

## 7. Information Warfare - Part 2

---

Tess Lambert, 01.10.2018

### Youtube Video

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GIG2U8DwjEQ>

#### [00:00:16.570]

Amen. Quick review. Yesterday we looked at the alpha and omega of warfare. We looked at the war in Heaven, how war first began, our first example, and saw that according to the prophetic model, that it is ending in the same way it began. That the alpha typified, the Omega. War in heaven was an information war, psychological warfare. And Satan manipulated the angels based on emotion. We then started tracing the information age, particularly as it relates to our reform line. We went into quite a bit of detail. What I want to do today is review, but I want to try and simplify it and go over it again so that we can make sure that no one is missing this common thread that is running through our reform line. So we will retrace our steps.

#### [00:01:22.430]

Before I do that, I want to diverge a little bit from my original plan. And I decided to do this based on some of the feedback I was getting from yesterday's class and some of the comments I was receiving and hearing. I want to pause the original study for a moment to make a particular point. If you can go through a journey as we trace a story with me.

#### [00:01:56.050]

July 2 of 2016, we're talking about a private messaging wall on the internet called 4chan. It's one of those deeper web places where you can pretend to be anyone you want to. Build a fake name, fake personality, fake job, untraceable, and then start putting out messages. On 4chan on July 2, 2016, someone who named themselves the FBI Anonymous, who said they are a high level analyst and strategist within the FBI, alleged that Hillary and Bill Clinton were pedophiles part of a child kidnapping ring. We're going to trace how this story developed. Somewhere on 4chan, someone saw that. The person's name here was Thee Rant, who picked this story up. But then someone who named themselves Fat Old Man picked up this particular post, claimed that they had a position within the NYPD and that their colleagues had told them this was correct, and start adding details onto this original story that they've seen posted by FBI Anonymous. They say that this is a hot rumor within the NYPD. Still on 4chan. They start adding details onto this story. This then leaves 4chan and enters Facebook. And it's a law enforcement group on Facebook repost these allegations. It moves from 4chan, to facebook to Twitter. Someone called Eagle Wings picks up this story. I'd like to note that by now we still have no evidence. But it's picked up by Eagle Wings. This is a Twitter account with 120,000 followers. And they repost it. Eagle Wings is believed to be part of a bot network. That means it's an automated account. These automated accounts don't have one known person running them. You don't know who is running them. What they do is they put out constant political messages. You know, no background. See no proof. Some of these fake accounts post up to 900

times a day, and that's a drop in the bucket of the evidence that these are fake accounts. This particular account, with 120,000 followers is also followed by part of Trump's campaign team. Particularly Michael Flynn. Still, it's kind of in the Internet. But there's no known person associated with it. It goes from this Twitter account back to Facebook. Carmen Kats, her name is. Reposts this story with more details. Carmen Kats is a fake Facebook account. She doesn't exist. It was begun by Cynthia Campbell. You could trace this account to Cynthia Campbell. Lonely woman, 60 years old, cat lady in Missouri, real person. She picks up this story, she runs with it.

#### **[00:06:20.500]**

She reposts it on a fake account. Her post Carmen Kats. Fake account. Her post is screenshot and shared back onto Twitter. This is at David Goldberg. No idea who he is. No profile picture that is not his real name. Cannot be traced. Estimated to be another bot account, highly automated. He posts this account twice, claiming to have again NYPD friends who are telling him that this is the truth. Screenshot posted again. One of his screenshots is shared 6369 times. Tweets or hashtags of Pizza Gate on Twitter now start to number 1.4 million. It was shared by 250,000 people in five weeks. 3000 of those accounts are believed to be automated bot accounts linked to the Internet Research Agency. This is Putin's Internet propaganda machine. And some of those bot accounts are retweeting, as I said, up to 900 times a day. So it goes through these other accounts. There's 250,000 other people retweeting. And this now starts to be retweeted by Donald Trump Jr. Roger Stone and Anne Coulter. November 2, if you can move with me, November 2. Infowars. Now it hits Infowars. There's a guest on that program, Douglas Hagman, who claims pretty much all of this conspiracy theory, takes it into more of the public domain.

#### **[00:08:36.010]**

Later asked to present any evidence for this, with a few expletives, he admitted that he didn't have proof. It leaves, November 2, Infowars. November 4 it hits Breitbart. Who shares it on Breitbart? Eric Prince, the brother of Betsy DeVos. It's that Breitbart post that is shared 81,000 times. Goes back from Breitbart to Infowars. Now they're alleging that Hillary rapes and murders children. It goes up to the November 22. Info wars. He posts PizzaGate is real. November 27, he does a half an hour story, posts two videos. Again, no evidence. December 1, he posts. PizzaGate The big picture. By December 1, a man called Edgar Welch watches obsessively infowars. And on that day, he invades Comet ping pong. By this stage, that's a Pizza restaurant. They've chosen with an automatic rifle, a 00:38 handgun and a folding knife, and he finds pizza. This is how that story developed.

#### **[00:10:08.710]**

And I suppose my problem is that after yesterday's class, the feedback I hear from people is, okay, we agree with you, we agree with all your lines, but they're all the same. Infowars, CNN, they're all the same. Breitbart, MSNBC, they're all the same. And I'm saying that, no, we don't agree. Because this is not how journalism works. It's not how we got 1989. It's not how we understood 911.

#### **[00:10:42.590]**

Let me post another story, if you follow another story with me. There's a British MI6 officer. He's undercover in Moscow from 1990 to 1993 over the fall of the Soviet Union. He's in the crowd when Boris

Yeltsin climbs on top of an army tank and condemns the coup that overthrew Gorbachev for those three days. After he leaves Russia in 1993 he is a leader in their Russian department. By 2006, he's ahead of MI6's Russia desk. This man is Christopher Steele. Over all of those years, he maintained contacts with inside of the Kremlin. 1990 to 1993 stationed in Moscow. There is some evidence that he was on Putin's hit list. He works in the investigations with who Putin has been killing, the fellow that was given polonium in Britain. He's one of the first to recognize the Russian link with that. He undertakes in around 2010, those early years, he helps to uncover the FIFA scandal. If you don't know that, I don't blame you. It's the World's Football Association for soccer, huge, powerful body. And because of that, major heads role and presidents heads of state are shown to have engaged in bribery and corruption, including Vladimir Putin.

**[00:12:49.130]**

It's Christopher Steele that is able to demonstrate that the soccer World Cup held earlier this year by Russia. They got illegally, we're able to hold illegally through bribery. His cover is blown as an MI6 agent through no fault of his own. So he leaves MI6, he forms Orbis. And if you want to know where to find it, it's 9-11 Grosvenor Gardens, London. He's been employed by a number one independent research facility and then by the Democrat party to investigate Donald Trump and his ties to Russia. He writes a Steele dossier. Using the same contacts that he kept from 1990 through 2010, when he's working with MI6. And he writes the Steele dossier. By the way, this FIFA scandal is accurate. And that Steele dossier, he makes two allegations. One is collusion. One is that Vladimir Putin has dirt on Donald Trump. Blackmail material. We've proven one on the line. And if you don't think I can put Donald Trump in a hotel room with Russian women on a line, I can do that, and I will do that. Collusion and blackmail material. This then goes from the steel dossier through the FBI, the CIA, and Obama's desk.

**[00:14:43.410]**

All of those choose not to release it, because I don't want to be seen to release material that is giving them the impression of bias that can't be solidly proven. The FBI, the CIA, and Obama sit on it through the last months of the election. And never release it. So Christopher Steele, he gets so frustrated with the United States that he brings together the heads of Western media, the heads of Yahoo news, and these different news channels into one meeting room. Gives them the steel dossier and says, look through this. It's yours now. And through those heads, they start to pour through it. Most of them are too afraid to release it. BuzzFeed does. And it goes through so called fake news media. What I'm suggesting is that, no, they're not all the same. This is not this. And it might seem like it's political. I'm not arguing Democrat, Republican. I'm not going there. I think some of the strongest men standing up against the end of democracy are Republican. Robert Mueller is Republican. Rod Rosenstein is Republican. James Comey now names himself unaffiliated. He was Republican. And I admire those men. Whatever their morality is, I don't care.

**[00:16:18.790]**

This was prophetic. And in 2004, they restrained the Patriot Act. The reason I believe that this is important is because we have two very distinct streams of information. And you can mark those two streams beginning in 2014. One stream heads this way. We get to 2016, which is the battle Ipsus. And one stream says there was no collusion. It's all made up. They say deep state conspiracy. Democrat conspiracy. They

say it never happened. Another says, there was collusion between Russia and the United States. They say, sometimes jokingly, with a little bit of earnest in there, that this is the last President of the United States. They say in earnest that this is 1933 Germany all over again. And I would suggest that it's much 1933 as 1939 if you want to make a secondary application. They're saying that Donald Trump is compromised by Russia. My problem. This is the Battle of Ipsus. We're heading towards Raphia, and I'm saying nothing's going to change. When we get to Raphia, what war are we going to see? It's an information war. And where does information come from? Since 2014, it's come through two separate streams. We're not going to see a mushroom cloud in the sky.

**[00:18:56.960]**

We're not going to see the electrical grid go down. We're going to have to point people, and say, that was the battle of Raphia. And for a large part of the United States, their response will be, deep state conspiracy theory, never happened. Democratic Party, Clintons. Wherever you want to take that. And what makes us think we're going to recognize it? That we're going to accept what that means? The first act of every dictator is to restrain the press. And if we get to Raphia and we see these things, we can say, okay, he restrains the press. It doesn't matter. They were fake anyway. Okay. Russia has released information about him. None of it's true. Steep state conspiracy theory. We can actually walk through Raphia and reject it and not even see it. And this should wake us up to how scary the idea of information warfare is. This isn't peace and safety. We have to go to the Levites, the Nethinim, and 11th hour workers and hope that they recognize this. And if they're over here at Raphia, they're not going to see it. And if we're over here at Raphia, how much harder is it going to be for us to give our message and point to them, to the rise of a dictator, to the battle of Raphia, to information warfare. By Raphia we have to have this sorted out, because this information warfare isn't flying above our heads. It's in our heads. This is the battle for the mind, and it began in 2014. And if we failed 2016 and headed down this stream of information, then we need to sort that out and get back over here. It's this fake news that gave us 1969, 1979, 1989, 1990, 1991, 1996, 911, 2004, 2012, 2013, 2014 and 2016 correctly, and what makes us think that something changed?

**[00:21:10.670]**

Last point. I've said a few times, and I'm going to keep saying it, that it's nothing new. I'm not saying anything new. But there is a close relationship between internal and external. And around this period of time, internally we're saying we can't listen to man, we have to study for ourselves. That we just have to find out the information our own way. And externally, they're saying it's all fake news, we can't trust them anymore. We need to study for ourselves and to turn to new sites that offer us the real story that no one else is willing to tell us. And they're popping up everywhere. And I would suggest that's a counterfeit of the internal. I'd never wanted to have a message on politics.

**[00:22:00.090]**

And for me, this isn't about politics. It's about two streams of information. It's not about republic and a democrat. You find them on both sides.

**[00:22:16.240]**

I'll go back to revision. One thought about what we mean when we say a new mode of warfare. Is anything new under the sun? Nothing is new under the sun. When we say new mode of warfare, what do we mean? We're not talking about something that hasn't ever been seen before psychological warfare. Information warfare has been around as we saw since War in Heaven. I'd like to suggest that new mode of warfare is just its ultimate development. It's reached the pinnacle of what this mode of warfare can become. When you think of elephants, they've been riding pretty big horses into battle from very early on. When you face an elephant in battle, it's just a bigger horse. When you face an atomic bomb, it's just a much more developed Molotov cocktail. You have that same thought developed through new infrastructure, new constructions into its ultimate form. I just wanted to include that thought.

### **[00:23:33.610]**

So, revision of what we did yesterday. We picked up this. What's been in this movement for a long time, the invention of the World Wide Web. In 1989, we saw that this invention by Tim Berners Lee came out in a paper titled 'Information Management a Proposal'. This was on the back of ARPANET, the beginning of the Internet in 1969. In 1989 you have World Wide Web. 1990 Tim Burners Lee invents the first web browser. 1991, the web is released. What I didn't mention yesterday, the Gore bill passes. Which was the plan for the creation the information superhighway. You can mark 1989 to 1991. It is World Wide Web fall of the USSR, and it's also increase of knowledge. I find it so beautiful that at the increase of knowledge, which gives us everything for our reform line, there is this boom, also externally. Is the beginning of Russian hacking of US service. I read you a quote which said the future began with Moonlight Maze. 911, we looked at the Patriot Act and how that related to how they accessed, stored, and used your information that they're able to gather on the Internet. Built into the Patriot Act was 1979. The FISA court that was set up. Pretty much a tool to make it look like they're constitutionally correct. Really a fake court.

### **[00:25:38.240]**

You also have Smith versus Maryland. This was a court case that set the precedent for what the government could do with your information. The state won over the individual. He was trying to prevent them from being able to use his phone records in a court case against him. And when the state won this, it became much more common for them to access phone records for court cases. And what went from being phone records that they were gathering in 1979. In 911 it becomes your internet history and your email metadata. 2004 we see Patriot Act restrained by Comey and Mueller. The executive branch, and the Patriot Act. And this is pretty much where we left off yesterday. We started looking into 2014.

### **[00:26:40.970]**

So we're just about caught up. What I suggested yesterday was that the key to understanding the internal in 2014 is to understand the external. Sorry, the key to understanding the external of 2014 is to understand the internal. Because we know what we're heading for in 2014 is our Sunday Law that has implications for this movement and implications externally as well. If we track the internal and then we'll try and see if this applies to the external. Internally, we have a message developed in England. In 2012 that message enters the United States. 2013 we see the work of enemies internally, Path of the Just, etc. We also have, though, the arrival of the message of Ezra 7:9. 2014, our midnight. Ezra 7 goes public. It does its work in the movement. Over this time, the message from 2012 is rejected by the leadership.

Midnight was a successful way mark internally, I would suggest that there has to be a successful Sunday Law externally. And we want to trace that following the same thing that we've been developing from 1989 going back to 1969. Pulling that same thread. 2012, a Sunday Law would have two primary obstacles, that is, a Democrat president reelected in 2012. And a Democrat majority in the Senate. The second being the work of enemies in 2013. Edward Snowden. Then we went back. And to clarify. Maybe like everything else, that takes us back to our increase of knowledge. Nigel Oakes, who has a background in television production and psychology, establishes the Behavioral Dynamics Working Group at University College in London. 1989. Nigel Oakes. Behavioral Dynamics Working Group. This is a group formed to study the dynamics of behavior, just working through the name.

**[00:31:10.790]**

In 1990, he establishes the Behavioral Dynamics Institute. This has become, according to its own account, the leading international center of excellence for research and development into persuasion and social influence. It is the only academic organization in the world whose understanding of the psychology of persuasion has been successfully applied on a global scale. In 1992, Nigel Oakes, speaking to the trade magazine Marketing, says, "*we use the same techniques as Aristotle and Hitler. We appeal to people on an emotional level to get them to agree on a functional level.*" And in 1993, on the back of BDI, he sets up Strategic Communication Laboratory, SCL. How to communicate strategically. After initial commercial access with commercial advertising, they expanded into military and political arenas. And it became known for its involvement in military disinformation campaigns to social media branding and voter targeting. They were working particularly out of war zones in Afghanistan with Al Qaeda and all of that over across into the Iraq War. And were employed at one stage both by the Pentagon and the UK Ministry of Defense, advising them on the Afghanistan war in particular. I described to you a 2005 exhibit at the Defense and Security Equipment International where they showed how they worked to orchestrate sophisticated campaigns of mass deception.

**[00:33:24.070]**

At this stage, they certainly weren't working in the west in that way. But they're showing what they're wanting to branch into. And they said, this might sound altruistic, meaning selfless, but we also want to make money.

**[00:33:40.870]**

Could you repeat one more time what he does in 1993. Before you said that it's going to go into warfare with the SCL?

**[00:33:48.910]**

He establishes strategic Communication Laboratory as a company. Then yes. He's pretty much developing his theories here and then using all of this research later on in these companies, he's developing. It's doing this work from 1993 through to 2012. In 2012 they enter the US market. From England. After the 2012 election, Alexander Nix, the CEO, "*found an American marketplace far more receptive to his entreaties. The overseas work in conflict zones amounted to a promising calling card, a new comparative advantage over entrenched American political firms.*" He says, "*this is really trying to*

*use psychology to understand why hostile audiences do what they do. And to use this methodology to deconstruct that behavior and then use communication to try and change attitudes and ultimately behavior. Persuading someone to vote in a certain way is really very similar to persuading 14 to 25 year old boys in Indonesia to not join Al Qaeda. The Republicans had been left behind. Nick Slater said. By the time Romney lost in 2012, there was a vacuum. And so that was our commercial opportunity."* In 2013, we have two people enter the SCL scene. Those two people are Christopher Wylie and Steve Bannon.

### **[00:36:00.310]**

Chris Wylie and Steve Bannon. Chris Wylie is young, pink head, a little bit punk. But he's a computer genius, a data scientist who helped set up Cambridge Analytic as it develops from SCL. He taught himself code at a very young age, put himself through all these courses himself, and was just picked up by different campaigns, particularly in Canada, before he was introduced to Alexander Nix. And he quickly became a data scientist with their SCL and then their director of research. I think he's only about 30. The other person who comes in at 2013 is Steve Bannon. And I find this man particularly fascinating. He has a particular political theory. What I'm about to describe to you isn't his own. He's taken this from a book. But this is very much the message that he promulgates, and that is that we are currently living in the fourth Great Turning in American history. He believes that the first was the American Revolution, the first Great Turning. The second was the American Civil War. The third the Depression in World War II. And the fourth he just describes is right now. What we're currently seeing. I want to read you a couple of quotes from him.

### **[00:38:01.530]**

First of all, a few months ago, if you want a little bit of a viewpoint into his personality, he said, *"I would rather reign in hell than serve in heaven"*. He said, "I do not believe the mainstream media do not believe the establishment, do not believe the permanent political class. Fight and embedded aristocracy that is Stalingrad. Referring to the famous World War II battle where the Russian Red Army defeated the Nazis at Stalingrad. He became President Trump's chief political strategist. And once he proudly declared, *"I am Leninist"*. When questioned, what do you mean by that? He said, *"Lenin wanted to destroy the state, and that's my goal too. I wanted to bring everything crashing down and destroy all of today's establishment."* It's worth noting that two days after Lenin seized power in Russia, he began an assault on the press, the first work of the dictator. One of his first works was to censor them. Lenin described them as a weapon no less dangerous than bombs or guns aimed at us. So why should we place it in our enemy's hands? First assault is on the fake news media.

### **[00:39:24.410]**

How do you make sure America, if you're Steve Bannon, comes out on the right side of the fourth Great Turning? Steve Bannon believes that we are currently in a cultural and political war. He described America as a war zone and has for quite a while now. And he says that if you want to change politics, you first have to change culture. And if you want to change culture, Christopher Wylie then told him, you need to first understand the units of culture, which are people. So you first have to change the individual to change the culture, to change the politics. And how do you change people? It's all down to the information that you feed them. Steve Bannon quoted *"there is a growing global antiestablishment revolt against the*

*permanent political class at home and the global elites that influence them, which impacts everyone from Lubbock, Texas to London, England. We look at London and Texas as two fronts in our current cultural and political war.*" That quote is worth noting because he says London and Texas. And in London it's the same SCL, Cambridge Analytica who formed Aggregate IQ, who took over and won Brexit for the Yes campaign. Again orchestrated by Steve Bannon through Aggregate IQ, Cambridge Analytic, SCL. You can trace them back. He's been both involved in both Brexit and this campaign, as they are the two fronts of what he sees as the current war zone.

**[00:41:10.050]**

He has said that politics is a war. Christopher Wylie said to him. If you want to fight a culture war, where are your culture weapons? You have to have a weapon. This is what Steve Bannon thought SCL could build for him. But you need money to do this. So in 2013, Alexander Nix, the CEO taking Director of Research Christopher Wylie with him, flew to the United States to meet with Robert Mercer and his daughter Rebecca Mercer. Rebecca, famously known as the First Lady of the far right. Robert Mercer is an American computer science. He was an early developer in artificial intelligence. Co-CEO of Renaissance Technologies, a hedge fund, which made him a billionaire in the early 1990's. And he has the exact same world view as Steve Bannon. Sorry.

**[00:42:07.760]**

Do you know what year Bannon gets involved with SCL?

**[00:42:10.530]**

2013.

**[00:42:18.650]**

Alexander Nix, the CEO, sells this idea to Robert Mercer. And it's important to note that SCL, Cambridge Analytic, they have no political affiliation, no political preference. The only thing they can't do is work against England because so much of their staff are English. They don't want to do in England what they're doing on the rest of the world. But they're just mercenaries for hire. You pay the most that will work for you. And what they offered to do was to bring their idea of psychological profiling, everything that they had done in the war zones and developed into the election campaign. So Robert Mercer, he's also the main sponsor behind Breitbart News, and much of what I listed. This is happening in late 2013. The pitch that would bring in micro targeting of voters, which isn't new, by the way, with new ideas of psychological profiling based on masses of personal data, that is new. They are no longer targeting you as a voter, but as an individual and as a personality. They're targeting your personality. To do that, they would need masses of personal data to build a psychological profile on as many individual American citizens as they can.

**[00:43:49.210]**

Mercer likes it, and he invests \$15 million to form the company Cambridge Analytica from SCL, with a provision that it must be overseen by Steve Bannon. Steve Bannon quickly becomes the vice President of



Cambridge Analytica, and everything then is done under his watch. So, December 31, 2013, CA is formed as an offshoot of SCL overseen by Steve Bannon and funded by Robert Mercer. Let's map it. It's developed in England. 2012, it enters the US. That's according to the CEO. 2013, while all this is going on, you have Snowden making a storm for the government. And you have the forming of Cambridge Analytica. From 2012 with Obama. We see a Sunday Law at this time was rejected by the government. And I'm not trying to suggest that this warrior for civil liberties, but his hand is forced because of Snowden. When Snowden leaks that the US has been creating backdoors into some of the world's biggest companies, he not only has his population angry, he has Google, Yahoo, Facebook, all these other companies furious. And Snowden also leaks information that they've also been hacking the phone of Angela Merkel. And once you start being shown to be surveying not only your citizens, but foreign leaders and allies, then you're really in trouble.

**[00:45:57.510]**

So his hand is largely forced, but it's rejected by leaders. CA is formed 2013. Work of enemies. 2014, it does its work. And what I'd like you to see is that this work is a continuation of the same theme we've been tracking, particularly if you consider the work of the Patriot Act. The only difference being is that in this history, it has one peculiar characteristic, and that is that it doesn't come from the government. So to understand what they did in 2014, Christopher Wylie was their Director of Research. He became a whistleblower around last year. No, earlier this year, I think. The first of a few whistleblowers that have come forward. Alexander Nix, the CEO and the face of the company he's considered a digital celebrity. If there's anything you want to watch about this, look up 2016. And I think it should be titled on YouTube 'Online Marketing Rockstars Festival'. This is a festival where all the biggest heads of marketing meet and you have hundreds of people. 2017, he was a headline act. 2016, he's presenting on what Cambridge Analytica can do. At the very end, he references their campaign and he says, if you want to see how good we are. I'm paraphrasing. One of two candidates we're currently working for. There's a vote in a couple of weeks, and you see who wins. That was Donald Trump. But he shows in that video exactly how Cambridge Analytica works. So it's not very long and it's worth watching.

**[00:48:13.540]**

Christopher Wylie, Steve Bannon, Alexander Nix, who is the CEO. The other person I want you to have in mind is Mark Turnbull, because he's going to come up shortly, and he was the managing director for Cambridge Analytica. He tries to keep a quieter profile than that of Alexander Nix. So in 2014, Alexander Cogan strange spelling, partly because he's Russian, developed an app that allowed Cambridge Analytica to collect personal details on 80 million Facebook users. So if you consider what's happening under the patriot act, that's the extraction of your personal data against your will and against your knowledge. What 2014 had for us under Cambridge Analytica was personal data extracted without your will, permission, or knowledge. So Cogan develops an app that allows him to legally collect the personal data of 80 million Facebook users. When this story came out, Christopher Wylie wanted to be a little bit cautious because he wasn't sure of the exact number, and he said about 57 million.

**[00:49:57.860]**

So he took a very conservative approach. Later research shows the numbers about 80 million. And this is Americans. What they gathered was everything on Facebook that you've liked, your private messages, your status updates, everything. This data is then passed on to Cambridge Analytica. This whole operation costing them about \$1 million. According to Christopher Wylie. They then use this to create computer algorithms. And what they would do. Is having all these data points on a specific individual that would pass it through algorithms to create a personality profile that broke down the mental and emotional vulnerabilities of those people. He said that this was a method conducive to Steve Bannon's overall objective, which was, "a culture war". Quoting Christopher Wylie, *"this is an information war. Social media is the battleground, and you are the target. Your coworkers only see one side of you. Your family only sees one side of you, but a computer sees all sides of you."* The problem is, I find them quite boastful. So before they were caught out, they made quite a lot of claims about themselves that I struggled to believe are totally true. And one of the things they claimed, they boasted of having up to 4000 to 5000 data points on 126,000,000 Americans.

### **[00:51:40.350]**

That data let's say it's me, they would have 4000 to 5000 data points. One data point might be my home address, what car I drive, what church I go to. They have all the television programs I've watched online, a status update I posted, something I shared on Twitter, all of those things. They can buy that data if you have the right connections fairly easily, especially if you want to use less legal means. They have not only data science, scientists and psychologists working for them, but strategists, creative designers, videographers photographers, et cetera. So what they would do is they would find my personal weakness, going by those 4000 to 5000 data points, pass it through an algorithm, find out my deepest known fears, according to Alexander Nix, fears I don't even know I have. And then they would create something ad based, anything that they thought would target that personal emotional vulnerability. And then they would send that out to my Facebook profile in the mail, whatever way they thought I could be accessed. And they're not doing this for large groups of the population. They're doing this in some cases individual on individual. So they would find out what kind of message you are susceptible to, including the topics, the content, the tone, how it is framed, what colors they should use, its psychological effect.

### **[00:53:17.460]**

It had to be either fear based, values based, et cetera. And then they would calculate other things. How many times would you need to see this message in a slightly different way to touch you with that message, to change your thinking even a little bit? Channel Four News started investigating this. This is from England. This is an England news site. They just decided to undertake a secret investigation over about four months. What they pretended to be was a foreign client wanting help in an upcoming election. I think he claimed to be in the upcoming Nigerian election and he wanted to employ Cambridge Analytica to run his election campaign. And they wore secret cameras and then met with Mark Turnbull and Alexander Nix. And I want to quote to you a couple of the things that these men said. Mark Turnbull said, *"the two fundamental human drivers when it comes to taking information on board effectively, are hopes and fears. And many of those are unspoken or even unconscious. You didn't know that was a fear until you saw something that just evoked that reaction from you. And our job is to get it. Is to drop that bucket farther down the well than anybody else, to understand what are those really deep seated underlying*

fears and concerns. It is no good fighting an election campaign on the facts because actually it is all about emotion."

**[00:54:51.550]**

When intelligence gathering is mentioned, Mark Turnbull said, *"we have relationships and partnerships, specialist organizations that do that kind of work. You know who the opposition is, you know their secrets, you know their tactics. There are various intelligence gathering organizations that operate very discreetly to find information like that. And this has to happen without anyone thinking, oh, that's propaganda. Because the moment you think that is propaganda, the next question is, who put it out? So we have to work very subtly. We have to be very subtly."* Alexander Nix says, *"we are not only the largest and most significant political consultancy in the world, but we have the most established track record."* I'd like to note that track record is mostly in developing countries, south America majorly. *"We're used to operating through different vehicles in the shadows,"* he continues to say. When asked about digging on opponents, he says, *"we do a lot more than that. But, you know, equally effective can be just to go and speak to the incumbents and to offer them a deal that is too good to be true and make sure that his video recorded."*

**[00:56:03.960]**

And he continues to speak about entrapments sending women around to an opponent's house with hidden cameras. Offering them a financial deal, etc. And Mark Turnbull says, *"it sounds like a dreadful thing to say this, but these are things that don't necessarily need to be true as long as they're believed."* Alexander Nix: *"so often we set up"* this is when they go into foreign countries. *"If we are working, then we can set up fake IDs and websites. We can go into students doing research projects attached to the university. We can be tourists. There's so many options we can look at. I've had lots of experience in this.* And that's how they can deny that they ever worked on the Brexit campaign. That they say they have no link to Aggregate IQ, which ran the Brexit campaign. The only problem is, Aggregate IQ uses the Cambridge Analytical Letterhead in their personal memos. And their CEO is on file as employed by Cambridge Analytica, and his title is Cambridge Analytic Canada. Which is Aggregate IQ.

**[00:57:28.360]**

What role did they play in Donald Trump's election? They're doing something else in 2014 that I would like to note. December 8 of 2016. This is after he's already won. Donald Trump says the following. I'm going to paraphrase it a little bit. Just add a couple of unimportant words because his sentences do not flow. He says, *"Funny how that term has caught on. I tell everyone that I hated this term. Somebody said to me to say, Drain the swamp. I said, Oh, that's so hokey. That is so terrible. But I said, all right, I'm going to try it. So a month ago, I said, Drain the swamp. And the place went crazy. I said, Wow, what is this? Then I said, Drain the swamp again. Then I started saying it like I meant it. And then I said it. I started loving it. And the place loved it. I mean, it's true. It's drain the swamp. I mean, it's true. It's true."* He's backtracking now. But I like when he says, then I had to start saying it like I meant it. He never came up with these phrases. Who gave the phrase to him drain the swamp in the first place?

**[00:58:43.370]**

Christopher Wylie says, "Early 2014, Cambridge Analytica began testing messages designed to tap into particular fears. And they're testing this on the American public. Immigration fears, anti government sentiment, an affinity for strongman leaders. They're putting out into the deep Internet phrases like 'build the wall', 'drain the swamp', 'race realism'. And what they're then seeing is how much traction these phrases get and the emotional response. It also surveyed opinions about Vladimir Putin. So they're testing drain the swamp, build the wall as early as 2014, the same year Russia starts launching its Social Media influence campaign. And these slogans became the bedrock for Donald Trump's platform.

Christopher Wylie: "we are testing all kinds of messages, all kinds of imagery, which included images of walls. So they're putting out images that their data team have developed of people scaling walls and just tracking the response and phrases, 'drain the swamp', and also 'deep state'. The idea that the NSA is watching you or that the government is conspiring against you. This is all what they're testing for, and the emotional response. I quote Wylie, *"a lot of these narratives, which at the time would have seemed crazy for mainstream candidates to run on, those were the things that we were finding. There were pockets of Americans who this really appealed to."*

#### **[01:00:26.210]**

Wylie said: "Bannon's push for the Trump campaign to endorse far right positions on issues like immigration and law enforcement largely stem from Cambridge Analytic 2014 research. 2016, Cambridge Analytica becomes head of data operations. Trump aide told that the firm played a key role in identifying political donors as well. Worth noting. Alexander Nix, speaking of Trump's campaign, says, *"we did all the research, all the data, all the analytics, all the targeting. We run all the digital campaign, the television campaign, and our data informed all of the strategy."* Christopher Wylie says *"this is the weapon that Steve Bannon wanted to build to fight in his culture war. And that weapon is developed in 2014"*.

#### **[01:01:35.350]**

I want to take a step back for a moment. I've quoted quite a few people. And I want to suggest how we can see a credible source when we have one. If you don't mind, I'll rub this out. I need the space. So on one side, you have Cambridge Analytica and Alexander Nix. He's a spokesperson and the one who has been in the most trouble because of this.

#### **[01:02:27.020]**

On the other side you have Christopher Wylie, young pinkhaired fellow. How do you know who to believe? Alexander Nix says, this whole narrative never happened. It's all lies. And Christopher Wylie is a disgruntled former employee. He said Cambridge Analytica never worked in the Kenyan election. He said Facebook data was useless when they received it and not used. He said, they didn't store that data, it was deleted. He said they have no ties to Aggregate IQ who run the Brexit campaign. He said they have no connection to Russia, never worked or briefed any Russian company. I don't believe this was orchestrated by Russia. I do want to suggest Russia knew in 2014 what Cambridge Analytical was doing, because Cambridge Analytical was giving debrief to a Russian oil company, Lukoil. Christopher Wylie says they worked in Africa and Kenya. They kept and used Facebook data, and Russia is listed as a foreign client of Cambridge Analytica and gave insider information they gave insider information on the US election to a Russian oil company Luke Oil. Also noting Aggregate IQ.

**[01:05:21.890]**

Mark Turnbull, Managing Director of CA, is on tape saying, *'the Kenyatta campaign in Kenya, which we ran in 2013 and 2017 for Kenyatta. We rebranded his entire party twice, written their manifesto, done two rounds of 50,000 surveys, huge amounts of research, analysis, messaging. Then we'd write all of his campaign speeches. And we'd stage the whole thing. So just about every element of his campaign.'* Never worked in Kenya. That's on video. It's not through any other source.

**[01:06:07.330]**

An email sent from Cambridge to Alexander Cogan surfaced in the investigation that followed. September 17 of 2014. They say, *"we're really pleased that despite the challenges and hiccups along the way, we were able to forge ahead with the Facebook harvesting and modeling. And we are working with the data in many different ways now. I think we can all be proud of the work completed thus far, and we are getting very positive feedback from our clients."* Christopher Wylie also makes a solid argument that their entire company of Cambridge Analytica is formed on algorithms that they developed from that Facebook data. So even if it is deleted, it's still built into their company. And he has papers and files to show that it was kept. Aggregate IQ set up in 2013 say they are 100% Canadian. Have never had a contract with Cambridge Analytica, are not the de facto Canadian branch of Cambridge Analytica or SCL. Problem. September 2014 documents of Aggregate IQ have Cambridge Analytica's logo.

**[01:07:26.080]**

March 2014 documents outlined how Aggregate IQ will provide SCL with an engagement platform using SCL's modeling data. July 2014. An internal staff list from SCL lists the president of Aggregate IQ, Zach Massingham, as head of SCL Canada. *"An intellectual property agreement by which Aggregate IQ licensed data to SCL, ends that Aggregate IQ developed software and code later used by SCL. According to Christopher Wylie, Aggregate IQ helped to distribute content during the last Nigerian election in support of Good Luck Jonathan. These videos they distributed were reportedly to intimidate voters and included gruesome videos of people being dismembered and threatening messages."* This is how they worked out of Africa. Aggregate IQ say that SCL provided them those violent videos to use in Nigeria, but that they refused to use them. That's their tactics when they're under a little bit of less observation. Alexander Nix says, we don't have any relationship with Russian or Russian individuals. A set of slides developed by Cambridge Analytica showing election tactics in Africa have been prepared to give a demonstration to Luke Oil. A client map of SCL on their websites has Russia highlighted as a client. I'm not suggesting Russia's behind this.

**[01:09:03.400]**

I'm just suggesting that one side is telling the truth and one side is lying. So when he goes on and says further things that maybe aren't so easy to prove yet, the very least, you know, you have a reliable source. This is for the most part, how I've tried to use media. This is how I choose to look at Christopher Wylie, how I suggest we should be looking at Christopher Steele. So what we see is the development of information warfare. 1969 the beginning of the Internet, 1979 the FISA Court set up. So much is going on in this history already. At the same time, we have the development of the World Wide Web. In England,

people are developing how to use this information to manipulate. 1990, first web browser. 1991 it's released and the information superhighway begins construction. Nigel Oakes building his company up to 1993 to create 'Strategic Communications Laboratories'. Which begins its seriously dirty information war in foreign wars and then in foreign elections. Russia comes into play, and it begins attacking. 911, we have the Patriot Act. The taking of individual people's personal data without their consent, without a reason to do that, and without their knowledge.

**[01:10:50.230]**

2004, we have James Comey and Robert Mueller restraining that Patriot Act. And the executive branch. SCL enters the US market in 2012. 2013, Cambridge Analytica is formed. 2014, it builds what is being described here as a culture weapon. Internally, a message enters the US. We have rejection by the leadership. Path of the Just, the work of enemies. 2014 successfully midnight for us, regardless of these influences. Ezra 7:9 comes into this movement in 2013, and it really goes public in the movement in 2014. Externally, message from England enters the US market. Company from England enters the US market in 2012, SCL elections. 2013, Cambridge Analytica is formed. The same time you have the work of enemies. Snowden and Obama. Rejection by leadership. And then in 2014, Cambridge Analytica does its work. It builds this culture weapon. And all of this is a set up for 2016. For the 2016 election. 1996 was testing ground. 2014 was testing ground. And it was all to lead up to this election. If you don't mind, we might close earlier today. I want to start a new subject tomorrow. You have a question? Yes.

**[01:13:17.700]**

What exactly was rejected by the leadership in 2014? I'm unclear as to what the external rejection was.

**[01:13:40.000]**

I'm suggesting they're fighting against the Patriot Act.

**[01:13:45.750]**

No further extension of the Patriot Act can come into that history because of the work of Snowden. Because of what he leaked, it can't continue. So it just has those obstacles, those elements.

**[01:14:02.530]**

What year did we put the Freedom Act in yesterday?

**[01:14:05.190]**

Freedom Act 2015. So I'd like to note the USA Freedom Act. It's not the Patriot Act, it kind of is the Patriot Act 2.0. But it has brought in a couple of at least seeming reforms. So when they were in this history, gathering mass data into one database, that's now illegal. They don't have your phone records. They don't have any of that information. What they can now do is buy an order from the FISA Court, go to your phone company and ask for it, which they then have to give. But there's a few more steps in place. It's not gathered into one location. Also, the FISA Court is less secret. In some cases, another judge or lawyer is

allowed in to witness the proceedings. And if changes are made to how that FISA Court operates, they have to be made public. In some cases, when your information is given over by your phone company, before it was illegal for them to tell you, now, in many cases, they can actually make that information public. So there's been reforms put in place. Many people say those reforms are meaningless. I kind of think that's a little true.

**[01:15:25.090]**

I don't think that the Freedom Act really changed much at all. It's my personal opinion. Yes.

**[01:15:35.110]**

Two things, one question, one thought. I didn't fully understand the rejection of the leadership. Because Obama was part of restraining the Patriot Act and he's being rejected as leadership?

**[01:15:47.360]**

No, the leadership is rejecting. Obama rejected it, and the majority in the Senate. He rejected any further work on the Patriot Act?

**[01:15:59.680]**

Okay, got that. And a thought I had. A while ago, and I don't remember quite the story, but the class can help me. We had this study on Constantinople and how Constantinople was taken down. There was the cannon maker which wakes up at midnight, and he creates this new big weapon. Is that 2014?

**[01:16:22.630]**

Sounds like it. Fits to me. That's interesting. So what line is that?

**[01:16:27.900]**

Could somebody help.

**[01:16:28.710]**

Revelation 9.

**[01:16:29.790]**

Okay. Right. I haven't heard of that before, but it sounds quite neat. Any other thoughts or comments? Yes.

**[01:16:41.810]**

Are you planning on going a little deeper into the connection between 2014 Cambridge Analytica doing its work and how that is a Sunday Law? How do you connect those things? How is that corporation the Sunday Law?

**[01:17:03.870]**

My suggestion to that is that a Sunday Law is the breakdown of the US Constitution, which is exactly what we saw under the Patriot Act. None of which is possible without 1989 and the development of this history. What Cambridge Analytica did was essentially what the Patriot Acts did, except they weaponized that information and used it in 2016.

**[01:17:48.340]**

So are you saying the Cambridge Analytica thing is the Sunday Law? Or are you saying the Freedom Act is the Sunday Law connected to Cambridge Analytica in terms of the way, the method and the use of the data?

**[01:18:05.070]**

I don't really want to stick to terms like Sunday Law rigidly. But the Freedom Act, I can't look at it as a Sunday Law when it's actually wind back of this one. If it's wound back, I can't see any progress there. And I'm marking Cambridge Analytic in 2014.

**[01:18:26.000]**

So you don't want to say Sunday Law rigidly, because in this case, it's not an actual law. You're marking just the progressive breakdown of the Constitution as seen here in the cyber world primarily. That's it?

**[01:18:39.700]**

Yeah.

**[01:18:40.070]**

Okay.

**[01:18:40.810]**

Pretty much. Shall we close in prayer.

**[01:18:46.270]**

Dear Father in Heaven, thank you, Lord, for our blessings. Thank you for that increase of knowledge, Lord, that gave all of us hope. Thank you for what is embedded in that history that has brought life and these truths and messages, this revival to your people. I pray, Lord, that we will learn from our history, from 1989 forwards. That we won't make mistakes that we've made in the past. Lord, that we will understand what has happened in our past histories. Particularly the history we've looked at today. That



as we face the same mode of warfare, the same battle ahead of us, that we will be prepared in heart and mind to have the right response when we see those things come to pass. I pray, Lord, for our family and our friends, for others in this movement, Lord, those who are new. Those who are battling, Lord, that they will love Your truth and hold onto those lines. I pray all of this in Jesus holy name. Amen.