

08/30.2025

The Government You Elected Isn't in Charge

Interview with Iain Davis on How Global Policy Bypasses Democracy Through Banks, Think Tanks, and Digital Control

In late 2021, as millions grappled with synchronized global lockdowns and vaccine passports, Iain Davis's work on "the global commons" cut through the confusion. His analysis revealed how the planet's resources were being restructured under cover of a health emergency – insights that became central to my essay in Nov 2021, "Is This a War?", which argued we were witnessing not a pandemic response but a territorial conflict between state and citizen. For those wondering why every country followed the same script, Davis provided the blueprint.

What distinguishes Davis is his ability to connect dots spanning decades and continents. His chart mapping the Bank for International Settlements atop global financial power remains the clearest illustration of how banking authority becomes policy that governs nations. While others chase individual villains, Davis reveals the interlocking directorate of think tanks, NGOs, and supranational bodies that reduce sovereign governments to administrative units. His background – a social care worker who retrained as a journalist after redundancy – brings working-class clarity to elite power structures.

This conversation ranges from his evidence that no bomb exploded at Manchester Arena to his warning that digital ID represents "a Rubicon we cannot cross." He explains how CBDCs will enable money that can be switched off for dissidents, how the Trilateral Commission lends leaders to national governments, and why the Great Replacement is fundamentally about replacing humans with technology, not immigration. His account of the Richard D. Hall trial – where a journalist was found guilty of "harassment by publication" for questioning an official narrative – shows how investigative journalism itself is being criminalized.

For those who discovered Davis during the pandemic, his work provided essential understanding: empire and oligarchy as functioning systems with specific mechanisms and identifiable players. His documentation of how policy flows from think tanks through supranational bodies to national governments, bypassing democracy entirely, explains why voting changes so little. As he notes here, we're witnessing "a complete abandonment of the Western democratic

system." In an information landscape saturated with propaganda and unfocused opposition, Davis offers something rare: careful documentation, specific evidence, and a framework for understanding how disparate policies form a system of control that transcends borders.

With thanks to Iain Davis.

1. Iain, you've built quite a reputation challenging official narratives through independent investigation. What initially sparked your interest in digging deeper into events that most people accept at face value?

Well, I think it started for me as a child. I've always been interested in history and geopolitics, and my work life didn't take me in that direction. I worked in social care, mainly in substance misuse services.

That was a kind of disconnect from my amateur interest, if you like. But then, the book that really struck me, that made me start to question things even more deeply – I would say prior to reading this, I'd always been politically of the left, and I'd been quite politically active. I was a union steward and that kind of thing.

I read Brzezinski's *The Grand Chessboard* when I was probably in my early 30s. So that's quite some time ago now. And it struck me that there really were people on this earth who consider populations and nation-states to be little more than pieces in a grand game that they were playing.

So then, from that, you start looking at ideas going back further in history, and I started looking at things like the Rhodes-Milner Group, and the ideas of Mackinder and people like that. And that's what got me going.

It struck me that these are not topics that are commonly discussed anywhere. They're not commonly discussed. So then I thought, well, hang on, that's a lot of historically verifiable information that nobody talks about, that nobody knows anything about. And that's what got me interested in the topic.

2. Your work spans everything from financial systems to false flag operations. How did your investigative journey evolve from your earlier career to becoming a full-time independent researcher and author?

Well, as I said, I'd already got this interest. I was approaching it from very much a left-of-center perspective. My concerns are about equality of opportunity and so forth. These are things that have always interested me, and why we don't have that.

But then when I was made redundant again – because in the private sector, you work from contract to contract. I would say that my time working with the client group was about a year out of any three, because the other two years, I was either putting the package together or writing bids for the subsequent renewal of the package. And if you lose the bid, you lose the contract, you're unemployed.

So I consequently thought, well, I'd already started writing the blog as a matter of interest, which my original blog was called In This Together. And then I thought, well, is it possible for me to do this on a professional basis? I didn't know whether it was or it wasn't. And then I retrained as a journalist, I did a vocational qualification as a journalist, just to get some sort of idea about journalism.

And then started writing more, and was very fortunate that I was picked up by some bigger outlets that started sharing my work. In the UK, we've got an outlet called UK Column. They started picking up my work and sharing it. And then that led to other bigger outlets sharing my work.

I do think I was, in a sense, quite fortunate. I'm not sure that that would happen if I was doing it now. If I started now. Because there is so much content online that on other platforms, for example, Substack. I'm not sure that you would be noticed, because when I started writing, it was just blogs, really, for independent journalists.

I started doing it more in earnest around 2010. I probably started doing it full-time about 2015 or something like that, so good, you know, 10 years ago or more. And those things like Substack and Steemit weren't so prevalent. So I would say it was less competitive then, so I was fortunate in that sense, I think.

3. In your book about the Manchester Arena attack, you present evidence that there was no bomb. For readers unfamiliar with this case, what single piece of evidence would you say most clearly contradicts the official story?

Yeah, so the Manchester Arena bombing happened on the 22nd of May, 2017. It was a bomb that went off in the foyer of the Manchester Arena, a place called the City Room, and it purportedly killed 22 people that were going to an Ariana Grande concert. The bomber was identified as an Islamist extremist called Salman Abedi, and that was the narrative that was put out.

The key piece of evidence, or one of the strongest pieces, is a piece of footage called the Barr footage,

which is a 43-second long piece of footage that was taken by a man called John Barr of the bomb scene. So John Barr was in the City Room and filmed the bomb scene.

This is unusual for a terror event, I would suggest, where we've got such direct footage of the bomb scene, and it isn't something that most people would ever want to look at. But that came out on the day of the bombing, or certainly within the first 48 hours.

And it was quite clear by looking at the footage that things didn't add up. Because if we consider what observable physical evidence is – if we can be certain, and I think we can with the Barr footage, that it hasn't been manipulated in any way – there's no evidence that a bomb... We're told that a very large shrapnel bomb exploded in a crowd of people in an enclosed space. And there's no evidence of that in the Barr footage.

That is the primary piece of physical, observable physical evidence that we've got that we can say strongly indicates that there was no bomb. There's simply no observable physical evidence of a bomb having just exploded in a crowd of people. There isn't any. So that's quite important, I would suggest.

[Follow-up] I assume there's no question that some people died, or is there a question mark on that also?

Well, I think the thing is, I would say that we don't know what happened to the people that allegedly died. Now, obviously, the official account is that they were killed by a bomb. But if there's no evidence of a bomb, which there isn't, what happened to them?

And I think this is the key point. I don't know what happened to those people. They could well have died, but the evidence shows that they were not killed by a bomb in that room at that time. Because there's no evidence of a bomb.

What happened to them, who knows? But I don't think it's necessary to speculate about what may have happened to them or not. It is only necessary that we point to the evidence which shows there was no bomb and ask those that peddle the official account, including the government, to account for that evidence, to explain it.

Because you would have thought, at the official Saunders inquiry, which was the official inquiry into the bombing, that video footage of the bomb scene would have been pretty important evidence to include in the inquiry. Not included. Excluded from the inquiry. The man who filmed it was not asked to give

any evidence at the inquiry.

Now, why not? If the purpose of the inquiry is to ascertain what happened, then why wasn't the primary observable physical evidence showing what happened not included in the inquiry? In fact, deliberately excluded from the inquiry.

4. You've written extensively about Central Bank Digital Currencies being "the endgame." Can you explain in simple terms why CBDCs represent such a fundamental threat compared to the digital banking we already use?

Yeah. So in a nutshell, digital currency and central bank digital currency – there are also things like stablecoins, which are being promoted at the moment in the US and globally – are programmable. It's programmable money.

We are accustomed to using digital money in terms of using our cards, but that is ultimately not programmable. The money itself is not programmable. The transactions resolve in fiat currency, whatever currency – if you spend dollars, or pounds, or whatever currency you use.

Central bank digital currency is a different form of money. It's still a fiat form of money, but it's an entirely electronic form of money, and it is programmable.

So in order to use something like this programmable money, we will have to, what they call, onboard the system, whatever the system is, that we need in order to access the money, which means that our digital ID will be tied to our digital currency. But the currency is programmable.

Now, currently, if he wanted to punish somebody for supporting the truckers protest in Canada, for example, you need to go through – enact, as the Canadian government did, enact an Emergency Civil Contingencies Act. Go through a kind of perfunctory, but nonetheless supposed court procedure, and impose restrictions on people.

In the future, with digital currency, such as central bank digital currency, that won't be necessary, because you can disable the money. So if I want to support the truckers protests, for example, I won't be able to, because my money will digitally not work. I won't be able to support that cause, I won't be able to buy that product. I won't be able to spend my money. I don't have control over it anymore. It is now controlled by a third party, which is an absolute game changer in terms of not only our relationship with money, but our relationship with authority.

Because now authority can just precisely control whatever we spend our money on. So all our economic activity, all our trade activity is surveilled, monitored, checked, and controlled by a third party.

5. The concept of "Technocracy" features heavily in your work. How would you describe this system to someone who's never heard the term, and why should everyday people be concerned about it?

Well, people should be concerned about it because it is rolling out everywhere. We've just spoken about digital currency and the effect of digital currency, which would be very much in keeping with the model of technocracy that was originally proposed in the 1930s by a group called Technocracy Inc, led by a guy called Howard Scott.

But it's a total and comprehensive centralized social behavioral control system. And it works by controlling the monetary system and all economic activity, and centralizing the distribution of all resources. So if you can control exactly what we've just been talking about – how someone spends their money, or what they spend it on, and you also control their access to any and all resources, such as energy – then you really do have total control of their lives.

Now, one of the things that people think technocracy is, if they've got any awareness of it at all, is a government led by a quasi-kind of government led by experts. So we saw that during COVID, where you got people like Anthony Fauci standing up and are seen by the population to be experts who are effectively controlling policy. Governments around the world were saying, "We are led by the science," suggesting that the scientific experts are controlling the policy.

Now, that is one aspect of technocracy, but that is not the most important aspect of it, because it is this overarching, all-pervasive, centralized control system, behavioral control system. And that is pretty much what is being constructed at the moment. Once you understand what technocracy is, it is pretty obvious that that is what is being installed globally. That's what we are seeing roll out at the moment. That's what all this digital surveillance and digital control is leading us to.

Because another important point is that when technocracy was first envisaged back in the 1930s, it wasn't a practical proposition. The bureaucratic system they were suggesting was unfeasible. Half of the country would have to have been part of the bureaucracy in order to manage it. It couldn't have been done. But modern technology – things like

decentralized finance, and financial technology, and AI – you bring all these things together, and technocracy is now eminently achievable.

From a technological perspective, it's pretty easy to achieve. Their problem is getting us to accept it, and that's where the kind of narrative control comes in, leading us towards accepting this kind of technocratic control system.

6. You've highlighted Keir Starmer's connections to the Trilateral Commission. What exactly is this organization, and why does membership matter when evaluating political leaders?

Well, it's a global policy think tank comprised of, they would say, policy makers, political leaders, and business people, bankers, and so forth.

The way that policy functions often around the world is that the policy think tanks suggest policy initiatives, and the policy initiatives then filter down through, often through centralized bodies like the United Nations. The policy then goes down through central government. Government then disseminates that policy to local authorities and local government, and that's how we get the impact of policy from a global perspective, from a centralized point.

So this is a global organization, the Trilateral Commission, that promotes the idea of splitting the world into regions. And it suggests that each of those regions should be managed as a kind of cohesive region. So you've got the North American region, the Eurasian region, and the South Pacific and the Pacific region.

So that's multipolarity, which is a kind of change in the way that the bureaucratic global governance system works. But they also advocate things like stakeholder capitalism. So stakeholder capitalism is an idea that was presented by Klaus Schwab in the 1970s, which suggests that global corporations, or multinational corporations, should be, quote-unquote, the trustees of society.

The Trilateral Commission calls that Capitalism 3.0, or 4.0, or 5.0, I can't remember which. But basically, stakeholder capitalism, suggesting that corporations should effectively make policy decisions.

Now, Keir Starmer is supposedly a non-serving member of the Trilateral Commission. But when you look at the history of Trilateral Commission membership, what happens is that a member of the Trilateral Commission who's in office – so in this case, the British Prime Minister – is temporarily listed as a former member in public service. So there's this

meaningless relisting as someone as a former member in public service. They're still listed as a member. But then, after a couple of years after they've finished in office, they're just quietly reinserted into the main membership list. They don't actually leave.

So we've got Larry Fink, who's the head of BlackRock, who's also currently the interim co-chair of the World Economic Forum, who is a trilateralist, he's a leading member of the Trilateral Commission. And he recently, and Keir Starmer, agreed a public-private partnership in the UK for BlackRock to take an 80% major shareholding in what are called free ports in the UK.

So that is a decision that was made by the government, but actually, we've got a situation where Keir Starmer, who in 2023 was asked who he would rather talk to, the World Economic Forum or the British Parliament, and he said in an instant, in a flash, he'd rather talk to Davos because he can envisage himself working with these people.

Well, he is working with them now. He's working with Larry Fink from BlackRock and the World Economic Forum, who's a Trilateral Commission member, as evidently, so is Keir Starmer. So this is a centralized authoritarian think tank with people we can identify as members of that think tank working collaboratively at the very top of government to roll out significant socio-economic and socio-political policies.

So that's got nothing to do with the will of the people. That's about, I would argue, central oligarch control.

7. In your analysis of "representative democracy," you argue it's actually the opposite of real democracy. What would genuine democracy look like in practice?

Well, if we go back to the Athenian Republic and the original development of democracy as an idea, the original proposal was by someone called Cleisthenes, I think it was 570 to 508 BC, or 507 BC, who proposed an idea he called isonomia, which meant equality under the law. And he is called the father of democracy.

So the system that Cleisthenes proposed was that what we today would call the separation of powers – so you've got the executive, i.e., the government, the legislator, in the UK we call that parliament, and then the judicial branch, the courts – instead of electing representatives to those, they are each formed by what he would call a sortition of the people.

So the executive, the government, would be formed by a random sortition of the population, a random

group of people who would deliberate on legislation, or who would formulate legislation. They would pass that to the legislator, which was again formed by a different random selection of the people, who would decide on whether the legislation would be enacted or not.

And if they did enact the legislation, that quote-unquote law would then be tested in courts across the land, jury-led courts, and genuinely jury-led courts. The judge is not there in the court to direct the jury. It's the other way around. The jury is there to direct the judge. The jury tells the judge what to do, not the other way around.

And every single one of those courts, which Cleisthenes called the Dicasteria, would have the power to annul any and all legislation. So any law where the accused was found technically guilty of breaking that law, the only concern of the jury would be to establish whether or not the accused was quote-unquote guilty.

And guilt would only be established if the jury was unanimously convinced that the accused acted with a guilty mind, *mens rea*. And the point being that the accused knew, or ought to have known, that what they were doing was causing real material harm or loss to another.

Now, if the court was satisfied with that, they would find them guilty. But if they weren't, but nonetheless the person technically broke the law, the jury would find that law at fault, because clearly there's something wrong with the law. If a law punishes an innocent person, then there's a problem with the law.

So they would find the law at fault and annul it. And this is really important for Cleisthenes' model of isonomia, which is democratia. Any court, anywhere in the land could annul the legislation.

So if that happened, the legislation would then go back to a different body, because the executive would be formed by a random sortition of the people on a temporary basis. So by the time a law is annulled and sent back to the executive for reconsideration, and the legislator for reconsideration, now a different group of people, randomly selected from the population, are considering that.

So this genuinely really is government of the people, for the people, and by the people. The people really are in charge.

Representative democracy is the antithesis of that. Because in a democracy, each one of us has to exercise our democratic responsibility. We are each

empowered by the system, in a real democracy, to exercise that. We don't give it away to somebody else. We have to take that responsibility.

In a representative democracy, you cede all of that sovereignty and all of that authority to someone else, who then rules your life, until the next time you choose someone else to rule your life. That is the complete antithesis of democracy.

8. You discuss how the "Great Replacement" narrative is weaponized by both extremes of the political spectrum. How does this distraction serve the interests of what you call the "oligarch class"?

Well, it's classic divide and rule. We've just been talking about how power is centralized. An oligarch is simply someone with political authority. A guy called David Rothkopf, who was a Council on Foreign Relations kind of insider, estimated there are about 6,000 oligarchs in the world. And he called them the superclass. Basically, they're people that he described as with the ability to move millions across borders, and by millions, he meant people and resources, not just money.

So the problem is that we don't focus on how that power system operates. We focus on animosities between each other – between the left and the right, black and white, gay and straight, men and women. We focus on all these kind of divisions, which is great for oligarchs.

Now, the Great Replacement Theory that started with a guy called Renaud Camus isn't necessarily about replacing us with other people, although it could be. So at one end of the political spectrum, and probably Renaud Camus himself would probably have acknowledged that this sprung from his work, we've got identitarianism, or ethnoculturalism, which focuses on the homogeneity of the British white working class, or the homogeneity of British white people versus British black people, or Australian white people versus Australian black people, that they've got their own ethnocentric culture, which they have a right to defend. That's what identitarianism is.

But identity politics, which is the other end of that spectrum, says that structural inequality happens because people are oppressed based on their characteristics. They're oppressed because they're black, they're oppressed because they're gay, they're oppressed because they're trans, or whatever. So these two ideas clash. So we've got ethno-cultural identitarianism at the right end of the political Great Replacement Theory spectrum, and what we might call identity politics at the left end.

So this is a great way for dividing people. It's the left versus right paradigm, which keeps us embroiled in bitter disputes, which serve absolutely no purpose whatsoever, while the oligarch class, or the parasite class, as I might call them, just carry on with business. They just carry on doing business as usual, and no one's paying sufficient attention to them to stop them doing it.

9. The Richard D. Hall trial seems to have set concerning precedents for investigative journalism. What implications does this case have for anyone questioning official narratives online?

Okay, so Hall was found guilty of harassment by publication. This was a civil trial brought against Hall. Hall was the first journalist to put his name to the reporting of the evidence that Manchester was, in all likelihood, a false flag hoax event. So two of the purported survivors of that event brought a civil claim against Hall for harassment.

Now, ordinarily in UK law, and pretty much everywhere internationally, there's not much point trying to sue a journalist for harassment. Because under the 1997 Prevention of Harassment Act in the UK, and there's similar laws everywhere, a journalist can always rely on their defense that they can say, well, I was investigating an important story of immense public interest in a potential crime. And pretty much any conduct that they take in pursuit of that story, which might include filming people, which might include observing people without their knowledge, which might include interviewing people – you're not going to be able to successfully sue a journalist in the UK under that law. The journalist would come up with a reasonable defense, and that would be it.

But what they did in Hall's case was deny him the opportunity to present himself as a journalist by removing all the evidence he reported in what they called a summary judgment prior to the trial. So Hall couldn't rely on that standard defense of a journalist because they removed that possibility from him and basically told him he couldn't.

So they then said that – now, bearing in mind that the claimants were two people that Hall had never met. He'd never interviewed. He'd never phoned them. He tried to contact them by email or online once, they didn't reply, and he never tried again. So these are two people he has never met, doesn't know, hasn't – and yet, he has been found guilty in the UK of harassment.

So the reason that he has been found guilty in the UK of harassment is because he was guilty of harassment

by publication. So what he wrote about them and what he published about them, i.e., questioning their account, which he didn't particularly focus on them anyway – they were just two people out of many, many people that he investigated as part of his initial investigation. So because he's questioned their account as survivors of a terror event, because he questions the terror event, not because he particularly questions them, but because he questions the terror event itself, the court found, for the claimed survivors of the event, that this caused immense distress. Therefore, he is guilty of harassment by publication, the court found.

Now, the implications of that for journalism more broadly are horrific. So let's say you're a journalist investigating a murder. You've got reason to believe that a judge murdered his wife. And you start investigating that. Now, ordinarily, there's nothing that that judge could do about a journalist that is investigating that story. But now, if you start publishing stories about the evidence which shows that the judge was likely involved in the murder of his wife, the judge can now, using that case precedent, take the journalist to court and sue them, saying that it's caused them undue stress and alarm and that they're guilty of harassment by publication.

So that is an end of investigative journalism. Because anybody that feels affronted by what the journalist is doing, this has set a case precedent whereby they can sue them. No national newspaper or national media outlet can afford for its journalists to be constantly sued because they're investigating a crime or potential crime. It is the end of investigative journalism. So that's why it's important.

[Follow-up] Has the case run its course, or is there going to be an appeal?

Yeah, well, I think there's likely to be further appeal to the European Court of Human Rights. I think that Hall has exhausted his appeal avenues in the UK. He took it to the Court of Appeal in the UK. This is a typical example of how the venal judicial system supposedly works in the UK. He presented his reasonable cause for appeal, and they just simply denied the appeal. So that's it. That's so much for your right of appeal. The court just says no.

Not only did the court not allow him to present any of the evidence that he had reported – it was an insane situation. So the evidence that he reported that would have substantiated his work as a journalist, he was not allowed to put that into the court. He could not present that to the court. They denied its existence.

But then they used the product of his work as the thing they said substantiated his course of conduct, which amounted to harassment by publication. So on the one hand, they acknowledged that he was working as a journalist and that this had caused harassment in their view – and this was a bench trial, no jury, just a bench trial, one judge. So the judge ruled or found that his work had caused harassment. But would not admit, or acknowledge, or even acknowledge the content of that work. As far as the court was concerned, that didn't exist.

10. You use the term "epistemic authorities" to describe who gets to define truth in society. Who are these authorities today, and how do they maintain their monopoly on "acceptable" explanations?

Okay, so this comes from political science, particularly the political science that investigates what they call conspiracy theory. There are certain political science models of what they call conspiracy theory. And their problem with it has always been that they acknowledge that some conspiracies are true. So Operation Gladio, Iran-Contra – these kind of things actually happened.

So they've always had this problem in experimental psychology linked to political science. They've always had problems nailing down how do you differentiate between the rational belief in a rational and evidence-based conspiracy and what they contend to be the irrational belief in crazy theories. How do you differentiate between the two?

Probably the leading experimental psychologist and political scientist that's the leading voice in this is a guy called Joseph Uscinski. And he has cited the work of a philosopher called Neil Levy, who he said gives a simple and consistent standard by which academics can demarcate the difference between the rational and the irrational.

And this is what Levy wrote in a paper called *Radically Socialized Knowledge of Conspiracy Theories*. And this is it, quote: "The distributed network of knowledge claim gatherers and testers that includes engineers and politics professors, security experts and journalists."

In his listing of journalists as epistemic authorities, Levy was almost certainly referring to journalists who work for state-controlled media, and not the journalists in the independent media who are frequently labeled conspiracy theorists. So he's basically saying that representatives of the establishment establish the truth. So mainstream

media, scientists, academics – these people establish the truth. And anything that questions their truth is, by definition, a conspiracy theory.

That's Levy and Uscinski's conclusion. So for example, for years and years, the fact that the Iran-Contra scandal was denied by the epistemic authorities. So anybody that said, well, hang on a minute, the Contras are smuggling drugs into the US to pay for weapons, and the CIA appears to be part of this – that was a conspiracy theory. Now it isn't a conspiracy theory, because now it's been admitted by the epistemic authorities. So it's only the epistemic authorities that say what's true and what isn't.

Well, of course, this is illogical beyond imagination. The only way to establish the truth is to verify facts using evidence. There isn't another way. There isn't some other model by which you can do that. So the idea that a certain group of people called the epistemic authorities in the published scientific literature determine the truth – it's just nonsense. It makes no sense. It's supposedly science, this stuff, but it's just ridiculous.

Now, that has gone on. The UN call these people the gatekeepers of information and news. So the UN has defined the epistemic authorities as the gatekeepers of information and news, and they define the truth. And everybody else, the UN calls a non-traditional actor. So non-traditional actors, they're all conspiracy theorists, and everything they say is false if they disagree with the gatekeepers.

Ultimately, the conspiracy theory label means you question the establishment. That's what it means. And that's not me saying that that's what it means in my view. That is the experimental, psychological, political, scientific definition of conspiracy theory.

11. Your piece on "The Occult Deception" suggests that certain knowledge is deliberately hidden or ridiculed. Can you give an example of suppressed scientific work that challenges mainstream understanding?

Yeah, I suppose the obvious one is climate, what is called climate denial. The generally agreed mass of population, I would suggest, suggests that anyone that thinks that there might be a problem with anthropogenic global warming and radiative forcing – anybody that suggests that is a climate denier because it's anti-scientific.

Well, that's not quite true. You've got people like Dr. Judith Curry, who's a former IPCC scientist, you've got Dr. Richard Lindzen, there are people like Freeman Dyson and John Clauser, Dr. John Clauser,

they're Nobel Prize-winning physicists. They don't agree. They don't think that the model that is given about climate alarm is well-founded.

So science is not decided by committee. It's not decided by consensus. It's not decided by a powerful group like the IPCC getting – the IPCC is a political group. It was formed as an intergovernmental group. It's not a scientific body, it's a political body. They don't come together and decree what the science is. That's not how science works.

Other things that I would say that are questionable, scientific things that we might say are part of the occult, if we think about Tesla's zero-point energy – the notion that there is energy in the vacuum of space. You've got Wallace Thornhill, who talks about an electric universe. The idea of abiogenic oil, where oil is not a fossil fuel. Everyone says, well, that's ridiculous. Well, why have we got fossil fuels on Titan, then? Saturn's largest moon? It's got lakes of methane. Methane's the main constituent gas in natural gas. Why is it on Titan, then?

These are questions, and I'm not necessarily advocating one scientific view over another. I'm not a scientist. I don't have a scientific background, but I do reserve the right to think critically about these things. And too often with what I would call the occult dismissal – because occult just means hidden from the oculus, hidden from the eye. So the fact is there is a lot of knowledge, not just scientific knowledge, but knowledge in general, that is hidden from the eye and not reported and not something that we are quote-unquote allowed to believe in. Science is just one of those fields of knowledge where there are many, many things that are hidden from us that we don't talk about.

12. Your analysis of October 7th suggests it was a false flag operation. What patterns do you see repeated across different suspected false flag events throughout history?

Well, for a start, they all suit an identifiable government agenda. In the case of obviously the October 7th attack, who benefits from that the most? Obviously not the people that are living in the Southern Command region. They don't. They get killed.

But the Israeli government – it is of great benefit to their propaganda narrative, and it enables them to do what they're currently doing at the moment, i.e., commit a genocide in Gaza. So that is enabled by the event, and that is common to false flags.

We were talking earlier about Manchester. What did Manchester do? Well, it enabled the government to

bring out some pretty draconian legislation that means that everybody that ever goes to a large event has to go through biometric scanning checks. Because it's too dangerous for us to go to a gig otherwise. We must be biometrically scanned to get in. So that is clearly what the government benefits from that event.

But also, another thing, an important thing, is it's very hard to understand what the alleged perpetrator gets out of it. So if we think about Hamas on October 7th, how does that benefit the Palestinian people or Hamas? How does that benefit them doing that? Because surely they did so knowing what the reprisals would be. So it's very difficult to see how that particular event benefited the Palestinian people. Quite the opposite, in fact. It couldn't have been worse for them.

So then there's – I would suggest another thing to look out for is the way that the initial account changes. So if you get an initial account of what happened, and you're given some so-called facts about what happened, and then over the next few months and over the next few years, all those facts change.

Now, of course, there will be an investigation and so forth, so some things that you might have thought were true initially might turn out not to be true, of course. But when it changes radically – for example, with the Hamas October 7th attack, initially the IDF categorically said that there were 2,900 people involved in the attack. A few months later, six months later, they're saying 5,000. So this suggests narrative control, not something that is based on a sound evidence base.

And that's another point. When you look at evidence, evidence isn't a fact. Evidence contributes towards our understanding of a fact. But evidence is the crucial component of building that comprehension of likely facts. It's crucial.

So when evidence is denied, overlooked, censored, ridiculed – that is another indication, when we're talking about terror events, that is another indication of a false flag. If we think about Manchester, for example, we've got observable physical evidence of there being no bomb in the arena, which is very important evidence. To completely deny that that even exists, which is effectively what the National Inquiry and the courts in the Richard D. Hall case have done – they have simply denied that it exists. You can't speak about it, you can't show it, you can't watch it, you can't see it, even though you can go and watch it on YouTube. As far as the courts and the official account are concerned, it does not exist. And that is very indicative, I would suggest. That doesn't prove it's a

false flag, but it is highly suggestive that there is something fundamentally wrong with the official account.

13. You write about "nocence" and "replacism" as tools of social control. How do these concepts manifest in everyday policies that affect ordinary citizens?

Yeah, so the idea – one of the great taboos is this notion of the Great Replacement, which comes from the work of Renaud Camus. And we were talking about either end of that political spectrum earlier. It can be interpreted, and certainly some of the things Camus said could be interpreted as racist and culturally antagonistic. And it could be interpreted as that, which is what the extreme right or far right, whatever you want to call them, that's how they interpret it.

But if you look at what he meant by replacism, what he meant was it's a form of socio-political violence called nocence, which means we can be – we're interchangeable, we can be replaced with anything. And he didn't just mean other people and other cultures. He meant machines, technology, bureaucracy, that we are dehumanized, we are digits on a spreadsheet. We can be replaced with anything. Our jobs can be replaced, our homes can be destroyed, our livelihoods can be destroyed, because we're nothing.

So what he meant by replacism was that we are of no value if something else comes along that our would-be rulers, or our actual rulers, would rather use instead of us. So if we think about AI, digital ID, programmable currency, the notion of the digital twin – nocence, which is spelled with a C, N-O-C-E-N-C-E – what he meant was it's the aggressive application of replacism.

So if we think, if we look at the DOGE in the US, a classic example of replacism. You've got this system, which is an AI-controlled analysis of people's efficiency. And then AI sends people that are working in the American U.S. Civil Service letters dismissing them from their jobs because they're no longer deemed efficient by AI, and AI will replace them. That is exactly what Camus was trying to get at.

So we've just seen, haven't we, the notion of coming out of China, the artificial womb that's been – I mean, the artificial womb's been around for a while, but now it's been placed in something that looks like a physical human being, a woman. So that is replacism of woman as a mother. Which is what Camus was trying to get at by nocence – that there's no sense, and I think

he used it as alliteration, that there's nocence is an attack on what it is to be a human being by replacing us with whatever.

And that's what he got at, and that's the essential aspect of what people call the Great Replacement Theory. So the Great Replacement Theory is just openly stated as some far-right loony idea. And the problem is that there are some people on the far right who do use it in that way. But the central part of the Great Replacement Theory that Camus was writing about was that we've just discussed – the replacement of the human being by other stuff, or other people, or other things. And therefore, we are meaningless.

[Follow-up] Would the steam engine have fit into that model?

Yeah. So Joe Schumpeter, the economist Schumpeter, would have called that creative destruction, and there's a big overlap. Creative destruction – technology replaces one market with a new market. So the steam engine gets replaced by the internal combustion engine because technology moves on, and the steam engine's now antiquated, and the internal combustion engine's much better.

So that's the end of the steam engine, start of a new market. But of course, what Camus said is, yeah, that's true, but you can apply that to us. You can apply that to human beings. Because using that same example, think of all the people that worked in factories that produced components for steam engines. Now, they either learn new skills and become engineers working in factories producing components for internal combustion engines, or they're just replaced. They're gone, and they're just replaced by the next iteration. Which is what he was trying to get at.

14. Looking at everything from CBDCs to technocracy to media censorship, what do you see as the most urgent issue people should be paying attention to right now?

Don't accept digital ID. This is a Rubicon we cannot cross.

Once we accept digital ID, it creates what is called your digital twin. So you now exist as a digital model of yourself. Now, this is true already to a great extent. When we apply for a driving license, when we apply for a bank card – it creates a digital version of us. There's a digital record of us. But what they are trying to do with digital ID is bring all of those systems together so that our digital twin is carried from the moment we're born throughout our lives.

The UN has said that it wants to give digital – this is SDG 16.9, Sustainable Development Goal 16.9 – that they want to give digital identity to every human on the planet. So every human on the planet has a digitally controlled twin. Now, once that digital twin is a representative of our lives, and it's on what the Bank for International Settlements are envisaging called a unified ledger, a global unified ledger of all transactions and all economic activity that can be monitored, surveilled, and controlled by AI algorithms, then basically what we're doing is handing over our agency to the system.

So digital ID is the thing that we cannot accept, we must not accept. Not as it is proposed now. It's going to be very difficult because obviously what they're going to do is present it as vendor agnostic, what they call vendor agnostic, which means there won't – it's unlikely whether there'll actually be a digital ID card, but it'll be the linking of different digital ID products together that collectively forms your digital twin, your digital self in the digital virtual realm.

And once that happens, and specifically when that's linked to programmable currency, we really are in trouble then. And so I would suggest that is the thing to be watchful for.

But more than that, more broadly, one of the focuses of my work – and I hope people will start realizing this in increasing numbers – is to understand that the government is not in charge. Your government that you elect is not in charge. It doesn't make decisions. It doesn't make a meaningful difference to the creation of policy. Policy is created at a global governance and at the level of the think tank. And then it is administered by national governments and local governments. So what you vote for is a different flavor of the same thing.

So the only difference you vote for, in my view, when you elect a government or elect a local representative, is that you are choosing how you want the policy to be applied, or the rationale that's going to be given to you for the policy. But you cannot change the policy, because governments don't make the policy.

15. For readers who want to follow your investigations and analysis more closely, where should they go to keep up with your work, and what projects are you currently focused on?

Yeah, you can find me at my blog, which is iaindavis.com, or my substack, which is iaindavis.substack.com. You can also find me at other outlets like Unlimited Hangout, Geopolitics and Empire. I'm fortunate that my work is syndicated by other outlets like The Off Guardian and Technocracy

News and Trends.

And also, I've just been working on a new book, which I'm hoping is coming out soon, not quite sure when. But I'm quite excited about that, so that should be coming out within the next couple of months or so, I hope.

And I'm also currently exploring this notion of what I call the neo-reactionary movement in the US. So people like Peter Thiel and Elon Musk, Curtis Yarvin, a philosopher in the UK, a guy called Nick Land, that came up with this idea of something called the Dark Enlightenment.

I've already written a couple of pieces that are on Unlimited Hangout called GovCore Technates. And I'm expanding on that research and looking at how, currently, the model of global governance, in my view, is shifting from the nation-state to the city-state. So they're rolling out more and more city-state type projects. Shenzhen in China, for example, is one of these special economic zones, which there are thousands around the world of these special economic zones.

Free ports are particularly interesting because they enable what they call residential settings. So free ports are quite obvious locations for potential new city-states. There's a whole global movement, very much focused around the same characters – Thiel, and Marc Andreessen, and David Sacks, and Balaji [Srinivasan], and people like that – that are behind this movement, this Neo-Reactionary movement. And their ideas gel with the shift to global governance of city-states, so we're seeing things like the Global Parliament of Mayors, the C40 Cities Network, which gives mayors the power to implement global governance policies.

So that's what I'm writing about at the moment and researching at the moment.

[Follow-up] If there was one book of yours you'd point people to, which one would it be?

I don't know, really. If they want to know about the bigger, international, some of the subjects that we've talked about today, then Pseudopandemic would be the book to read. But if they're interested enough to know about how lawfare works and the ins and outs of how a false flag terror event rolls out, then I would suggest The Manchester Attack.