, Ukraine’s crummy dictator-president Zelensky and all the other pernicious inanities that are being used like a wrecking-ball on the nation’s moral and historical foundation. Tucker exposed them all.

That’s why he was fired. It had nothing to do lawsuits or disgruntled employees whining about a “toxic work environment”. Nor did it have anything to do with ratings or money. This was a carefully-calculated, narrowly-supported targeted assassination of the man—who more than any other—had become a problem for the reprobate Mafia that runs the country and who is determined to silence or annihilate anyone who speaks out against them.

PROPAGANDISTS



So don't be duped by articles in the MSM. They are there to misdirect and confuse, not to inform. Have confidence in what you've seen with your own eyes and know to be true. Tucker Carlson was a victim of a system that no longer tolerates free speech, even-handed criticism or any divergence from the official narrative. Who doesn't know this already?

How many readers remember the night that Tucker ran a segment on the JFK assassination? Here's a short recap from an excellent article by Lew Rockwell:

In a remarkable television broadcast on December 15, 2022, Tucker Carlson made an explosive charge. He pointed out that, contrary to law, the White House was refusing to release thousands of pages of documents about the assassination of John F. Kennedy on November 22, 1963. **Carlson said that these documents proved CIA involvement in the assassination** and that someone within the government who had looked at these documents made a direct statement to this effect.

.... We spoke to someone who had access to these still hidden CIA documents, a person who was deeply familiar with what they contained. We asked this person directly, **'Did the CIA have a hand in the murder of John F. Kennedy, an American President?' And here's the reply we received verbatim. Quote, 'The answer is yes. I believe they were involved.** It's a whole different country from what we thought it was. It's all fake.' ["Why Tucker Carlson had to be Purged"](#), Lew Rockwell

So, after 60 years, someone finally had the courage to tell the truth on national television. That's shocking.

But how many people who saw that segment reacted the same way that I did? How many people said to themselves, **"They're not going to allow this to continue, they're not going to let Carlson expose their crimes to the world. No way. Whatever it takes, they're going to shut this guy up."**

And that's what they've done, they've shut him up.

There are things you can't say in America, and that is one of them. **You cannot say the CIA killed John Kennedy even though the majority of people know that it's true.** Because it doesn't matter if it's true. Just like it doesn't matter that it took place 60 years ago. You still can't say it, because the people who own the media—and who sit on the boards of all the other global corporations—don't like it when you criticize the organization that does their dirty work. They won't allow that.

This is the lesson of Julian Assange, which is: Do not reveal the crimes of elites and—if you do—you're going to be crushed. Assange violated that rule and now faces a lifetime in solitary confinement. They've not only ruined his life, they've also trotted him out in front of the world media to make an example of him. And the message they're trying to send is this: "Mess with us and we will fu** you over." That is the message.

Now it's on to Tucker who is even more widely reviled for his nightly attacks on the same group of powerbrokers. What do you think they have in store for him?

It's hard to say, but they're not going to pull their punches, that much is certain.



Jimmy Dore @jimmy_dore · 1m

...

No one else in all of Corporate news ever brings on anti-war voices, the one that did just got axed. Doesn't matter that he's the most watched show in all of news - much like when MSNBC fired Phil Donohue for his anti-Iraq War coverage when he had #1 show on network. #WarMachine

It's worth noting that, by some accounts, Carlson was not explicitly fired. Did you know that?

According to former Fox host Megyn Kelly, Carlson is not free to negotiate with other potential employers because he's still technically under contract with Fox. Check out this blurb from Red State website:

There's a report from 19FortyFive from John Rossamondo that Tucker **Carlson texted them, "I'm still employed by Fox,"** that he had not been fired. Now, we're not seeing anyone else reporting on that, so we relate that report with that proviso. That report does, however, fit with what Kelly said. 19FortyFive also said **Carlson did not explain the reasoning for the parting of ways,** just as Kelly said.

If this is all true, then, as Kelly says, Fox needs to let Carlson out of the contract as soon as possible, so his voice is freed to get about doing his job. But for the moment, it's concerning, if it means he's stopped from pursuing other opportunities and is effectively silenced." (["Megyn Kelly Drops Important Info About Tucker Departure, Blog Reports Text From Tucker"](#), Red State)

What Kelly seems to ignore is that "silencing" Carlson was the primary objective from the get-go. The fact that he is still under contract simply makes it easier for his enemies to control and censor him. Many readers have noticed that Carlson has not posted another video on his Twitter account since last week's 2-minute blockbuster that raked in over 70 million views. That probably means that he's been advised by his attorney that anything he produces will be construed as a violation of his contract with Fox. In other words, **keeping Tucker on the payroll may be the most effective way to shut him up** which is precisely what they want.

On an entirely different topic: There seems to be widespread agreement that Rupert Murdoch was directly involved in Carlson's removal.

But—in my opinion—that seems very unlikely. Murdoch probably knew that the fallout from Carlson's termination would be devastating for both ratings and the Fox brand. That's why he (probably) avoided the decision for as long as possible. But try to imagine the enormous pressure he must have been under from his fellow oligarchs as well as the numerous deep-

state agencies that have coalesced into—what Matt Taibbi calls—the “Censorship-Industrial Complex”.

The billionaire globalists and their government assets despise Carlson and see his rational, laser-sharp analysis as a grave threat to their broader societal project. That is why they descended on Murdoch like a barrage of heat-seeking missiles forcing the dithering mogul to eventually throw in the towel. Once again—this is just my opinion—but I think it is much more likely that Murdoch “caved in” rather than threw his prime-time superstar under the bus.



There’s also another development that preceded the Tucker incident that might have had some bearing on the final outcome, that is, the giant private equity corporation Blackrock bought a sizable chunk of Fox just two months before Carlson was given his pink-slip. Here’s the scoop from an article at Nasdaq:

Fintel reports that BlackRock has filed a 13G/A form with the SEC disclosing ownership of 45.74MM shares of Fox Corporation, Class A (FOXA). This represents 15.1% of the company.

In their previous filing dated January 27, 2022 they reported 39.87MM shares and 12.40% of the company, an increase in shares of 14.75% and an increase in total ownership of 2.70% (calculated as current – previous percent ownership). [BlackRock Increases Position in Fox Corporation](#), Nasdaq

Let me see if I got this straight: **‘Liberal-leaning’ PE goliath Blackrock buys a 15% share of uber-conservative Fox News in early February, and 3 months later the network’s brightest star is given his “walking papers”.** Doesn’t that sound a bit suspicious?

Indeed, it does. Check out this short clip from an article by analyst Tom Loungo who helps to clarify what’s going on:


This is symptomatic of **Blackrock’s use of proxy to get what they want. Larry Fink, BLK CEO, is notorious for his antics in forcing heads of state and CEO’s to do his bidding while hiding behind the smokescreen** of ‘I’m just a guy investing your hard-earned capital on your behalf for the good of humanity.’

Now, this is some prime Grade AA Bullshit.

Blackrock is Davos’ main arm-twisting subsidiary in the C-Suites of the S&P 500 as well as the Euro STOXXX 50 (link will need translation from German). He may as well change his first name to Don but there are some ethnic issues with this outside of

Queens.” [“Tucker, Blackrock and the SIFI Two-Step”,](#) Lew Rockwell)

I think Luongo is on to something here. Blackrock’s stake in Fox might have nothing to do with Fox’s prospects for future profits. Instead, it might be a straightforward power-play aimed at eliminating America’s most persuasive critic of big pharma, corporate malfeasance and the tyrannical globalist agenda. At the very least, the proximity of Blackrock’s purchase should prompt a thorough investigation of the possible link between the giant Wall Street monoliths and outspoken critics of the system. But while an independent probe is certainly warranted, I’m not holding my breath.



It’s not possible to understand what happened to Tucker Carlson without having some knowledge of the way things actually work. Fortunately, journalist Matt Taibbi has explained much of what is going on now through his work on the Twitter Files which shows how the concentration of wealth and influence has spawned an expansive information matrix that threatens to quash free speech while strengthening the power of the billionaire elites. Here’s a short excerpt from a piece by Taibbi:

....the story of the #TwitterFiles.... is “really the story of the collapse of public trust in experts and institutions, and how those experts struck back, by trying to pool their remaining influence into a political monopoly.”....

#TwitterFiles reporters like Michael Shellenberger, and myself didn’t have much of a

hint of what we were looking at until later in the project. That larger story was about **a new type of political control mechanism** that didn't really exist ten years ago. In preparation for testimony before the House in March, Shellenberger gave it a name: **the Censorship-Industrial Complex**....

We didn't understand at the time, but the third, fourth, and fifth installments of the #TwitterFiles... served as an introduction for all of us to **the major components of a vast new public-private speech bureaucracy**, one that appeared to have been founded in the United States, but was clearly global in scope.... **a censorship industrial complex** that...

Combines established methods of psychological manipulation... with highly sophisticated tools from computer science, including artificial intelligence. The complex's leaders are driven by the fear that the Internet and social media platforms empower populist, alternative, and fringe personalities and views, which they regard as destabilizing....

The core concept is too much democracy and freedom leads to mischief, and since the desire for these things can't be stamped out all at once but instead must be squashed in every person over and over and endlessly, the job requires a massive investment, and a gigantic bureaucracy to match." ["Report on the Censorship-Industrial Complex](#), Matt Taibbi, Racket News

Bottom line: The merging of public and private power has already taken place and is expressed in the removal of any and all critics of the newly-minted system. In short, Tucker was not fired by Fox News management but by the new speech-policing behemoth that descended on Murdoch like a swarm of hornets coercing him to make a choice that he probably would not have made otherwise.

A similar point is made by Patrick Lawrence in his recent review of Jacob Seigel's [A Guide to Understanding the Hoax of the Century](#) Here's an excerpt from the author's piece:

In his last days in office, President Barack Obama made the decision to set the country on a new course"...(In) 2016, he signed into law the Countering Foreign Propaganda and Disinformation Act, which used the language of defending the homeland to launch an open-ended, offensive information war.".....

This was to be not merely a "whole-of-government" undertaking: It was "whole-of-society," meaning **all lines between the public and private sectors would be erased and control of the hearts and minds of every American was made the objective.**

Now we can understand how easily our public institutions enlisted in this good cause. These included Big Tech and the national security apparatus, of course, as well as law enforcement — the Justice Department and the Federal Bureau of Investigation—the think tanks, the universities, the NGOs, and media. "The American press," (Jacob) Siegel writes, "was hollowed out to the point that it could be worn like a hand puppet by the U.S. security agencies and party operatives."

There were also various self-proclaimed guardians of "internet freedom,"

whose shared objective was to suppress all forms of dissent by making sure no such thing survived their efforts.....

“Something monstrous is taking shape in America,” Siegel writes....

“What is coming into being is a new form of government and social organization that is as different from mid-20th century liberal democracy as the early American republic was from the British monarchism that it grew out of and eventually supplanted. A state organized on the principle that it exists to protect the sovereign rights of individuals, is being **replaced by a digital leviathan that wields power through opaque algorithms and the manipulation of digital swarms.** It resembles the Chinese system of social credit and **one-party state control**, and yet that, too, misses the distinctively American and providential character of the control system.” [The Most Powerful Demolition of Russiagate Yet](#)”, Patrick Lawrence, Consortium News

How do these excerpts help us to understand what happened to Tucker Carlson?

If Carlson was fired by Murdoch for his alleged involvement in the Dominion settlement, that is entirely different then if he was the victim of **an emerging speech-policing bureaucracy that is deeply entrenched in the government and which seeks to arbitrarily limit what opinions are permissible and not permissible.** If the latter is true, then we can assume that Carlson’s termination has broader meaning for everyone living in the United States today. What it means is that **a sprawling new system has been secretly assembled within the state that is explicitly designed to end free speech as we know it and extinguish the last glimmer of personal liberty in America.**

That’s why we need to know what people or organizations were behind the firing of Tucker Carlson.

*

Note to readers: Please click the share button above. Follow us on Instagram and Twitter and subscribe to our Telegram Channel. Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

This article was originally published on [The Unz Review](#).

Michael Whitney is a renowned geopolitical and social analyst based in Washington State. He initiated his career as an independent citizen-journalist in 2002 with a commitment to honest journalism, social justice and World peace.

He is a Research Associate of the Centre for Research on Globalization (CRG).

All images in this article are from TUR

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Mike Whitney](#), Global Research, 2023

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

[**Become a Member of Global Research**](#)

Articles by: [Mike Whitney](#)

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