

Prelude to the Red Pill



ESC

NOV 17, 2025



4



1

Share



You're here because you know something. What you know you can't explain, but you feel it... like a splinter in your mind.

Answer these questions honestly from your own life experiences.



1. 'Can I still function if I refuse?'

When a new app, digital pass, or platform is introduced as 'optional' or 'for your convenience', map out what would actually happen if you refused it.

Start with something concrete: your smartphone.

- Try to access your bank without the app. Many banks now require two-factor authentication through their mobile app — no app means no access to your own money.
- Book a flight without digital check-in — you'll pay extra fees and wait in lines designed to punish non-compliance.
- Apply for a job without online portals — your resume goes straight to the void.
- Access your child's grades, attendance, or teacher communications without the school's app — you're made to run through hoops, and probably secretly marked as a *'disengaged parent'*.
- Pay for parking without the app — the nearest parking meter is far away, and it might not work. In its place is now a sign with a QR code.
- Get your prescription without the pharmacy app — wait three times longer and still need to show your phone for the discount.

The mechanism does work as intended: analog alternatives aren't banned, they're just made progressively more expensive, inconvenient, and socially unacceptable until they disappear entirely. Bank branches close because *'everyone uses online banking'*.

Government services go *'digital first'* then *'digital only'*. Your doctor requires you to use their patient portal for results that once came by phone. Your apartment building replaces keys with smartphone entry.

You're never legally mandated to participate. You're just architecturally excluded from normal life if you don't. The control isn't in making you comply — it's in **making non-compliance functionally impossible while maintaining the fiction of choice.**

2. 'What stayed after the emergency?'

Track the lifecycle of *'emergency measures'* across multiple crises. Notice what never goes away.

- **After 9/11:** The PATRIOT Act was passed in 45 days with sunset clauses. Two decades later: mass surveillance is normalised, the TSA theatre remains, no-fly lists expanded from 16 names to tens of thousands, financial transactions are monitored for amounts as low as \$600, you need ID for domestic trains and buses, ask your bank for cash and they'll want to know what it's for, '*see something, say something*' became permanent culture... exactly as it was in East Germany. The emergency ended; the architecture stayed.
- **After 2008:** Emergency bank bailouts became permanent too-big-to-fail policy. Temporary central bank interventions approved through emergency measure became permanent quantitative easing at central bank disgression. Crisis reporting requirements became routine financial surveillance. '*Temporary*' negative interest rates lasted over a decade. Banks gained the right to freeze accounts based on '*risk patterns*' defined by algorithms you'll never see, with limited possibility of appeal.
- **After COVID:** Vaccine passports '*for international travel*' suddenly expanded to restaurants, transport, gyms, and offices. Contact tracing infrastructure pivoted to general population movement monitoring. QR code check-ins remain '*voluntary but recommended*'. Remote work surveillance tools marketed for '*temporary home offices*' became standard employee monitoring, with these tools increasingly integrating AI which has you train your eventual, digital replacement. '*Medical misinformation*' policies slowly expanded to cover *any* health topic, regardless of how absurd. Emergency executive orders showed leaders exactly which constitutional provisions they could suspend with the right framing.

The next crisis won't start from your old baseline of rights and freedoms. It starts from here — with all these tools already normalised, tested, and ready. Each emergency is a ratchet click, with rights surrendered during a time of crisis never fully restored in calm.

3. '*Who's grading my behaviour?*'

List every score, rating, or flag attached to your name — the ones you know about and — *especially* — the ones you don't.

- **Financial:** Your credit score is just the visible tip. There's your banking behaviour score (*too many transfers? suspicious!*), your insurance behaviour score (*fitness tracker shows inconsistent exercise? higher premiums!*), your employment stability score (*job-hopping? risky!*), your consumption pattern analysis (*buying patterns suggest depression? flag for review!*), your social network financial health score (*friends have bad credit? you're higher risk!*).
- **Digital:** Every platform maintains shadow profiles, and your engagement quality score determines reach, regardless of truth. Your 'authenticity' rating affects visibility, while your controversy score triggers manual review, possibly leading to an outright ban. Your network influence score sets your treatment tier. Your appeals history marks you as compliant or difficult. Your off-platform behaviour is tracked through data brokers and affects your on-platform treatment.
- **Professional:** Beyond performance reviews: culture fit scores, collaboration indices, innovation metrics, internal social network analysis (*are you a connector or isolate?*), email sentiment analysis, meeting participation scores, training completion rates, 'growth mindset' assessments. HR dashboards reduce you to risk metrics: flight risk, litigation risk, culture risk, succession planning scores.
- **Social/Consumer:** Uber's algorithm tracks whether you complain, while Airbnb hosts share blacklists. Dating apps assign desirability scores that determine who sees you. Neighborhood apps track your 'community contribution'. Schools score parental involvement. Your email address itself carries reputation — when did you create it, what services have flagged it, how many databases contain it.

These scores don't just measure — they modify. You learn to routinely perform for the algorithm. You optimise your behaviour for metrics you can't see, set by people you'll never meet, using criteria you're not allowed to know.

4. 'Who exactly decided this?'

Take any policy affecting your daily life and trace it to an actual human decision-maker. Watch yourself hit walls.

- **Your local mask mandate?** City council points to state guidance, state points to CDC, CDC points to WHO, WHO points to an expert committee whose members were appointed by previous committees based on criteria set by foundation funders whose boards are interlocked with pharmaceutical companies, NGOs, and policy institutes funded by the same dozen foundations.
- **Your professional licensing requirements?** Set by boards captured by the very industries they regulate, following '*model legislation*' written by trade associations, based on '*competency standards*' developed by international bodies, framed as an malleable '*ethics disclaimer*', and funded by corporations that profit from higher barriers to entry.
- **Your child's curriculum?** Local school board implements state standards based on federal guidelines derived from UNESCO frameworks developed by ideologically driven education experts, funded by technology companies that coincidentally sell the solutions to the problems their standards create.
- **Building codes that make housing unaffordable?** Written by the International Code Council, a private organisation, adopted wholesale by governments that never read them, influenced by industry groups that profit from complexity, with no democratic input or accountability.

The brilliance of this system is that **everyone can blame someone else**. Local officials are '*just following guidance*'. National bodies are '*harmonising with international standards*'. International bodies are '*following the science*'. Foundation funders are doing so '*in good faith*'. Scientists are '*just reporting data*', and if later turns out flawed, it's because '*we need more surveillance to address data gaps*'. Nobody actually decides anything — things just somehow get decided.

5. 'What strings come with this money?'

Examine the behavioural control mechanisms embedded in every financial flow.

- **Your mortgage:** Beyond repayment: you must maintain insurance they approve, from companies they select, at coverage levels they determine. You can't modify your property without permission — you must allow inspections. Your usage is restricted — no business without approval, no subdivision, no additional dwellings. Miss any of these conditions and you're in '*technical default*' even if you've never missed a payment.
- **Employment:** Your salary comes with implicit social media monitoring, lifestyle clauses, non-compete agreements that follow you for years, intellectual property assignments that capture your thoughts outside work, mandatory arbitration that waives your legal rights, morality clauses that make your private life a firing offense, diversity quotas that determine your advancement potential, political neutrality requirements that silence you as a citizen.
- **Government contracts/grants:** Require specific hiring practices, approved vendor lists, wage determinations, environmental standards, expensive reporting requirements that consume 30% of the grant, ideological commitments disguised as '*values alignment*', training programs that amount to political re-education, outcome metrics that predetermine what you'll discover, and what you certainly won't.
- **Digital payments:** Every transaction is not just recorded but analysed. Patterns trigger reviews, certain purchases even flag your account. Too many cash withdrawals? That's suspicious. Wrong political donation? You deserve debanking. Buying from the wrong country? Frozen. The control isn't just in blocking transactions — it's in training you to self-censor your spending.

Even '*universal basic income*' proposals come with strings through consumption requirements (*must spend locally*), prohibited purchases (*no savings allowed*), activity requirements (*community service*), social credit integration (*behaviour affects payment level*). It's not income — it's a **behavioural remote control disguised as support**.

6. 'What can't I say at work?'

Map the invisible boundaries of professional speech. Not illegal speech — just career-limiting speech.

Can you question why diversity metrics matter more than performance metrics? Can you ask why your company takes positions on political issues unrelated to your business? Can you note that certain identity groups receive preferential treatment? Can you share studies that contradict the official position on climate, COVID, or social issues?

Try to express concern that your daughter's women's sports team has to compete against biological males. In most professional settings, you've just committed career suicide. Not because it's illegal or false, but because it violates the new blasphemy laws that everyone knows yet no one ever wrote down in detail.

The enforcement mechanism is deliberately vague, that's where an '*ethics disclaimer*' becomes useful. There's no list of forbidden words — that would be too obvious, too contestable, possibly even legally problematic. Instead, there's a cloud of risk around certain topics, which you really learn through others' destruction what can't be said. You watch colleagues disappear after town halls, and careers stall after challenging the wrong initiative. You learn to read the room, sense the boundaries, stay away from the edges. It's essential survival skills in the new, '*ethical*' age.

The most insidious part: **the boundaries move**. What was required speech yesterday (*'colorblindness is the goal'*) becomes forbidden today (*'colorblindness is racism'*). What's celebrated today might be criminal tomorrow. So you gradually learn to say nothing substantial, to speak in approved euphemisms, to enthusiastically support whatever the current thing happens to be. But you gradually learn to position yourself on every issue so that you can later backtrack, or claim victory.

You learn to say nothing, enthusiastically.

7. 'Is my input actually allowed to change anything?'

Examine the gap between consultation and influence.

Your company's employee survey asks about '*workspace preferences*' but never about fundamental strategy. The predetermined office consolidation happens regardless of responses. The survey's real purpose: identifying who will resist, how to manage them, and making everyone else '*feel heard*'.

Your city's '*community input session*' on the new development has beautiful renderings and listening stations. But the developer already has permits, the financing is arranged, the contracts are signed. Your input might change the color of the bike racks or the type of flower in the pots — not whether the development happens. Should your councillors refuse the development, perhaps because of lack of voter enthusiasm, the central government simply overrides, possibly stripping local government of what little power they had in the process.

All your feedback gets carefully logged. The product roadmap was set two years ago by metrics you don't see, serving advertisers you don't know about, for reasons that are never made quite clear. Your feedback helps craft the announcement, but it doesn't impact the decision in the slightest.

Even voting increasingly feels like this. You choose between candidates who agree on fundamentals and differ on emphasis — like the order of implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals, not whether you fundamentally agree with poverty brought on by '*net zero*'. The permanent bureaucracy remains, and the international agreements stay binding — while debt loads continuously grow in spite of higher than ever taxation levels. The surveillance expands regardless of which political candidate wins. You can change the actors but not the play, and when those actors lose, they don't look particularly surprised — *or even sad* — about it. Challenge your local politicians, and they'll refuse to answer questions. Whether you voted for them is immaterial.

The consultation is never '*Should we?*' but always '*How should we implement what we've already decided?*' Your participation legitimises the outcome — '*we consulted extensively with stakeholders*' — while never actually influencing it... if you were even '*included*' as a '*stakeholder*' in the first place.

8. *'What am I trading for this convenience?'*

Inventory the capabilities you've surrendered for convenience.

- **Navigation:** You can't read a map or remember routes. Your spatial memory has atrophied, and you're lost without GPS. When the satellites fail or the service changes terms, you find that maps require interpretation.
- **Communication:** You can't remember phone numbers, addresses, or birthdays. Your social connections exist at platform discretion. One algorithm change or the retirement of an application, and you lose touch with hundreds of people. Your relationships are mediated by companies that profit from outrage.
- **Memory:** You've offloaded your memory to devices. Photos, documents, conversations — all in the cloud. When access is revoked, your history vanishes. You've become dependent on external storage for your own biography.
- **Transactions:** You can't function in cash. Cheques are no longer accepted. Every purchase requires permission from multiple intermediaries. Your ability to transact depends on continuous system approval, and thus, ultimately your compliant behaviour.
- **Entertainment:** You can't entertain yourself as you depend upon a continuous stream of 30-second videos, silly cats optional. You've lost the ability to be bored productively. Your dopamine regulation is outsourced to algorithms designed for addiction through colourful explosions on your mobile screen.
- **Skills:** You can't fix anything, and tend to throw away repairable items. Cook from basics, grow food, repair clothes, build furniture, navigate by stars, start a fire, purify water... the basic competencies your grandparents considered normal are now specialised knowledge, some even command high salaries.

Each convenience creates a dependency. Each dependency becomes a control point. The system doesn't need to threaten you — it just needs to threaten your access to the conveniences you can no longer live without.

9. 'Why is everyone furious at each other but not at the people in charge?'

Track where social energy gets directed versus where power and agenda-setting actually sit.

Your social media feed is full of rage about pronouns, statues, masks, vaccines, abortion, guns, race, gender, religion, gain-of-function. Every issue perfectly calibrated to split the population into irreconcilable camps.

Meanwhile, what almost never dominates the conversation:

- **Monetary architecture:** Central banks create or destroy trillions with no democratic input. The Federal Reserve, ECB, Bank of Japan — they coordinate through the Bank for International Settlements to set the price of money itself. They decide whether your savings vanish through inflation or your job disappears through recession. The BIS engineers the future through conditional economics delivered at point of the individual CBDC transaction. No election touches them, nor does the media ever discuss these topics in depth.
- **Ownership concentration:** Three asset managers — *BlackRock, Vanguard, State Street* — own controlling stakes in every major corporation. They vote those shares to enforce ESG standards that reshape entire industries. The same firms own competing companies, your employer, your bank, your media, your pharmaceutical companies. It's not monopoly — it's something worse: a meta-monopoly where competition becomes theater. But the more pertinent question — who but the central banks could even afford fund this continuous one-directional expansion, where investments magically never go bad?
- **Philanthropic engineering:** A handful of foundations — *Gates, Rockefeller, Ford, Soros, Wellcome* — fund the same 'solutions' globally. They finance the research that becomes 'the science'. They fund the NGOs that demand the policies. They fund the media that shapes the narrative. They fund the universities that train the experts. They fund the pilots that become the template. Every social change follows the same pattern: foundation-funded study → NGO campaign → media

amplification → policy adoption → ‘*everyone agrees*’. And should you disagree, your funding is strangely cancelled.

- **Standards cartels:** Bodies like the OECD, ISO, and UN agencies, plus WEF-style forums and modelling centres such as IIASA, turn political choices into ‘*technical necessities*’. They set the metrics and taxonomies that become mandatory. They define ‘*sustainability*’ and ‘*planetary boundaries*’. They create ‘*risk assessments*’ that predetermine outcomes. They establish ‘*best practices*’ that quietly become legal requirements. No one elects them, but everyone must obey them.

The algorithm doesn’t just show you outrage — it trains you to produce it. You learn what gets engagement: dunking on the other side, not analysing power. You’re rewarded for horizontal combat, punished for vertical analysis.

Notice how issues are framed:

- ‘*Liberal vs Conservative*’ not ‘*Citizens vs central banks that control your currency*’
- ‘*Black vs White*’ not ‘*Debtors vs the creditors who set the terms*’
- ‘*Boomer vs Millennial*’ not ‘*Workers vs the asset managers who own everything*’
- ‘*Vaxxed vs Unvaxxed*’ not ‘*Patients vs the pharma-foundation complex*’
- ‘*Climate believers vs deniers*’ not ‘*Energy consumers vs the foundations defining ‘sustainability’*’

The people the media and education train you to hate – *your neighbors with different yard signs* – have zero control over monetary policy, institutional investment, vaccine mandates, or philanthropic agenda-setting. The people who do have that control don’t have yard signs, in fact, you probably can’t see their homes due to the tall gates, while suggesting your borders should be erased, lest you be called a ‘*racist*’. They have central banks, sovereign wealth funds, and charitable foundations with larger budgets than most countries, and should even these fail, your social media silence can be engineered in a heartbeat. Sure, your account is not technically deleted, but your posts just won’t be allowed to go viral.

The system works perfectly when you exhaust yourself fighting horizontally while the vertical architecture — *money creation, ownership concentration, philanthropic engineering* — remains untouched and officially ‘*non-political*’.

10. ‘Am I the problem for asking?’

Test what happens when you question fundamental premises.

- Ask why we needed lockdowns when Sweden didn’t.
- Ask why college costs rose 1000% without quality improvement.
- Ask why we can’t audit the Federal Reserve.
- Ask why Israel gets unconditional support.
- Ask why certain vaccines can’t be questioned.
- Ask why some groups’ disparities matter and others don’t.
- Ask why your currency lost 96% of its value.
- Ask why cancer rates keep rising despite ‘*progress*’.

Don’t argue answers — just note **what happens when you ask**.

You’re not engaged with evidence. You’re categorised: ‘*conspiracy theorist*’, ‘*science denier*’, ‘*extremist*’, ‘*racist*’, ‘*anti-semitic*’, ‘*dangerous*’, ‘*fringe*’, ‘*discredited*’, ‘*debunked*’. The response isn’t argument but diagnosis. **You don’t have wrong opinions — you have a mental defect.** You don’t need debate — you need treatment, deplatforming, deprogramming.

The questions themselves become evidence of corruption: only a bad person would ask that. Only someone captured by ‘*disinformation*’ would think that. Only an extremist would notice that pattern. The circularity is perfect: questioning the system proves you’re the kind of person whose questions shouldn’t be taken seriously.

This is the hallmark of ideological control: when asking questions becomes proof of pathology. When noticing patterns becomes dangerous. When requesting evidence

becomes antisocial. When doubt itself is transformed from a virtue into a vice.

What Your Answers Reveal

If you recognise these patterns — if the ‘*optional*’ became mandatory, the temporary became permanent, the scores became controls, and the questions themselves became crimes — then you’re not paranoid.

You’re observant.

What you’re seeing isn’t one secret conspiracy, but a stacked **architecture of control**:

- **At the monetary layer:** Central banks and the BIS network decide the price of money, the pace of inflation, and the conditions of credit. Your economic life is determined by committees you can’t vote for, following models you can’t review, optimising for metrics that don’t include your wellbeing.
- **At the ownership layer:** A handful of mega-asset managers vote the shares of every major corporation, enforcing ‘*stakeholder capitalism*’ that serves everyone except actual stakeholders. Competition becomes impossible when the same three firms own all the competitors.
- **At the agenda layer:** Large foundations finance the research, the advocacy, the media coverage, and the pilot programs that become ‘*inevitable*’ policy. They decide which problems exist (*by funding them*) and which don’t (*by ignoring and/or defunding them*). Every country mysteriously discovers the same ‘*solutions*’ because the same money funded the same ‘*evidence*’. And never mind all the evidence discarded during investigation.
- **At the standards layer:** International bodies and modelling hubs turn political preferences into technical requirements. The OECD and ISO define ‘*fair*’ taxation and ‘*good*’ governance. The WHO defines ‘*health*’ in the broadest possible way, and manufactures indirect ‘*social determinants*’ to track it. The IPCC and IIASA-style centres define ‘*safe*’ emissions and ‘*planetary boundaries*’, yet their models are unchallengeable, and the data is not available to the public. The WEF and similar

forums define ‘*stakeholder value*’, yet what you value might only be of economic worth. These definitions become law without ever facing voters.

Once these layers lock together, everything below is just implementation:

- Governments ‘*follow the science*’ that foundations commissioned
- Regulators ‘*harmonise with global standards*’ they had no role in creating
- Corporations ‘*align with ESG metrics*’ their investors demand
- Universities and NGOs chase grants that require working inside the predetermined framework
- Media amplifies the approved narrative or loses access and advertising

You don’t need conspiracy when you have convergence. Conspiracy is merely a bonus. Every institution faces the same pressures, uses the same consultants, attends the same conferences, reads the same reports, adopts the same frameworks, and arrives at the same solutions: more data, more metrics, more coordination, less sovereignty, less privacy, less choice.

Challenge this architecture and you’re not ‘*disagreeing about policy*’ — you’re:

- ‘*Denying the science*’ (that they funded)
- ‘*Threatening financial stability*’ (that they define)
- ‘*Violating international obligations*’ (that they wrote)
- ‘*Ignoring planetary boundaries*’ (that they calculated)

The frame itself becomes sacred. You can argue within the model but not about the model — the Overton Window’s technical cousin.

This is why:

- Efficiency beats privacy (*the metrics demand it*)
- Safety beats freedom (*the models say so*)
- Metrics beat judgment (*dashboards are ‘objective’*)

- Management beats democracy (*voters are 'uninformed'*)
- Convenience beats capability (*the infrastructure requires it*)
- Narrative beats evidence (*the story serves the system*)

The cage isn't built from conspiracy but from convergence. The same kinds of people, circulating through the same institutions, using the same models and funding streams, keep arriving at the same destination: **a world where you're free to choose from options they've pre-selected, free to speak within boundaries they've preset, free to participate in processes they've predetermined.**

The system doesn't need you to believe in it. It just needs you unable to function outside it. Your lived experience of friction, dependency, and narrowing options isn't paranoia. It's pattern recognition.

These questions don't ask you to accept any ideology. They ask you to notice what you already know:

- That democratic choice has been replaced by **stakeholder management.**
- That sovereignty has been replaced by **standards compliance.**
- That citizenship has been replaced by **user status.**
- That politics has been replaced by **parameters.**

And that **noticing this isn't radical** — it's the first requirement for navigating the world as it actually operates, rather than as the ratification theatre suggests it should.



Ratification Theatre

ESC • NOV 13

[Read full story →](#)



Recommend The price of freedom is eternal vigilance. to your readers

Playing advanced Dig Dug.

Recommend



4 Likes · 1 Restack

Discussion about this post

Comments Restacks



Write a comment...