**NeoNarcissists**

In a time when flaunting your best self on social media has become a norm, narcissistic traits seem to be everywhere.

In today's slang, off-putting behaviors like entitlement, superiority, and self-congratulating are known as 'flexing'. Such traits might be more common these days, but being narcissistic is still seen as a pathological personality trait, akin to being sadistic, manipulative, or even psychopathic.

However, a 2021 study of 270 people with a median age of 20 lends more credit to the notion that narcissistic behaviors are not always driven by the same things as psychopathy.

"For a long time, it was unclear why narcissists engage in unpleasant behaviors, such as self-congratulation, as it actually makes others think less of them. Our work reveals that these narcissists are not grandiose, but rather insecure," [said](http://www.nyu.edu/about/news-publications/news/2021/march/narcissism-driven-by-insecurity--not-grandiose-sense-of-self--ne.html) clinical psychologist Pascal Wallisch from New York University (NYU).

"More specifically, the results suggest that narcissism is better understood as a compensatory adaptation to overcome and cover up low self-worth," [added](http://www.nyu.edu/about/news-publications/news/2021/march/narcissism-driven-by-insecurity--not-grandiose-sense-of-self--ne.html) clinical psychologist Mary Kowalchyk, also from NYU.

Psychologists do already distinguish between two [rather different types of narcissists](https://www.psychologytoday.com/au/blog/the-mysteries-love/201906/vulnerable-vs-grandiose-narcissism-which-is-more-harmful): 'vulnerable narcissists' who have low self-esteem, attachment anxiety, and are highly sensitive to criticism; and 'grandiose narcissists', who have high self-esteem and self-aggrandizement.

This latest research helps to further disentangle the two.

Kowalchyk and team used a series of measures to assess the levels of different traits including narcissism, self-esteem, and psychopathy for each of their participants, and found that flexing behavior is strongly associated with individuals who also have high insecurities and sense of guilt. Those exhibiting psychopathy showed relatively low levels of guilt.

"Narcissists are insecure, and they cope with these insecurities by flexing. This makes others like them less in the long run, thus further aggravating their insecurities, which then leads to a vicious cycle of flexing behaviors," [said](http://www.nyu.edu/about/news-publications/news/2021/march/narcissism-driven-by-insecurity--not-grandiose-sense-of-self--ne.html) Kowalchyk.

This is in contrast to individuals that exhibit grandiose narcissism, who genuinely believe in their own self-importance and do not display signs of insecurity. To the researchers, the difference between the two goes further than just a category distinction.

"We posit that what was previously seen as grandiose narcissism is actually better understood as one behavioral manifestation of psychopathy," [the team wrote](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2021.110780) in their paper.

They acknowledge further research is needed in a more diverse population across larger time scales to validate their results. But these new findings align with [a small study from 2017](https://www.sciencealert.com/how-do-you-upset-a-narcissist-show-them-a-picture-of-themselves), in which narcissistic men's brain scans revealed emotional distress and conflict when they were shown a photo of themselves.

In fact, there have [been conflicting studies](https://www.sciencealert.com/we-might-have-been-wrong-about-what-s-going-on-inside-narcissists-agentic-implicit-esteem-mask) around whether narcissists do or do not like themselves; by defining the two types of narcissism more precisely, we can arrive at a better understanding of their behaviors, since both types of narcissist may also cause real harm to the people around them [in the form of narcissistic abuse](https://www.psychologytoday.com/au/blog/toxic-relationships/201709/how-spot-narcissistic-abuse).

Pathology aside, narcissistic traits – also thought to be [fueled by an increased focus on individualism](https://dx.doi.org/10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0188287) – can be seen reflected in our society through the [ways we write](https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022112455100) with more "I" than "we", more self-focused lyrics [in our songs](https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023195), and a shift towards stories based around fame.

Researchers have measured these shifts, too. For instance, endorsement rates for the statement "I am an important person" [have increased](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0040181) from 12 to 80 percent in adolescents between 1963 to 1992.

Furthermore, flaunting ourselves on social media is something many of us participate in, collectively forming and feeding insecurities about not fitting in. These behaviors are [hardwired into us](https://www.sciencealert.com/the-bystander-effect-is-not-exclusive-to-humans-but-neither-is-a-willingness-to-help) as an obligatorily social species.

While narcissists are notoriously great at using social media, whether social media can increase narcissism [has been less conclusive](https://theconversation.com/is-social-media-turning-people-into-narcissists-66573), but [the new paper](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2021.110780) suggests that "an increase in such behaviors – specifically self-elevation – makes sense within the framework we propose here, as engaging with social media inherently inflicts constant social comparison and appraisal, which could exacerbate insecurities about self-worth."

So, next time you're ready to dismiss someone's boastful behavior as self-importance, it might be worth considering they're just… insecure.

**The FBI’s Next Raid**

Firearm statistics expert John R. Lott Jr. recently exposed the FBI’s gross underestimation of the number of times armed citizens have stopped a mass shooting event and suggested that the agency is purposefully muffing the numbers for political reasons.

In his [review](https://www.realclearinvestigations.com/articles/2022/08/10/how_the_fbi_undercounts_armed_citizen_responders_to_mass_killers_-_and_media_play_along_847128.html) of the FBI data published by Real Clear Investigations, Lott, president of the Crime Prevention Research Center, attributed the discrepancies to errors on the FBI’s part, including misidentifying and overlooking incidents.

The FBI insists that only 4.4 percent of active shooter incidents between 2014 and 2021 were interrupted or stopped by an armed citizen. But according to Lott, the number is actually 14.6 percent.

The FBI [defines](https://crimeresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/U-_ActiveShooter13B_FBI.pdf) an active shooter as “an individual actively engaged in killing or attempting to kill people in a confined and populated area.” The bureau excludes incidents it deems “related to other criminal activity, such as a robbery or fighting over drug turf,” according to Lott.

Lott notes that the FBI’s narrow criteria necessarily eliminate many [incidents](https://www.realclearinvestigations.com/articles/2022/08/10/the_good_guys_with_guns_the_fbi_stats_omit_846869.html) that should be included.

For instance, between 2014 and 2021, the bureau counted 252 active shooter incidents, but Lott found 281. The [FBI](https://www.westernjournal.com/stefanik-fbi-protected-clinton-comey-continues-protect-hunter-biden/) reported only 11 shootings stopped by an armed citizen, while Lott found 41.

Lott finds the discrepancies glaring. As do others.

“So much of our public understanding of this issue is malformed by this single agency,” said Theo Wold, former acting assistant U.S. attorney general, according to Lott’s report.

“When the bureau gets it so systematically — and persistently — wrong, the cascading effect is incredibly deleterious. The FBI exerts considerable influence over state and local law enforcement and policymakers at all levels of government.”

Death and TaxesBottom of Form

“Although collecting such data is fraught with challenges,” Lott wrote, “some see a pattern of distortion in the FBI numbers because the numbers almost exclusively go one way, minimizing the life-saving actions of armed citizens.”

Wold and Lott are right. When the FBI purposely lowballs statistics like this, the left uses the fake numbers in a direct attack on our Second Amendment rights.

Indeed, the media sits like a vulture just waiting for data that can be used to destroy the “good guy with a gun” narrative. Lott pointed out that [The Washington Post](https://www.washingtonpost.com/nation/2022/07/18/greenwood-mall-shooting/), [The Associated Press](https://apnews.com/article/shootings-indiana-indianapolis-gun-politics-8b49655e3737c1924480e1039405a196) and [The New York Times](https://www.nytimes.com/2022/07/19/us/armed-bystander-indiana-mall-shooting.html) went all-in to blast the pro-gun position after armed citizen Elisjsha Dicken [ended a mall shooting](https://www.westernjournal.com/good-guy-gun-legal-carrier-stops-mall-shooter-almost-soon-began/) in Greenwood, Indiana, in July.

After the shooting, Indiana University law professor Jody Madeira told the Post that armed citizens are “particularly dangerous.” Madeira added, “You’ll get this idea that these people are needed out there to help protect citizens, when in reality that’s the job of the police.”

Unfortunately, the FBI isn’t merely fudging data. It is also putting Americans in danger. By putting out misleading statistics that are used to discount the benefits of a legally armed citizenry, the FBI is necessarily putting lives at risk.

After all, if the FBI’s data is successfully used to thwart gun ownership, mass shooters will be given a free hand to take out as many people as they can until police intercede.

The FBI should be faithfully serving Americans, not cooking its books to help liberals try to take guns away from legally armed citizens.

**Death and Taxes**

I believe it was Benjamin Franklin who said there were only two things guaranteed in life; death and taxes. Well, the Global Syndicate has ordered the government to combine them into one job description. Was President Joe Biden’s administration overselling the position of IRS agent — or is something more sinister brewing in Washington, D.C.?

That question had Twitter Wednesday after the [IRS](https://www.westernjournal.com/report-schumer-manchin-spending-bill-supercharges-irs-go-middle-class-income-earners/) posted a job description for new special agents that included a “key requirement” of being “legally allowed to carry a firearm,” [Fox Business](https://www.foxbusiness.com/politics/irs-faces-online-uproar-special-agent-job-posting-requiring-ability-use-deadly-force-necessary) reported.

Moreover, “major duties” required applicants “be willing to use deadly force, if necessary” and “willing and able to participate in arrests, execution of search warrants, and other dangerous assignments.”

The [post](https://www.jobs.irs.gov/resources/job-descriptions/irs-criminal-investigation-special-agent) was taken down for a time after the firestorm before reappearing later with the words “deadly force” omitted as of press time Thursday.

However, the internet is forever, and filmmaker Ford Fischer shared a screenshot of the original description as it was posted.

“The IRS is hiring new special agents!” Fischer tweeted Wednesday.

“Requirements include working min ’50 hours per week, which may include irregular hours, and be on-call 24/7, including holidays and weekends’ and ‘Carry a firearm and be willing to use deadly force, if necessary.'”

Bottom of Form

This description that seems less pencil-pushing peon and more gun-toting cowboy came on the heels of news that the IRS could add as many as 87,000 new agents as part of the [Inflation Reduction Act](https://www.westernjournal.com/top-business-school-finds-democrats-inflation-reduction-act-increase-inflation-24/) that passed the Senate last weekend and will likely sail through the [House of Representatives](https://www.reuters.com/world/us/pelosi-says-us-house-will-pass-inflation-reduction-act-friday-2022-08-10/).

This combination added to suspicions over abuse of power in government agencies, including the IRS, which has already amassed [$725,000](https://www.westernjournal.com/weaponize-irs-gaetz-raises-concerns-massive-irs-munitions-stockpile/) worth of ammunition this year alone, and the recent FBI [raid on the home](https://www.westernjournal.com/midterm-vulnerable-democrats-silence-speaks-volumes-trump-fbi-raid-may-come-back-bite/) of a former president.

It’s reasonable that the job of a special agent at the IRS requires more practical hands-on crime-fighting skills than the usual desk jockey auditing spreadsheets would.

However, the convergence of many troubling moves by the Biden administration and its bureaucracy is reason enough to warrant further scrutiny.

Moreover, the relationship between the government and the governed has fundamentally changed in recent years — look no further than [COVID-19](https://www.westernjournal.com/woman-mysterious-head-gash-diagnosed-covid-19-days-later-doctors-find-bullet/) lockdowns — and Americans are rightfully wary.

Perhaps it’s simply that the IRS was hoping to entice new applicants by playing up the law-enforcement aspect of the job with a sexy-sounding job description — but times like these demand vigilance against tyranny.

Now, that being said, I don’t think we have anything to worry about. It’s just a psyop to put us on edge or to make one of us take the shot heard around the world. Don’t take the bait, Earth explorers.

If the US military has a hard time finding willing bodies with a GED to get behind a gun and kill people and blow stuff up, I doubt they are going to find college educated dweebs to volunteer to kill people for tax money.

There are two strikes against this all-volunteer tax army. First, if you have never killed anyone by the time your 25, you likely never will under any circumstances. Second, Congress will be back in the hands of patriots in a few months, so these revenuers will never be funded. Don’t worry about this. The Global Syndicate knows this as well as I do.

Whatever you do, don’t shoot a revenuer. That will be the shot heard around the world.

**The New Tyranny**

You already know that taxation without representation is tyranny. For the past 24 months we have been suffering under lawmaking without representation. If you thought your Congressman was in DC representing you and your family, you have been deceived.

Consider one Democrat Congressman, Virginia’s Don Beyer. Oh, he was there. But his 10 comrades were not. Little Donny Beyer cast 10 proxy votes on the House floor on Friday in favor of the Democrats' $740 billion climate and healthcare spending bill, the Inflation Reduction Act. Oh, he was well paid, don’t you worry about that.

Democrat Congressman Lou Correa of California also cast 10 proxy votes on behalf of lawmakers. Democrat Congressman Jamaal Bowman of New York cast seven proxy votes on the floor. This means that 27 districts got taxed, but their Congressmen were AWOL.

Oh, it’s much worse than that. The truth is that 187 Democrats abdicated their elected representation and allowed their vote to be cast on their behalf ahead of Friday's vote, according to the House clerk website. This total represented about 35% of the House. Get that? 35% of Congress sold their vote to the Global Syndicate. That is 35% of Congress that needs to be fired in 81 days. That’s right. You have 81 days to get your country back.

How was this amount of power seized by the Global Syndicate? How did these Congressmen lose their vote, and thus lose their constituents? It all goes back to House Speaker Nancy Pelosi who seized unilateral control in 2020 and just extended that tyrannical power through Sept. 26. House Republican Leader Kevin McCarthy has pledged to end the proxy voting system if the GOP wins back the majority in the House. I will believe that when I see it. I do not trust or believe a word McCarthy says.

The CBO said on Thursday that it needed more time to fully score the current Senate-passed version of the bill, but the House held the vote, and it passed with 220 votes from Democrats. There were 207 Republicans who voted against it, and 4 did not cast a vote. Xero Republicans voted for the bill. None.

"Given the scope of the amendments to title I, Committee on Finance, CBO expects that it will be a few weeks before we can fully analyze and estimate those budgetary effects, at which point we will provide a complete cost estimate for the legislation," CBO Director Phillip Swagel wrote on Thursday in a [letter](https://www.cbo.gov/system/files/2022-08/Honorable_Bernie_Sanders.pdf) that was sent to House Budget Committee Chairman John Yarmuth from Kentucky.

Don’t hold your breath. Never before has the CBO analysis been used to make a change in anything. They get it wrong every single time. America Free Radio has a 1700% better record at nailing the analysis than the CBO. That’s why our listeners know where to stand when this comes flying apart. They are safe and out of the way of this dumpster fire known affectionately as the agency government.

Democratic leaders used budget reconciliation to avoid the legislative filibuster in the 50-50 Senate. This is equivalent to an orgy where the house charges at the door, pockets 100% of the concessions, and films the entire event to use at a later date as it sees fit. The only other way to stop the steamroller of the razor-thin Democrat majority is a [parliamentary procedure](https://www.britannica.com/topic/parliamentary-procedure) called Cloture which is a method for ending [debate](https://www.britannica.com/art/debate) and securing an immediate vote on a measure that is before a deliberative body, even when some members wish to continue the debate. Provision for [invoking](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/invoking) cloture was made in the British [House of Commons](https://www.britannica.com/topic/House-of-Commons-British-government) in 1882, with the requirement that such a [motion](https://www.britannica.com/topic/motion-parliamentary-procedure) could carry only if it received at least 100 [affirmative](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/affirmative) votes.

A cloture’s main purpose is to provide a means to check a [filibuster](https://www.britannica.com/topic/filibuster)—an endless debate by a minority to keep a motion from being put to a vote. In most parliamentary bodies a cloture motion is not debatable, is not subject to [amendment](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/amendment), and requires more than a simple majority vote. For example, in the [United States](https://www.britannica.com/place/United-States) [Senate](https://www.britannica.com/topic/Senate-United-States-government) a three-fifths vote is necessary, which then limits debate to an additional 30 hours.

Reconciliation is a legislative process that enables expedited passage of a bill relating to certain matters in the federal budget by a simple majority of votes. That means 50.1% of the votes. One party can make laws, and the other party shouldn’t even bother to come to work.

50% of the Senate made a version of the bill that was passed by Kumallah Harris and was not altered in the House. It now goes to President Biden's desk to be signed into law.

**Bye Bye Miss American Pie**

The FBI was founded in a cauldron of corruption with one purpose; to protect the DNC by any means. Murder, subterfuge, blackmail, witness intimidation, lying, entrapment, and spying were authorized by FDR and all subsequent presidents to go after their enemies. By the way, their enemies included judges, lawyers, reporters, private investigators, and even presidents. The FBI groomed their soldiers from a population of desperate people, both foreign and domestic, to execute DNC enemies and cover for DNC officials.

What did President Donald Trump do? He exposed them. The fraudulent warrants now have reached epic proportions. They have Huma Abadeen’s laptop, the Awan laptop, Debbie Wasserman Schultz’s laptop, Hunter Biden’s laptop, and likely have the 33 thousand emails of Hillary Clinton. And what happened to her server? It turns out an American lawyer now serving as the 25th [United States secretary of health and human services](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_Secretary_of_Health_and_Human_Services) since March 2021 has it in safe keeping. Call it insurance. Oh yes. Becerra previously served as the [attorney general of California](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Attorney_General_of_California) from January 2017 until March 2021. Becerra was [Chairman of the House Democratic Caucus](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Democratic_Caucus_Chairman_of_the_United_States_House_of_Representatives) from 2013 to 2017. Hillary’s server was removed and sequestered by Bacerra himself. No one has dared try to raid his home to find it.

The FBI even deleted its own text messages between agents involved in the Bureau’s investigations of Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump. They deleted recordings, emails, and even surveillance footage that would have implicated FBI agents in assassination attempts against the President and his family. Congress, the Bureau, and the U.S. Justice Department are at each other’s throats over the missing messages and what they might say.

This gives off the same stench that emanated from the tall tales the media fed the public during the Russia Hoax. The *Post* expects us to believe that Trump was hiding extremely sensitive documents, yet the FBI waited 18 months — just 90 days before an important national election — to descend on his Florida home and seize at least a dozen boxes of material. After Garland’s sanctimonious press conference, the search warrant and redacted inventory list was released. Conspicuously absent were affidavits of probable cause indicating that evidence of federal crimes would be uncovered during the surprise raid at the Mar-a-Lago estate.

According to an [article](https://www.politico.com/newsletters/playbook/2022/08/13/inside-the-mar-a-lago-warrant-00051572) in *Politico*, the search warrant was issued pursuant to “potential crimes involving obstruction of justice, the removal of records and violating the Espionage Act.” Why does all this stuff sound so familiar? To most Republicans and Independents, goofy stories in the media about nuclear secrets and espionage read like just another chapter in the ongoing *Get Trump* saga. The midterms are almost upon us and Merrick Garland has just reminded us why the Democrats can’t be trusted with power. He and his FBI goons may well be responsible for transforming a moderately good Republican turnout into a Mar-a-Lago wave.

It’s far from the first time, as James Bovard points out at The Hill. In 1973, acting FBI director Patrick Gray was forced to resign for destroying evidence in the Watergate investigation. After the 1992 murder of Vicki Weaver by an FBI sniper, an FBI division chief went to prison for destruction of evidence in that case.

The FBI has had since 1935 to prove its worth. A dispassionate look at its history says that it’s far more often served as a center for blackmail, corruption, assassination, larceny, witness intimidation and political manipulation than as anything resembling a legitimate law enforcement agency.

In fact, it was a bad idea in the first place.

The U.S. Constitution defines only three federal crimes: Treason, piracy and counterfeiting. The first two are military matters and the third is handled by the Secret Service. There’s no room for an FBI in a constitutional law enforcement scheme. The only reason it even exists is to protect the DNC.

Every State has its own bureau of investigation. They work together, and yes across State lines to catch the bad guys. With today’s technology, the states could presumably set up their own clearinghouses to exchange information and track down cross-border bank robbers and kidnappers. The FBI need to be dissolved immediately. The latest raid across State lines by the DC Bureau is just the latest reasons to bulldoze the building.

There is absolutely zero particularly compelling, or even legitimate reason to have the FBI. It’s probably not going too far to think of J. Edgar Hoover, the FBI’s first director, as having been a sort of shadow president for much of his 48 years of service. He used agents to entrap and blackmail aspiring political leaders, and to get what he wanted from them both for the Bureau itself and in public policy generally.

Who needs an election? Just ask J. Edgar what to do.

The use of federal law enforcement agents to menace a former president finds no precedent in U.S. history. But regimes in El Salvador, Honduras, Panama, Nicaragua, and Mexico indicted former presidents in just the last two decades. Corruption, of the indicters as much as the indicted, regularly motivates such uses of state power to kneecap political rivals.


Like so much else south of the border, this phenomenon finally arrived in the United States.

The question is, who has the authority to dissolve the FBI? Only the president. Now, the next question. What American has the courage to take them on? The FBI has more armed troops and lawyers than all the National Guards combined. Are you really ready for this war? I guess the other question is this. Is there any honor left in the Bureau? If so, step forward and set your weapon on the ground and walk away.

**EV Trap**

According to a recent survey conducted by [AAA](https://newsroom.aaa.com/2022/07/americans-reveal-fresh-thoughts-on-electric-vehicles/), **one quarter of Americans say that they would be likely to buy an electric vehicle (excluding hybrids) as their next car.** That leaves three quarters who don’t see themselves plugging in instead of filling up just yet.

**And the reasons for that hesitancy are mainly threefold.** As the following chart shows, it all comes down to three factors: **high prices, range anxiety and charging challenges.**

[](https://www.statista.com/chart/27974/reasons-for-not-buying-an-electric-vehicle/)

You will find more infographics at [*Statista*](https://www.statista.com/chartoftheday/)

There are few more things that are not on the infographic.

1. Insurance costs for homeowners will go up by double
2. Resale value of EVs with exhausted batteries are not established. Probably they are zero. Look at French market.
3. EV rebates will not apply to all buyer or all cars. Chinese batteries may not qualify.
4. There are no recycling operations set up for Lithium batteries. All bricked batteries will go straight in the landfill.

But hey, if you're not re-mortgaging the house to buy that EV, you are a climate-change-denying Nazi, right?

**Why Trump Does Not Announce He is Running, Yet**

There is no doubt that Donald J. Trump is the leader of the Republican party. There is also indisputable evidence that his endorsement in a GOP primary is the single biggest factor when voters go to the polls to decide who they want as their nominee. By most counts, President Trump has endorsed slightly north of 200 candidates and more than 190 of those won.

Many of the districts President Trump has endorsed in are currently held by Democrats. With [inflation at record levels](https://tradingeconomics.com/united-states/inflation-cpi), President Joe Biden is making mistake after mistake and the National Republican Congressional Committee (NRCC) is raising vast sums of money. Many of these districts are “in-play” for a GOP pick up.

This political climate has given the NRCC the ability to compete in races, either because of redistricting or the strength of the candidate, where Democrats have as much as a plus seven advantage. These races are difficult to win even in the best of years.

I think President Trump should wait to announce any potential campaign until after the mid-terms because he will become the central focus in these seats. The media will be asking every candidate if they support everything President Trump says or has ever done.

We all know the media doesn’t hold Democrats to the same standards. They don’t ask Democrat candidates running for office if they support Joe Biden’s failing policies for America… But, hey those are the cards we are dealt.

Let’s keep the mid-term elections focused on electing America First candidates. Those that want to come to Washington, D.C., and hold Biden and his out-of-control administration accountable.

Let’s give them an opportunity to tell the voters of their districts what they believe in and stand for. We all know that Trump is the most popular Republican in the country and has the ability to make or break a candidate with his endorsement.

With most (but not all) of the primaries over, it’s time to let these GOP nominees stand on their own and articulate why they will be good stewards of our taxpayer money.

It’s also important to remember that history has showed candidates who announce for President early don’t’ often remain at the top of the polls.

Donald Trump waited until June of 2015 to enter the race. At the time, Gov. Jeb Bush had already announced, Governor Scott Walker (R-WI), Sen. Rand Paul (R-KY), Sen. Ted Cruz (R-TX) and many others. As we know, all of those candidates who entered early fell by the wayside and within a month Donald Trump was the front runner. He never looked back and won the GOP nomination.

For the 2024 Presidential race, he doesn’t need to rush. He has a boat load of cash (in excess of $100 Million) in the bank, has 100% universal name ID and the strongest, most conservative record of accomplishments of any person in America. In short, if he runs, he will win.

The Federal Election Commission has strict rules of how much money he can personally solicit once he becomes an official candidate for office, therefore, it is in the best interests of his campaign to wait so he can continue to solicit almost unlimited funds for a potential run.

For these reasons, and knowing of the inherent media bias against him, I believe Mr. Trump should wait to announce any potential run for President of the United States until 2023. I would suggest Flag Day for an announcement. That day just so happens to coincide with Mr. Trump’s birthday. What better way to celebrate his birthday than telling all American’s it’s time to put America First again and he is entering the ring to Make America Great Again?

**The Dutch Effect**

Farmers in the Netherlands reduced nitrogen pollution by nearly 70% through a voluntary system. But the government says that is not enough and is demanding that they cut pollution by another 50% by 2030.

By the Dutch government’s own [estimates](https://www.wsj.com/articles/europes-green-vision-finds-latest-foe-in-dutch-farmers-angered-by-greenhouse-gas-targets-11659690358), 11,200 farms out of the roughly [35,000 dedicated to dairy and livestock](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Archive:Agricultural_census_in_the_Netherlands&oldid=162045) would have to close under its policies; 17,600 farmers would have to reduce livestock; and total livestock would need to be reduced by one-half to one-third. The Dutch government has demanded that animal farming stop entirely in many places. Of the over $25.7 billion the government has set aside to reduce pollution, just $1 billion is for technological innovation, with most of the rest for buying out farmers.

This effort has sparked a fierce backlash among Dutch farmers, who argue that the government seems more interested in reducing animal agriculture than in finding solutions that protect the food supply and their livelihoods.

“Why would you buy out farmers or reduce livestock when you have the possibility to invest in innovation?” asked Caroline van der Plas, the founder and sole Member of Parliament for the Farmer-Citizen Movement party, or BBB in Dutch. “The car industry innovated for the past 40 years. There aren’t fewer cars and the cars we have are cleaner. We even have electrical cars. That's what I think is so crazy. Why don't we treat the farmers just like the car industry? Give them time to develop solutions or innovate? We can produce food in a much more efficient and cleaner way if we do that. And it's much cheaper also then by buying out farmers.”

Advertisement - story continues below

Farmer protests in the Netherlands come at a time of heightened global food insecurity created by Russia’s invasion of Ukraine, a major wheat exporter.

The Netherlands is the largest exporter of meat in Europe and the [second largest exporter of food overall](https://www.wur.nl/en/newsarticle/dutch-export-of-agricultural-products-exceeds-90-billion-in-2018.htm) by economic value in the world, after the United States, a remarkable feat for a nation half the size of Indiana. Farm exports [generate](https://apnews.com/article/netherlands-agriculture-pollution-58f6c899530f5e9f05e9964da8c328da) nearly $100 billion a year in revenue. Experts attribute the nation’s success to its farmers’ embrace of technological innovation.

Bottom of Form

The Netherlands is just one of the countries where governments are pushing for sharp limits on farming. Canada, for example, is seeking a 30% reduction in nitrogen pollution by 2030. While the Canadian government says it is not mandating fertilizer use reductions, only pollution reductions, experts [agree](https://www.realagriculture.com/2022/08/trying-to-wrap-our-heads-around-the-federal-fertilizer-emissions-plan-a-timeline-of-how-we-got-to-this-point/)that such a radical pollution decline in such a short period will only be possible through reducing fertilizer use, and thus food production. The cost to farmers would be between [$10 billion](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2022-07-27/trudeau-spars-with-farmers-on-climate-plan-cutting-fertilizer-grain-output) and[$48 billion](https://www.realagriculture.com/2022/08/trying-to-wrap-our-heads-around-the-federal-fertilizer-emissions-plan-a-timeline-of-how-we-got-to-this-point/).

“If you push farmers against the wall with no wiggle room, I don’t know where this will end up,” [said](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2022-07-27/trudeau-spars-with-farmers-on-climate-plan-cutting-fertilizer-grain-output)Gunter Jochum, president of the Western Canadian Wheat Growers Association. “Just look at what’s happening in Europe, in the Netherlands. They’ve had enough of it.”

Where the proposed Dutch restrictions are driven by land and air pollution concerns, the Canadian restrictions are driven by the desire for strong action on climate change. But greenhouse gas emissions from farming pale compared to those from energy. Where carbon emissions from farming in Canada [rose](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2022-07-27/trudeau-spars-with-farmers-on-climate-plan-cutting-fertilizer-grain-output)87% to under 8 metric tons between 1990 and 2020, emissions from oil and gas production tripled, adding 69 metric tons of carbon dioxide, during the same period. With the pollution, however, came more food. Canada’s spring wheat yields [increased](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2022-07-27/trudeau-spars-with-farmers-on-climate-plan-cutting-fertilizer-grain-output)over 40% during the period.

The most dramatic consequences of government intervention occurred in Sri Lanka, where a 2021 fertilizer ban led to a massive reduction in yields, sparking starvation and an [economic crisis](https://srilankabrief.org/sri-lanka-starvation-stares-in-the-faces-of-their-daughters-and-sons/) that [brought down the government in July](https://www.independentsentinel.com/sri-lanka-has-collapsed-under-the-weight-of-socialism-mmt-esg/). Because agriculture is a source of greenhouse gases, the efforts by the governments and the backlash they are fomenting may be a harbinger of a global crisis.

Why are politicians being so dogmatic, in the view of their critics, at a time of rising food insecurity? After all, it’s obvious the strategy is not working – not even for them. In the Netherlands, after farmers blocked highways, dumped manure on roads, and started fires in protests across the country, they won the support of the broader public. If elections were held today, the governing parties would lose a significant number of members in parliament while Van der Plas’ Farmer-Citizen party might win enough to form a new government, with Van der Plas as prime minister. In Canada, the federal government has sparked a backlash from the regional governments of Alberta and Saskatchewan. And now, Dutch farmers are [inspiring](https://dailycaller.com/2022/07/11/farmers-protests-erupt-europe-food-crisis/?utm_medium=email&pnespid=6rhuUiRZK6xDhv_fuiW.FMjUtQ2sWMV4M7bkzfky8xZmnD5otEmzUxhaXkBzdFjFS.PiZEnh_Q) protests by other farmers across Europe, including in Germany, Poland, and Italy.

What, exactly, is going on?

To better understand the situation, I visited the Netherlands in July, interviewing farmers, government officials, and agricultural experts. One of those experts was Dr. Rudy Rabbinge, Professor Emeritus in Sustainable Development and Food Security at Wageningen University in the Netherlands.

Rabbinge, 75 years old, has worked all of his life as a farmer, scientist, and cofounder, with Nobel Peace Prize winner Norman Borlaug, of the Green Revolution, which brought modern farming technologies to poor and developing nations starting in the 1960s. Speaking rapidly in excellent English, Rabbinge told me how he had converted his own family farm into a nature preserve, which he has shown off to hundreds of visiting dignitaries over the decades. Rabbinge advocates for “nature sparing” farming techniques to increase yields, and thus reduce the amount of land needed for farming, thereby creating more land available for nature conservation through the use of fertilizer and other chemical inputs.

“My neighbor, a dairy farmer, does his job very well,” says Rabbinge. “And we are right next to each other. I invite people to come see it. Kofi Annan, the former Secretary General of the United Nations, came to visit, and together we started the Alliance for the Green Revolution in Africa. But in the Netherlands we have ministers who say that they are the boss and know the best policy, but often they have no experience, and leave the work to the people in the ministry.” None had come to visit, he said, since the controversy began.

Rabbinge traces the current crisis back to 2006 when the Dutch government ended the system of “mineral bookkeeping” he helped to create. Under that system, farmers measured nitrogen inputs in the form of feed and fertilizer and measured nitrogen outputs in the form of milk and meat. From that they could calculate how much was escaping as nitrogen pollution. Farmers took various measures to reduce pollution and paid fines for exceeding their limits. Between 1995 and 2006, this system, which set targets but let farmers decide how to meet them, [slashed](https://www.rivm.nl/stikstof#:~:text=Emissie%20(uitstoot)&text=De%20belangrijkste%20bronnen%20van%20stikstofoxiden,betere%20plantengroei%20en%20hogere%20gewasopbrengsten.)pollution by 70%.

This success ended when farmers revolted against government efforts to align its system with more prescriptive European Union regulations. Spooked by radicalized farmers, the Ministry of Agriculture halted the system of mineral bookkeeping. As a result, the continuous reduction in nitrogen emissions also ended. “It would have been better had they stuck with the system,” said Rabbinge, who blamed extremes on both sides – green-minded government ministers and radical anti-government farmers.

There are two forms of nitrogen pollution harmful to people and the environment: nitrogen oxide (NOx),a compound of nitrogen and oxygen, and ammonia (NH3), a compound of nitrogen and hydrogen. Nitrogen oxide tends to come from industrial emissions, while ammonia mostly comes from farm animal manure and synthetic fertilizers. Data from the government [show](https://www.rivm.nl/stikstof#:~:text=Emissie%20(uitstoot)&text=De%20belangrijkste%20bronnen%20van%20stikstofoxiden,betere%20plantengroei%20en%20hogere%20gewasopbrengsten.) that ammonia flatlined after 2006.

Another pivot point happened a decade later. In 2015, the Dutch government introduced an emissions trading scheme, which would allow farmers to buy and sell from each other rights to pollute in the present in exchange for reductions in the future. In 2016, environmental groups sued the Dutch government. In 2018, the EU Court ruled against the Dutch government and said the nation’s pollution-permitting scheme was inadequate, and in 2019, a Dutch high court sided with the EU.

In response, the lower house in the Dutch parliament asked for an external committee of experts, including Rabbinge, to advise the government. Rabbinge and his colleagues proposed reviving the system of mineral bookkeeping. The government rejected it. “Our recommendations were never seriously considered,” he says.

The government sees it differently. “We made a promise 20 years ago to take care of our nature preserves,” a senior staff person who works for the governing coalition in the Dutch Parliament told me. “We never did because having a strong economy was more important.”

But Rabbinge stressed that if farming is done efficiently, it can significantly reduce negative side effects. “For example, you could produce the same 15 billion liters of milk that the Netherlands currently produces while reducing by 50% the amount of land, by reducing by 80% the amount of pesticide, and by 70% the amount of nitrogen pollution.”

Government officials latched on to hard targets and regulations. Rabbinge calls this the “fallacy of misplaced concreteness,” whereby bureaucrats lawyers and economists, in particular, tend to want to see hard-and-fast rules rather than the incremental and iterative approach of mineral bookkeeping and the similar "4R" program in Canada.

Consider the map published by the Dutch government in June. Government officials no doubt meant for it to be helpful. It showed which areas needed to reduce emissions by very specific amounts, which ranged between 12% and 95% depending on the location. But it alarmed farmers and, according to independent scientists, was based on false precision. Scientists simply don’t have a good enough understanding of the sources of nitrogen pollution to create such a detailed map.

One of the people who raised concerns about the accuracy of government maps of pollution is a microbiologist named Han Lindeboom, a member of the green-oriented D66 party that had pushed for strict pollution limits. Lindeboom says he debunked government claims about one of the sources of pollution. “I knew there was no ammonia coming from the North Sea and that they had simply added ammonia to their model. I went to the North Holland nature areas and found no critical excess of nitrogen pollution. Still, [government scientists] didn’t want to give in.”

Lindeboom says he wrote up a report and presented it to members of Parliament from the D66 party, but they ignored it.

In other words, the government is focused narrowly on shutting down farms near nature areas, even though the polluting nitrogen mineral deposits in the nature areas may have come from elsewhere. “You see that very often with policymakers and economists,” said Rabbinge. “They believe they know very well how society functions but don’t do experiments to test whether the outcomes of their models are in line with their simulations. As a result of the fallacy of misplaced concreteness you think you know things you don’t know. If you think pollution in a nature area is coming from a nearby stable, you might be wrong, because the pollution might be coming from higher levels in the air, and settling elsewhere.”

Rabbinge went on. “Economists and policymakers believe in the outcomes of models that have never been verified and are taken up by people sitting in an office in the Hague. They don’t know what’s happening in the stable or the field.”

'People Don’t Really Respect Farmers Anymore'

Jeroen van Maanen, 44, loves cows. The windowsill in his kitchen in the Dutch countryside is cluttered with trophies he has won for his prize cows. “I have a lot more than this,” he explains. “These are from only from the last years, 2017, 18, and 19.”

Van Maanen is a dairy and beef farmer who has become radicalized by his government’s proposed crackdown on nitrogen pollution. We walk through his barn. “We milk about 130 cows. Sometimes my kids help but I got divorced five years ago, and so they live in the village most of the times.”

Van Maanen says he was born to be a farmer. “I was a very shy boy till I was 12 or 14. And the only reason I started talking was so I could talk about cows.”

At the same time, said Van Maanen, “It's not an easy life. There’s a lot of negative parts. In the past, you were just farming for high results.”

Back in the barn, Van Maanen said, “Now, there's demands for the environment or for the government. Every year there’s more. And it's increasing your costs. They say the consumer wants it but the consumer’s not paying for it. The prices on the shelf are the same amount. People say they want small family farms. They say, ‘The farms are getting too big.’ Well, we had a fucking system that made them get bigger.”

He continued: “You know, a farmer isn't a farmer for money. It’s the way of life. As long as there's people on earth, they need food. We need farmers for that. It’s a very responsible job. And I think every farmer in the whole world is doing the best he can, but it's not appreciated anymore. People don't really understand or respect farmers anymore.”

I told Rabbinge about what Van Maanen said. “Farming is not just a job,” Rabbinge stressed. “It's a way of life. And if you take that away, then you're taking away a lot of motivation to live. That's why you see more farmers killing themselves.” Indeed, researchers find higher suicide rates for farmers in [Europe](https://boris.unibe.ch/144761/1/Steck%20SwissMedWkly%202020.pdf), [Australia](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Ashlesha-Khadse/publication/343397783_Food_sovereignty_and_farmer_suicides_bridging_political_ecologies_of_health_and_education/links/5f3e8333458515b72931e4bf/Food-sovereignty-and-farmer-suicides-bridging-political-ecologies-of-health-and-education.pdf), the U.S., and [India](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6902368/) in [what appears](https://journals.lww.com/co-psychiatry/Abstract/2010/03000/Economic_crisis_and_mental_health.9.aspx) to be a [global phenomenon](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Ashlesha-Khadse/publication/343397783_Food_sovereignty_and_farmer_suicides_bridging_political_ecologies_of_health_and_education/links/5f3e8333458515b72931e4bf/Food-sovereignty-and-farmer-suicides-bridging-political-ecologies-of-health-and-education.pdf).

**The Davos Factor**

Farmer-Citizen Party leader Caroline van der Plas and other farmer advocates believe the push to crack down on farming does not just stem from national governments. She said many are influenced by the World Economic Forum, which hosts a famous annual conference in Davos, Switzerland, for heads of state, think tank researchers, and environmentalists.

Both the Canadian and Dutch Prime Ministers have enjoyed close ties to the World Economic Forum. In 2017, WEF chief Klaus Schwab [said](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=daE0jthD5F8&t=8s), “We penetrate the cabinets” of governments, particularly singling out Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau. “I was at a reception for Prime Minister Trudeau and I know that half of his cabinet, or even more than half of his cabinet, are actually [WEF] Young Global Leaders.” In 2021, WEF [announced](https://www.weforum.org/press/2020/01/global-leaders-unite-under-the-food-action-alliance-to-deliver-a-better-future-for-the-people-and-the-planet/)that the Netherlands would host the Global Coordinating Secretariat of WEF’s Food Innovation Hubs.

But it’s not so much that the WEF is the puppet master behind Dutch and Canadian government crackdowns and more that all three are influenced by environmental groups operating under the sway of pro-scarcity dogma, including agroecology, a kind of organic farming.

In the WEF’s founding document it cites as an inspiration the seminal 1972 report commissioned by the Club of Rome, “Limits to Growth,” which [claimed](https://www.nytimes.com/1972/04/02/archives/the-limits-to-growth-a-report-for-the-club-of-romes-project-on-the.html) the world would run out of silver, mercury, and tungsten by 2012, and see per capita incomes decline by 2020. Last year WEF published an article that [claimed:](https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2021/08/agroecology-food-security-climate-change/)“Through natural processes and avoiding chemicals such as pesticides and fertilizers, agroecology reduces the environmental harm of food production while stabilizing yields.”

I asked Rabbinge if the experts were under the sway of 18th century British economist Robert Thomas Malthus, who wrongly predicted that humans were doomed to periodic overpopulation and starvation.

“Malthus was one of these economists who was extrapolating to his models,” he said. “He neglected the negative feedbacks [e.g. lower yields, crop failures] which always take place. Same thing with the Club of Rome which published the ‘Limits to Growth’ report in 1972. They eliminated negative feedbacks. But those negative feedbacks exist and result in innovation allowing higher outputs and fewer inputs.”

Rabbinge called organic farming “a religion.” Advocates oppose chemical fertilizers because, they say, they pose a danger to living systems. It’s a philosophy from Rudolf Steiner that is 100 years old. “As a result of the synthetic fertilizer ban in Sri Lanka there was yield reduction between 30 and 50% which created a shortage of food," said Rabbinge. “People say we should do without chemical fertilizers but if we did that on the world scale then we could only support two or three not 8 billion or ten billion which we expect in 2050. So they are creating a situation of chronic hunger.”

Misplaced concreteness and Malthusian pessimism are thus two sides of the same coin. “Decades ago we simulated yields of 11 to 12 tons of wheat per hectare,” said Rabbinge. “At the time they were less than five. People said achieving yields so high was ridiculous. Well, today they are between 10 and 11.”

Misplaced concreteness orients policymakers toward what *they* can do, reduce pollution, not toward what *farmers* can do, increase yields while reducing inputs.

Agroecology, for its part, provides green cover for what is ultimately a philosophy hostile to innovation and growth. “The organics advocates are against science-based agriculture, external inputs, and high productivity agriculture,” said Rabbinge. “They say with low productivity you can feed the world, which of course is impossible. They also say there are too many people. But if you want a lower population the best way is not through repression but by stimulating growth so both parents have an income sufficient to feed themselves and send their children to school. If you do that, you see that the population come down immediately.”

Malthusian ideology and misplaced concreteness are only made possible because elites, from heads of state to government ministers, spend many days every year jet-setting around the world to speak at conferences in places like Davos and Aspen, and spend little to no time visiting with farmers like Rabbinge and Van Maanen. If they did, they would not only gain greater empathy, they would also see that there are good solutions right in front of them.

“To give you a typical example,” said Rabbinge, “farmers who would like to reduce ammonia pollution know that the fluid component of the dung can be separated from the structural material like the straw. If you separate them within two hours you can avoid the creation of ammonia. But doing this is forbidden by law because the fertilizer has an animal origin, and raises the risk of disease. But farmers can prevent that risk. And so the policymakers, detached from reality, say they know better than the farmers what to do and treat them like children. The government has no empathy with the farmer community.”

**Up From Ideology**

Within a few weeks of the farmer protests, public support had turned in their favor. Dutch citizens showed their solidarity with farmers by flying the national flag upside down and waving red kerchiefs like the kinds worn by Dutch farming women in the past.

Polling [shows](https://twitter.com/abdellahd2021/status/1546073877750620165?s=20&t=ISUQhup64Mci03DscDJklQ) that, were the elections held today, the Farmer-Citizen Party go from having one to 20 seats in Parliament while the ruling party, the liberal conservative party, or VVD, would go from having 34 seats to 21. “We would be the second biggest party in Holland,” said Van der Plas. “I never could have imagined last year when I was voted in parliament, that this would happen so quickly and so rapidly.”

I asked Van Manen how he felt when he saw so much public support for the farmers. “It was great,” he said. “You could go on a hike, you could go on the highway, you could go on the beach, and there was support. I'm not nostalgic, but it felt like American or Canadian soldiers at the end of the war, you know? There were people all over the place waving and putting their thumbs up. No one actually knew why we were there. But they could all feel the feeling.”

I asked Van der Plas if she felt her party was ready to govern. “We are ready,” she said. “We were building our party from the moment we were voted into parliament. But when you are the biggest? Let's see if it happens. If there were elections, and we were the biggest party, that would mean I would be a candidate for prime minister. That's really crazy for me to say this. I think, ‘Am I ready for this? Am I ready to lead such a big party with everything that comes with it? All the people you have to hire?’ Yeah, it makes me a little bit nervous. I can say that.”

Van der Plas said she would act to reduce the EU’s scope of work. “I would like the EU to go back to how it was when it was formed. Cooperation between a few countries on trade and transportation and economics. It’s too big right now. We are a sovereign country. Let's keep it to trade and economics. And, I would say, quit the World Economic Forum. We have the EU. We already have 27 countries we can cooperate with. Why do we need all these CEOs and global leaders and young professionals? Choices we make about climate or nitrogen or immigration should be discussed in Parliament, not by the World Economic Forum.”

In late July, representatives from the government and from farmer organizations asked a former government minister, Johan Remkes, to serve as a mediator for negotiations. Last Friday, they met for the first time.

Dutch Prime Minister Mark Rutte [apologized](https://www.dutchnews.nl/news/2022/08/radical-farmers-pledge-hardest-action-ever-after-nitrogen-talks/)for the publication of the now-infamous map saying, “Communication needs improvement.” But he refused to budge on the government’s goal to reduce nitrogen pollution 50% by 2030.

In response, radical farmers pledged more protests. “You can prepare for the toughest demonstrations FDF [Farmers Defense Front] has ever conducted,” [warned](https://www.telegraph.co.uk/world-news/2022/08/06/angry-dutch-farmers-vow-cause-protest-chaos-ever/)the organization’s leader. “We’re definitely going to escalate.” That same day, police [arrested](https://www.dutchnews.nl/news/2022/08/farmers-have-a-deep-lack-of-confidence-in-government-remkes-says/)a man accused of dumping waste that contained asbestos, and setting it on fire.

Lost in the drama is the fact that the Netherlands remains a model for the world in not only producing abundant food but also for reducing pollution.

**Potter Creator is Next to Die**

Warner Bros. Discovery condemned an apparent threat against "Harry Potter" author J.K. Rowling in a statement Sunday, saying the company supports "freedom of expression."

Rowling shared a screenshot Saturday of a Twitter reply to her tweet wishing fellow author Salman Rushdie well after a man stabbed him in the neck at a New York lecture hall on Friday. She wrote that she felt "sick" over Rushdie being attacked and hope that he would recover.

"Don't worry you are next," a user responded.

**The War Against Birth**

What if I told you there was a slick and beautiful propaganda campaign in your kid’s school to sterilize them before they reach puberty? It is absolutely true, and the Global Syndicate is pretty sure there isn’t a damned thing you can do about it.

Boston Children’s Hospital is promoting the mutilation of healthy kids who become convinced they are “transgender” after months of in-school grooming programs paid for by the Global Syndicate’s pharmaceutical companies. They can be realigned via “gender-affirming” hysterectomies, sterilization, and chemical castration despite the irreversible mental and physical damage those procedures cause.

For almost a decade, BCH has mutilated children’s sexual organs under the guise of “inclusive reproductive health care for people of all gender identities and anatomies.” That includes prescribing hormones that suppress menstruation in underage girls and block the increase of testosterone in minor boys, phalloplasties and metoidioplasties [for 18-year-old girls who want penises](https://www.childrenshospital.org/treatments/phalloplasty), vaginoplasties [for 17-year-old boys who want vaginas](https://www.childrenshospital.org/treatments/vaginoplasty), [chest reconstruction](https://www.childrenshospital.org/treatments/chest-reconstruction) and [breast augmentation](https://www.childrenshospital.org/treatments/breast-augmentation) for children as young as 15, and even medically unnecessary hysterectomies for girls whom the hospital deems eligible for surgery.

The shocking thing is that they have produced surgeons who will mutilate a perfectly healthy young person for money.

Just this week, BCH [scrubbed](https://www.theblaze.com/news/boston-childrens-hospital-trans-hysterectomies?utm_source=dlvr.it&utm_medium=twitter) a video titled “What happens during a gender-affirming hysterectomy?” after facing backlash for promoting the surgery for minors who can’t consent and do not have the mental capacity to make such a life-altering decision.

An archived version of the footage shows Dr. Frances Grimstad, an obstetrician-gynecologist, describing the process of rendering teen women infertile by removing key female reproductive organs in the name of affirmation.

“A gender-affirming hysterectomy is very similar to most hysterectomies that occur,” Grimstad happily explains. “A hysterectomy itself is the removal of the uterus, the cervix, which is the opening of the uterus, and the fallopian tubes, which are attached to the sides of the uterus.”

Grimstad notes that ovaries, which produce eggs, may also be removed in an attempt to convince young girls that they are boys.

BCH also appears to have [taken down](https://www.childrenshospital.org/directory/frances-grimstad-do-not-delete) Grimstad’s profile on its website, but a [bio](https://www.hsph.harvard.edu/sogie/sogie-team/frances-grimstad-md-ms/) on the Harvard Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity and Expression Health Equity Research Collaborative page describes how the OB-GYN has participated in “clinical and research work surrounding transgender and intersex reproductive health” for years.

“She has been involved in trans health advocacy since her own adolescence, when she decided to pursue medicine to address disparities in care faced by these communities,” the page, which also states Grimstad’s pronouns, says. “Her interests center around optimizing reproductive health outcomes for both populations including hormonal and menstrual management, surgical care and family planning.”

Text, letter

Description automatically generated

Grimstad’s clip is part of a [video series](https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLNdnrJ0WHYVaziwFvcHuqgIupMhNa7fKE) from BCH that positively frames genital mutilation and chemical castration for minors without addressing the irreversible damage, such as  “[sexual dysfunction, infertility, cardiac event[,] endometrial cancer](https://abigailshrier.substack.com/p/not-a-kitchen-table-issue-jen-psaki?s=r),” and even [transition regret](https://thefederalist.com/tag/sex-change-regret/) that have resulted from those procedures.

The playlist, designed to help families “understand” gender and LGBT issues, [includes 90 videos](https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLNdnrJ0WHYVaziwFvcHuqgIupMhNa7fKE) (some of which are currently hidden) of doctors and other health care professionals promoting the butchering of children. Some topics highlighted in the clips include: “Recovery after chest reconstruction,” “Let’s talk about sex (for trans folks),” “Why is hair removal necessary before phalloplasty?,” “What is tucking?,” and “Fertility preservation: What transgender patients should know.”

BCH not only [brags about](https://www.childrenshospital.org/programs/gender-multispecialty-service) starting “the first pediatric and adolescent transgender health program in the United States,” but also claims that laws from Republican states that have legislated against the maiming of minors in the name of transgenderism “are in direct opposition to our commitment to equity, diversity and inclusivity, as well as the standard of care that we live by.”

A [BCH blog post from April](https://answers.childrenshospital.org/gender-affirming/) also condemns conservatives’ attempts to classify these procedures as “child abuse” and claims that “caring” for trans-identifying children means “supporting kids who are exploring their gender identity, transitioning socially (for example, changing their pronouns, using an affirmed name, or modifying their clothing), or pursuing medical care.” In the article, the author repeats lies, [some of the same ones touted by the Biden administration](https://thefederalist.com/2022/04/21/the-white-house-is-lying-to-you-about-the-irreversible-damage-chemical-castration-causes/), that declining to mutilate children will result in more suicides.

BCH’s [webpage](https://www.childrenshospital.org/programs/transgender-reproductive-health-service) describing its genital mutilation operation and chemical castration regimens for minors even includes a section that details how doctors at the hospital should “ask you what language you use to describe your body and its functions,” even if those answers deny biological reality.

**The Rule By Law**

BI Director Christopher Wray’s Thursday stated that anyone who disagrees with the FBI is a domestic terrorist. They will go on a list. You may not be able to travel or get a federally insured loan. You may have your bank account seized, be arrested, or join the J6 prisoners of war in a 19th century dungeon in DC.

This outrageous tactic is the modus of the second most feared agency in the world. The first is the IRS and they are recruiting 87 thousand more soldiers.

“Unfounded attacks on the integrity of the FBI erode respect for the rule of law and are a grave disservice to the men and women who sacrifice so much to protect others,” Wray began his short, four-sentence [statement](https://www.fbi.gov/news/press-releases/press-releases/statement-from-director-wray), before immediately pivoting to the truism that “violence and threats against law enforcement, including the FBI, are dangerous and should be deeply concerning to all Americans.”

I am proud to tell you, Chris, aur attacks are founded. Well founded. The only body that has the authority to remove the FBI from the earth is we the people.

By calling political criticism “attacks” and then immediately warning the country of the danger “violence and threats” against the FBI pose, Wray deceitfully framed legitimate speech as violence or, at a minimum, the threat of violence. The object of this framing is obvious: to strike fear into Americans who have finally found their voice following the FBI’s raid of Trump’s private residence at Mar-a-Lago. There are 100 million of us, Mr. Wray.

In a country founded on first freedoms — foremost of which is free speech — Wray’s statement proves shocking. But worse still is the reality that the FBI already identifies patriotic and historic speech and symbols as suspect of violent extremism, such as when groups profess, “Don’t Tread On Me” on an emblem of the Gadsden flag or challenge with the Gonzales flag, “Come and Take It.”

While Wray’s effort to equate speech and terrorism proves the most offensive part of his Thursday statement and one that merits universal condemnation, the director’s attempt to sweep away the legitimate criticism of the bureau as “unfounded” deserves derision as well.

There is nothing “unfounded” in the condemnation of the FBI for its handling of the Crossfire Hurricane investigation, and it is because of that widespread misconduct that Americans doubt the legitimacy of the FBI’s decision to search the former president’s home.

Crossfire Hurricane revealed that agents at the highest levels in the bureau held an anti-Trump political bias. The inspector general’s report established that the FBI submitted four FISA applications replete with lies and material omissions, allowing agents to obtain a court order to surveil Carter Page in violation of Page’s constitutional rights. And Americans discovered the FISA court served as no real check on the FBI’s abuse.

The country also learned that the FBI used a backdoor conduit in Bruce Ohr to continue to accept “intel” from Christopher Steele after terminating him as a “confidential human source.” The Mueller report revealed that for all the talk about investigating Russian interference in the election, the FBI ignored the obvious question of whether Steele had been fed Russian disinformation to meddle in our affairs. And the trial of Michael Sussmann revealed how nonchalant the FBI was about being misled.

There is nothing “unfounded” about any of these criticisms, and it is precisely because of their legitimacy — and that they all flowed from a “get-Trump” mentality — that the country now condemns the FBI’s raid on Trump’s home.

Further, even if this time the FBI (and its sources) didn’t lie and the court didn’t rubber stamp the search warrant, the raid still deserves condemnation because of the obvious double-standard.

The FBI never raided Hillary Clinton’s home during the FBI’s investigation of the former secretary of state for mishandling classified documents. Consequently, Clinton had [time](https://dailycaller.com/2022/08/09/opinion-america-has-a-two-tiered-justice-system-and-the-fbi-just-proved-it-cleveland/) for her minions to wipe her homebrew server with BleachBit, making it impossible for the FBI to recover some emails.

The FBI also didn’t [raid](https://dailycaller.com/2022/08/09/opinion-america-has-a-two-tiered-justice-system-and-the-fbi-just-proved-it-cleveland/) Clinton’s houses to search for the 13 mobile devices it believed she might have used to email her staff. The DOJ instead asked Clinton’s lawyers to provide the Blackberries and other devices to agents. Clinton’s attorneys later [told](https://dailycaller.com/2022/08/09/opinion-america-has-a-two-tiered-justice-system-and-the-fbi-just-proved-it-cleveland/) the FBI “they were unable to locate any of these devices.”

The double standard appears also to apply to Hunter Biden, unless the FBI somehow succeeded in quietly searching his residences without anyone’s notice. But even that would contrast with how agents [treated](https://dailycaller.com/2022/08/09/opinion-america-has-a-two-tiered-justice-system-and-the-fbi-just-proved-it-cleveland/) Roger Stone, when the media amazingly knew to be handy during the pre-dawn raid and search of the Trump ally’s home. And these are but a few of the [many](https://dailycaller.com/2022/08/09/opinion-america-has-a-two-tiered-justice-system-and-the-fbi-just-proved-it-cleveland/) examples of disparate treatment based on political affiliation.

Nor is criticism of the FBI’s broader handling of the Hunter Biden case “unfounded,” as multiple whistleblowers recently made clear when they told Sen. Chuck Grassley, R-Iowa, that FBI headquarters buried verified or verifiable evidence implicating the son of the now-president. That those whistleblowers only came forward with these details in the last two months, even though the alleged misconduct dates to 2020, raises other well-founded reasons to “attack” the bureau.

If “every day [Wray] see[s] the men and women of the FBI doing their jobs professionally and with rigor, objectivity, and a fierce commitment to our mission of protecting the American people and upholding the Constitution,” as he claims, then why did these whistleblowers only now come forward? Were they not as rigorous and committed as Wray thought? Or were they too afraid of what would happen to them and their careers if they blew the whistle, suggesting they aren’t quite as “fierce” as Wray assumed? Or maybe there’s a more widespread lack of commitment to the Constitution?

Wray should ponder these questions and also ask himself why he seems more offended at the public’s criticism than he is at the agents and leaders who caused the country to consider the FBI the bad guys. And with yesterday’s outrageous attempt to spin Americans’ criticism as calls to violence, Wray should be given lots of free time on which to reflect.

**The Rebirth of Education**

I said in 1996, when the internet started getting fast, institutional education would soon come to an end. It did not. They tightened their monopoly on jobs. Forget about education. It was the diploma that was the accredited ticket. Without it, you worked by the hour and had no hope of breaking $30 an hour, unless you stated your own business.

The education was another thing entirely. Smart people had access to the latest information. They had access to instruments, satellites, probes, and professors that no colleges could provide. Breakthroughs were just a few years away.

The shocking thing to me was that the vast majority of companies hiring out there did not give a rat’s ass about skills or knowledge. They only cared about the diploma. I hired lots of engineers over the years without one, but the global corporations were stuck on it. The junior colleges were stuck on it. If you had a masters degree or a PhD from an online college, it wasn’t worth the screen print. Regardless of performance in the classroom or the success of the students of these brilliant instructors, they were all fired.

Most colleges and universities in the U.S. need more than reform. The rot is palpable. Taxpayers should be appalled at proposals for so-called “loan forgiveness” because no one is being forgiven — costs are merely shifting. President Joe Biden’s administration wants to unload all loan costs on taxpayers. Federal officials have already started the process by carving out certain student groups for forgiveness, such as students at certain for-profit colleges, along with giving a so-called “fresh start” to students who were in [default](https://www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/articles/2022/06/14/government-hits-reset-on-student-loan-defaults-but-many-could-experience-default-again) before the pandemic. Taxpayers, whether they know it or not, are already covering these expenses.

Meanwhile, universities have suffered from [administrative bloat](https://www.goacta.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/The-Cost-of-Excess-FINAL-Full-Report.pdf) for years. Policymakers should question school budgets and the growth of departments committed to so-called “diversity.” Non-instructional spending on student services and administration is increasing at higher rates than instructional spending.

Given the spread of “diversity” offices, why do students still weigh the cost of sharing their opinions out loud for fear that they will be canceled? Ostensibly these offices are created to make more students feel welcome. But campus climate [surveys](https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2022/06/02/survey-college-students-still-dont-feel-free-speak-campus) show students are afraid to speak up inside or outside of class. Headlines continue to report that [shout-downs](https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2022/03/23/law-student-protests-stifle-speakers-yale-uc-hastings) and other examples of campus censorship sadly have become routine. Administrative bloat and the diversity craze have not made universities more civil.

“It’s not new that conservative people have been sending their children to liberal schools,” said education entrepreneur Robert L. Luddy in an interview. “People think in the status quo. They send their children there and don’t think about it.”

**Creating Competetive Alternatives**

Luddy has created private schools in North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia that teach curricula based on classic works of literature, science, and history. He is now applying the same technique to higher education. “In recent years, colleges have become more expensive and egregious in the things they are doing,” he said.

Luddy is part of a select group of business leaders, researchers, and educators around the U.S. who are trying to repair higher education by building new colleges as examples of what higher education should be.

He created Thales College to “provide a high quality, affordable undergraduate option for students.” Tuition stands at $4,000 per term. Students can finish in three years and will complete coursework while also working in apprenticeship programs.

“It takes a range of skills to be very successful,” Luddy said. He wants to offer students an education “that is leading somewhere.”

Luddy and other founders of new schools stress that they can build new institutions focused on pursuing truth without destroying existing schools.

“We can’t abandon the overwhelming majority of colleges and universities,” Michael Poliakoff, President of the American Council of Trustees and Alumni (ACTA), a group that studies higher education, said in an interview. “There are too many lives at stake.”

Poliakoff, too, believes in rebuilding. He is a member of the Board of Visitors for [Ralston](https://www.ralston.ac/about/our-history) College in Savannah, Georgia — another new school for those hoping for reform, as the current trends leave reformers in what he calls “a boat going upstream.”

Added Poliakoff: “We need places that have actually thought through ‘what is it that makes an educated person?’”

C. Bradley Thompson, executive director for Clemson University’s Institute for the Study of Capitalism, is also on the board at Ralston. “The traditional understanding of a university has been entirely lost in today’s world,” Thompson said in an interview. “There is a market, a huge demand, out there from young people and their parents for a better kind of education.”

He explained that Ralston wants to restore the 19th-century ideal of education, which he says is the “relentless pursuit of truth and the wisdom and knowledge that has been passed down generation to generation for almost 2,000 years in Western civilization.” Noted author and free speech advocate Jordan Peterson is the school’s chancellor.

**Cultivating Diversity of Thought**

These ideas about rebuilding and this entrepreneurial spirit are spreading. Other free speech defenders and cultural commentators such as former Wall Street Journal and New York Times writer Bari Weiss and Brown University professor Glenn Loury helped launch the University of Austin in Texas last year. Times columnist Ross Douthat [called](https://www.nytimes.com/2021/11/10/opinion/university-of-austin-colleges.html) the school an important experiment and an “effort to push back against [the] decadence” of higher education.

Philanthropist and investor Stacy Hock is on the board of advisers at U. Austin. She explained in an interview that “any vibrant industry is benefitted by new entries to the marketplace.”

“The idea of starting a new institution that can be on par with [established institutions] is daunting,” Hock said. Still, she added, “it’s desperately needed.” When U. Austin launched last year, Hock said thousands of students and tenured professors expressed interest in the new school.

“Students felt self-censored on campus,” Hock continued. “There was this real desire to engage with intellectuals around ideas in a pretty uncensored but also rigorous way.” The school launched a seminar program for undergraduates this summer, and school leaders expect to offer both master’s and bachelor’s level programs in the coming years.

Investors based in Silicon Valley started [Minerva University](https://www.minerva.edu/) a decade ago, offering virtual classes and providing students with opportunities [in cities such as Seoul, Berlin, and Taipei](https://www.theguardian.com/education/2020/jul/30/the-future-of-education-or-just-hype-the-rise-of-minerva-the-worlds-most-selective-university) for different job training experiences. The school is highly selective and admits just [1 percent](https://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/minerva-remains-most-selective-university-301057235.html) of student applicants.

The traditional four-year college experience is not the right choice for every student after high school. But those who want a degree should be able to choose between schools based on academic quality and affordability. They should be able to choose between schools that protect the diversity of ideas. [Reams](https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/news/college-professors-donate-to-democrats-over-republicans-by-ratio-of-95-to-1-study) [of](https://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2016/oct/6/liberal-professors-outnumber-conservatives-12-1/) [research](https://www.thecrimson.com/article/2022/7/13/faculty-survey-political-leaning/) find that a strong majority of professors support left-of-center policymakers and causes. Students at this level need to wrestle with ideas, and this process requires instruction from different perspectives.

“America’s universities are an anathema to what universities should be about,” Clemson’s Thompson noted. “Soon we are going to see colleges that don’t have DEI offices,” he said, adding, “going forward, these are very exciting times.”

Higher education requires rebuilding instead of simply reforming. For those attending schools that were created to rebuild higher education, it is already an exciting time to go back to campus.