

The Machinery of Modern Censorship

By White Wolf

Censorship rarely storms through the front door. It slips quietly into public life wearing the mask of safety, progress, or benevolence. Over time, I have watched the contours of public discourse shrink as governments, corporations, and cultural institutions work in concert to police speech and regulate thought. But censorship does not stand alone; it is part of a larger architecture that includes **propaganda, social engineering, linguistic manipulation, and legal redefinition**. These forces form a lattice of control—subtle in their presentation, sweeping in their effect.

Here, I examine these interconnected forces from the perspective of an educator who has spent years studying how power constructs illusion. My aim is not simply to critique but to illuminate: **to show how censorship functions as both a symptom and a tool of modern authority**, and why understanding its mechanisms is vital if we intend to remain free-thinking human beings in an age that increasingly prefers compliant subjects.

The Decline of Propaganda and the Turn Toward Force

For much of the twentieth century, propaganda was an art form. Skilled strategists—people who understood psychology, linguistics, and the rhythms of human behaviour—crafted narratives that guided public perception without overt coercion. Figures like Edward Bernays understood that **people rarely interrogate their beliefs; they absorb whatever is repeated with confidence and emotional resonance**. Governments, corporations, and intelligence agencies built vast industries around this principle, shaping everything from wartime morale to consumer behaviour.

But **propaganda requires talent**. It demands minds capable of subtlety and nuance. In recent years, that talent has evaporated. The departure of competent thinkers, replaced by ideologically selected bureaucrats, has drained the system of the very intelligence it once relied upon. Institutions now prioritize compliance over expertise, signaling virtue rather than achieving results. The consequences are predictable: **propaganda has become clumsy, contradictory, and embarrassingly transparent**.

Instead of persuasion, we get slogans. Instead of reasoning, we get threats disguised as moral imperatives. The machinery of influence, once staffed by cunning professionals, now wheezes and sputters under the weight of its own incompetence.

And when persuasion fails, **power reaches for its cruder cousin: censorship**.

Censorship is not the first choice of a confident

Modern governments have already criminalized speech in areas ranging from medical policy to historical interpretation. Each new restriction is sold as narrow and necessary. The pattern is subtle but unmistakable: **censorship begins at the margins**. Once the principle is established—that certain thoughts may be forbidden—the net expands. **Soon, criticism of institutional incompetence becomes suspect. Then political dissent.**

Then skepticism of the regime itself.

The most revealing feature of this trend is **the near-total silence of opposition parties**. They do not challenge the principle; they merely quarrel over the parameters. The supposed left-right spectrum dissolves when **both sides agree that free expression is conditional upon government approval**.

Censorship is not merely about controlling speech. **It is about controlling the boundaries of thought**. Once a population internalizes that certain questions cannot be asked, the state no longer needs to police every conversation. **People censor themselves**.

When a government begins criminalizing opinions, **the trajectory is predictable**. What begins with fines and bans quickly evolves into surveillance, prosecution, and imprisonment.

Totalitarianism grows through incremental restrictions that the public accepts piece by piece.

Confusion, Contracts, and the Language of Control

Censorship in the public square is only one layer of control. Another layer is embedded in the very structure of law. Our modern legal and administrative frameworks are built on **linguistic sleight of hand—definitions that appear straightforward but conceal deeper transformations of meaning**.

The heart of the matter is the concept of confidence, the very root of the word “con.” A confidence game is a system designed to obtain something valuable by gaining the target’s trust. Governments operate using precisely this principle. They build systems that appear benign, neutral, or helpful, but in practice, **these systems extract rights, property, or autonomy through redefinition**.

Consider the distinction between “valuable con-

See ‘Governments Blurred Definitions’ p.3



institution. It is the last refuge of a failing one. When a government or corporate structure can no longer win arguments through skill, it simply forbids the argument altogether. **The shift from propaganda to censorship is therefore not a mark of strength but of deep institutional panic.**

Censorship: The Operating System of Fragile Power

Censorship is always justified with noble language. Every tyrant in history has claimed to protect the public from dangerous ideas. In our age, the vocabulary has changed—“misinformation,” “disinformation,” “hate speech,” “extremism”—but the principle remains. These terms are elastic, malleable, and ultimately **defined by those in authority**. If a government declares that two plus two equals five, then the statement “two plus two equals four” can be labeled harmful misinformation. If the ruling class embraces an ideology built upon contradiction, **anyone pointing out the contradiction becomes a danger to public order**.

Advertisement

VACCINE INJURY · CANCER PREVENTION / HEALING & MORE
FREE 15 MINUTE PHONE CALL WITH
A FORMER REGISTERED NURSE
250.444.EZRA(3972) SCHEDULE TODAY AT
EZRAHEALING.COM



If you or your family is suffering from **VACCINE INJURY** and/or **CANCER** we are here to help you heal!

Is Canada Communist?

By Gerald Heinrichs

During one of his 2023 broadcasts, Joe Rogan declared “*Canada is communist.*” More recently, author Kim Thuy said, “*Canada is more communist than Vietnam.*” And Olympian-pundit Theo Fleury wrote, “The Communist takeover of Canada is complete.”

Some Canadians might be alarmed and wonder how people can say such things. But on the other hand, could there be good reasons for these remarks?

For example, perhaps the accusers see **parallels between Canada’s mainstream media and communist state-controlled media** like China’s *People’s Daily* or the Soviet *TASS*. That’s because in 2025, Canada’s government paid over \$220 million to the Canadian Media Fund and the Canadian Journalism Collective. And that was in addition to \$1.24 billion paid to CBC. The accusers would argue that **much of what Canadians call news today, is paid for and regulated by the government.**

Or maybe the accusers are looking at the Soviet Cheka, which arrested dissident writers, or the Soviet Glavlit, which censored what could be published and read. And perhaps they see **similarities to the disturbing laws now pushing through Canada’s parliament** and framing up the same prosecutions here. An article in *The Atlantic* says Canadians are seeing an “Extremist Attack on Free Speech,” and the *National Post* says it is an “extremely dangerous assault on religious freedom.”

Or the accusers may **recall the demolition of statues, street names, and holidays during the Bolshevik Revolution.** Or the infamous “Destroy the Four Olds” campaign during the Chinese Cultural Revolution, seeking to destroy old ideas, culture, customs, and habits. Author Jamie Glazov writes, “The lust for destruction is the root of Marxism.” And maybe the accusers see **parallels to the tear-down and cancel culture in Canada these last 10 years**, cheered on by many of today’s leaders.

Or maybe the accusers recall the **government gun confiscations in Bulgaria and East Germany** that happened after the communists came to power. And they might see similarities with **Canada’s ongoing**

“gun grab” against lawful owners—ever-tightening policies that “*criminalize responsible citizens,*” says Alberta premier Danielle Smith.

Or perhaps the accusers are referring to the **prolific destruction of Christian churches by commu-**



nists in Romania and North Korea, let alone the many destructions during the Russian Revolution and the Chinese Cultural Revolution. And perhaps they see similarities to the **200 recent church attacks in Canada**—attacks brushed off with blindness and indifference by many leaders. Even the *New York Post* reported the “weak response to religious arson has been alarming.”

Or perhaps the accusers are looking at countries

like **Cuba and North Korea that created massive government bureaucracies, hand in hand with communist regimes.** And maybe they compare this to Canada, where, according to *The Globe and Mail*, the **federal workforce has grown by 100,000 since 2015**, and with such wantonness, there are “managers managing managers.”

Or maybe the accusers are examining how, during the last elections, **Canada’s own Communist Party campaigned in support of climate action, CBC funding, and opposing US influence, such that there appears to be less and less difference with Canada’s Liberal government.**

Maybe the accusers are troubled that **Canada is now pivoting away from the US and towards communist China.** As *Politico* reports, “Canada says its friendship with the US is ‘over’” and as Mark Carney recently boasted, “*The new Canadian government places high importance on its relations with China.*”

Or perhaps the accusers are looking at the Soviet Comintern, which **sought to establish a world unified party.** And maybe they see similarities in how **Canada’s Liberal government signs up for almost every cause put forward by today’s globalist packs.**

Or maybe the accusers are alarmed that all these things are happening slowly, through **quiet regulation and radical laws easing in over months or years.** And perhaps they observe that, because of this slowness, **many Canadians deny there are any problems.** And on that issue, perhaps the accusers read author James Lindsay speaking about “Communism in slow motion” and Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, who warns that “**Communism is breathing down the neck of all moderate forms of socialism.**”

Consequently, many Canadians have reasons to claim that **Canada is on the wrong path.** Meanwhile, others reject these fears, claiming they are flawed descriptions of a “moderate liberal country” that has a “mixed economy.”

So the two opinions stand far apart, and the disagreement is large. And that clash, one against the other, might define much of Canada’s political news in 2026.

Gerald Heinrichs is a lawyer in Regina, Saskatchewan.

- The City of Calgary has passed a new flag policy. **City Hall flag displays are now limited to Canadian, provincial and municipal flags.** When introducing the motion, Councillor Dan McLean explained that flag raisings should be limited to symbols that unite *all* Calgarians. While not explicitly stated, this should put an end to rainbow flags.

- **A Canadian judge has dismissed a demand from Canadian government lawyers to seize Freedom Convoy leader Chris Barber’s “Big Red” semi-truck.** She ruled that the court is already “satisfied” with Barber’s sentence and taking away his very livelihood would be “disproportionate.”

- **In a major shift, the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention has ended its long-standing recommendation that all newborns receive the Hepatitis B vaccine within 24 hours of birth.** Instead, for babies born to mothers who test negative for Hep B, the CDC now says the decision should be made by parents together with their physician. The Hep B shot given at birth has always been controversial because infants are at extremely low risk, and original clinical trials followed infants for mere days, with virtually zero long-term safety studies.

- **Florida takes on the pediatric gender industry:** Florida Attorney General James Uthmeier has filed a sweeping lawsuit against the American Academy of Pediatrics, the World Professional Association for Transgender Health, and the Endocrine Society, accusing them of misleading the public about the safety of “gender-affirming” medical interventions for minors. The suit alleges the groups pushed irreversible treatments on confused children to serve ideological and financial interests, despite no credible evidence supporting their claims. Florida says their conduct violates consumer-protection laws, amounts to racketeering and is seeking \$1 million in penalties per organization, plus \$10,000 for every misleading claim about the safety or reversibility of these treatments.

- In a major victory for religious freedom that highlights the real risks of vaccine mandates in education and healthcare, the University of Colorado Anschutz **School of Medicine has agreed**

FREEDOM WINS!

to pay over \$10.3 million in damages, tuition, and legal fees to 18 students and staff who were denied religious exemptions to its COVID-19 vaccination mandate.

- **The US State Department has ordered a visa ban on foreign “censorship” workers,** targeting content moderators and fact-checkers accused of suppressing Americans’ free speech—a move supporters say reclaims digital sovereignty and pushes back against global speech policing.

- **Jury holds Johnson & Johnson accountable for talc cancer cover-up.** A Los Angeles jury has awarded \$40 million to two women who developed ovarian cancer after decades of using Johnson & Johnson’s talcum-based baby powder. Jurors found the company failed to warn consumers about known cancer risks and instead worked to suppress the truth. According to trial testimony, J&J withheld critical safety information, manipulated scientific research, and misled regulators for years to protect profits.

- **House votes to protect kids from medical gender interventions.** The US House has passed the *Protect Children’s Innocence Act*, banning puberty blockers, cross-sex hormones, and gender surgeries for minors. The bill passed 216–211 and now heads to the Senate.

- In a moment that marks a historic rupture with more than a decade of ideologically driven medical policy, **the US Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) formally declared that so-called “gender-affirming care” for minors is unsafe, ineffective, and constitutes chemical and surgical mutilation—and will no longer be permitted, funded, or protected by the federal government.**

- **The US Department of Health and Human Services has terminated roughly \$19 million in federal grants to the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP), citing growing concerns over the organization’s drift from evidence-based medicine toward ideological advocacy.** Officials pointed specifically to the AAP’s promotion of

gender-affirming medical interventions for minors, its prolonged school masking guidance despite limited evidence of benefit, and COVID-19 vaccine recommendations for infants that exceeded federal guidance.

- **A multi-state push for a moratorium on mRNA is now underway.** Lawmakers from Michigan, Minnesota, Idaho, and Washington have launched a coordinated push to halt mRNA injections, marking the first multi-state effort of its kind. Elected officials cited vaccine injuries, public distrust, and suppressed scientific debate as driving forces behind the movement. Proposals include classifying mRNA shots under existing bio-weapons laws, restricting their use, and passing county-level resolutions warning residents.

- **YouTube quietly reinstates “disinformation” channels.** Without fanfare, YouTube has unblocked two prominent voices it censored during the pandemic: activist Ronnie “Rizza” Islam and Sayer Ji, founder of *GreenMedInfo* and co-founder of *Stand for Health Freedom*. Both were members of the so-called “Disinformation Dozen,” a label used to justify widespread censorship—yet YouTube now admits neither violated its rules. Earlier this year, Alphabet Inc.—the parent company of Google and YouTube—acknowledged in an official letter to Congress that it had removed content, not because it was false or unlawful, but due to coercion from federal officials.

- **Alberta Premier Danielle Smith says the province will move to ensure people who defend their homes from unlawful intruders are not automatically charged,** framing the change as a clarification of self-defence law often referred to as a “castle doctrine” approach.

- President Donald Trump signed a memo **seeking to align US childhood vaccine recommendations with best practices in developed countries, where children receive fewer vaccines** than in the United States. Trump said further study is needed to ensure Americans receive “*scientifically-supported medical advice.*” Currently, the United States gives the most injections and doses, followed by Canada.

Coastal First Nations: A Well-Funded Activist Network, Not A Representative Authority

By Larke Newell

Horror, revulsion, and shame exploded throughout Canada in the aftermath of the alleged gruesome discovery of 215 buried indigenous children at the former Kamloops Residential School. The opinions of other countries followed suit.

As a result, vengeance was swift, although neither legal nor logical, in the form of vandalism and arson towards churches throughout Canada.

The government initially allocated \$7.9 million and later increased it to \$12.1 million to the local First Nations for the recovery of the remains. Eventually, that amount grew to \$320 million nationwide.

Now, five years later, **no confirmed remains or forensic evidence have been forthcoming.** In fact, shockingly, **not one shovel of dirt has been turned.** Initial funding allocated for excavation, archival research, and site security was diverted: \$405,000 for administration, \$37,500 for marketing, \$100,000 for the employment of two trauma counsellors for six months, and \$54,000 for travel. In blatant disregard for the task at hand, \$532,000 was used for publicists, architects, and engineers for long-term projects, including a museum, a Healing Centre, and a nursing home for indigenous elders. **No remains or body parts, no forensic evidence, no transparency whatsoever.**


Fueled by public outrage, the Department of Crown-Indigenous Relations attempted to obtain information on the excavation project but was rebuffed. Finally, the information was obtained from the Information Commissioner.

At the core of this issue is a fundamental misrepresentation. Contrary to mainstream media reports and insinuations, **Coastal First Nations is not what it claims to be. It is a well-funded activist group, not a band or bands.** Its original name is the Great Bear Initiative Society, and it is based in Vancouver at the corner of Granville and West Hastings. **It got its seed money from wealthy left-wing, anti-oil American foundations** such as the Rockefeller Brothers Foundation and the Tides Foundation.

At the centre of this episode is Roseanne Casimir, chief of the Kamloops Indian Band. She has done more harm to both the band and Canada's reputation than

anyone and has destroyed any foreseeable chance of healing for indigenous Canadians. This is the woman who, on May 27, 2021, announced the horrifying scenario of “*confirmed*” remains of children aged three years and older. Since that fateful day, **she has manipulated the government into paying millions of dollars and fraudulently misused those funds.** The only media she will invite to her publicity events are mainstream government lapdogs, such as the *CBC*, thus perpetuating her myth.

Never has she mentioned that the late Liberal cabinet minister and senator Leonard Marchand Sr. was once a student at the very school she is maligning, and



that he had nothing but praise for his time there.

This conduct does not exist in isolation. It reflects the broader activist infrastructure, funding networks, and political strategies employed by the Coastal First Nations organization itself.

Not only should this woman resign, but she must be held accountable for perpetuating this nightmare. As well, **she and her band of thieves must be made to repay the millions of dollars they received from taxpayers** for excavating that has yet to be carried out.

The same activist network responsible for shaping the Kamloops narrative has also played a central role in obstructing Canada's energy development.

Unfortunately, this was not the only damage done by this organization. Next on the list is the pipeline debacle. **These same left-wing foundations have**

donated millions to stop all oil and gas production in Canada. For many years, **they have sown their seeds and wreaked havoc:**

- In 2008, they organized a smear against Canada's tar sands in northern Alberta, as well as demonstrating against the Northern Gateway pipeline project.
- In 2014, the executive director of Coastal First Nations threatened the project with indigenous resistance. What many did not realize is that **most of the indigenous communities along the proposed route supported the pipeline.** This subterfuge is ongoing. Curiously, both this activist group and the BC government believe that they have veto power over the building of a pipeline. However, in actuality, the law states that this is not true. **They have no say whatsoever in the matter.**

Once again, the mainstream media is continuing to push the narrative that all First Nations people are against any resource development projects, but **this is patently untrue.** Not a word is mentioned about this, and **the indigenous people who try to speak up are simply ignored.**

The passage of DRIPA, or the Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act, introduced what is effectively a claim that all Canadian land—especially that in BC—is owned by First Nations bands and must be returned to them. **Consequently, no one can develop or do anything on said lands without their permission, while government funding is treated as unlimited**

and ongoing. This has created an untenable situation, prompting virtue-signalling ideologues and instigators such as BC Premier David Eby to call for a repeal, but the chiefs and council—once again aided by the Coastal First Nations group—respond with fierce and uncompromising threats.

In conclusion, **this group of well-paid activists has inflicted horrific pain on the indigenous families involved in the residential school fiasco by perpetuating a terrible scam. The pipeline holdup and the land grab are more of the same, with dire results for the country.**

*Further information can be found in the book **Grave Error** by C.P. Champion and Tom Flanagan, and in the documentary film **Making a Killing** by Dallas Brodie and others, available on YouTube.*

Governments Blurred Definitions

Continued from p.1

sideration” and the watered-down notion of “consideration.” Historically, both parties had to exchange something of real value. But over time, governments blurred the definition, allowing arrangements in which **one party receives tangible benefit while the other gains only symbolic or hypothetical advantage.** Such contracts, were they between private citizens, would be considered unconscionable. Yet **when the state is involved, they are standard procedure.**

The same dynamic appears in administrative processes:

- **Applications** now imply subordination.
- **Registration** has been redefined in ways that often imply transfer.
- **Certificates** have evolved into instruments that create separate legal entities.

Birth documentation illustrates this perfectly. A certificate of live birth records an event. A birth certificate, however, **creates a legal persona—a corporate-style fiction used by the state to interface with the individual.**

Most people never realize that **the “person” referenced in legal texts is not the flesh-and-blood human being** but a construct created by the state.

The effectiveness of this system depends entirely on trust. When people assume the government acts in good faith, they unknowingly accept frameworks designed to subordinate them. They sign documents they do not understand. They participate in processes that subtly reshape their legal status.

The most potent form of censorship may be the

censorship of understanding. If people cannot interpret the language of the law, they cannot resist the mechanisms built upon that language.

Property, Title, and the Illusion of Ownership

Censorship and legal manipulation converge most clearly in the realm of property. The modern individual believes they own their home or land. But what they typically possess is not the land itself—it is a **title, a legal abstraction.** Ownership has been absorbed by the state through mechanisms like the **Torrens land registration system.**

Historically, landowners possessed the land outright. But governments discovered that **genuine ownership makes a population difficult to control.** A citizen who truly owns something can stand independent of the state. A tenant cannot.

Under Torrens, when an individual registers land, they **inadvertently transfer superior claim to the state.** What they receive is a certificate of title—a **document confirming statutory tenancy, not true ownership.**

This explains legal terms such as:

- **Joint tenants**
- **Tenants in common**

These terms are not accidental. They describe a relationship of **tenancy, not ownership.**

The wealthy avoid this trap. They place assets in trusts, separate control from liability, and ensure that **nothing is technically in their own name.** The system was never designed for the average citizen; **it was designed to bind them.**

When property ownership becomes an illusion, **the state's power to enforce censorship increases dramatically.** A population afraid of losing homes, licenses, or livelihoods becomes easy to silence.

Toward Clarity and Courage

Censorship, propaganda, legal manipulation, and property redefinition form an **interlocking architecture of modern control.**

- **Institutions incapable of persuasion rely on censorship.**
- **Governments incapable of earning trust rely on legal illusion.**
- **Societies incapable of sustaining truth rely on linguistic fog.**

Yet the moment we recognize these mechanisms, **their power begins to evaporate.**

The first step toward freedom is **understanding how illusions are constructed.**

The second is **refusing to accept those illusions as reality.**

We cannot rely on institutions to correct themselves. But individuals who learn to see through illusion reclaim the autonomy that censorship seeks to destroy.

Freedom begins with clarity.

Clarity demands courage.

And courage is the one thing no institution can suppress once it awakens in the human heart.

Read more by White Wolf on prosepma.ca/forum

Campbell's VP Caught Admitting He Won't Eat Campbell's Food

By Liam DeBoer | [BlendrNews.com](#)

Campbell's vice president was secretly recorded admitting that **he won't eat the company's own food** because it contains **3D-printed chicken** and **bioengineered meat**. That's where we are—a food system racing toward lab-grown substitutes—while the people inside of it quietly avoid the products they sell.

The recording captures an unfiltered look at how a major North American food brand talks when the public isn't listening. The audio came from an hour-long tirade by **Martin Bally**, Campbell's vice president and chief information security officer, who **mocked consumers, bragged about showing up to work high**, and dismissed Campbell's food as **unhealthy junk for poor people**.


The employee who recorded the comments, **Robert**

Garza, says he reported the behaviour, and **20 days later, he was fired**.

Campbell's insists the rant doesn't reflect its values, but it exposes something deeper: **insiders don't trust the modern food system** yet expect the public to accept it blindly. And that's where this ties into what's happening in Canada.

Health Canada recently tried—very quietly—to reclassify cloned beef and pork so they could be sold without labels or a safety review. No press release, but rather a silent policy shift that would have allowed **cloned meat into grocery stores with no warning**. Only after public backlash did Ottawa pause the plan—not because they wanted to, but because **they were caught**.

Originally published on Instagram @liam_out_loud



The Devil's Playbook: How the West Is Being Unmade

By Liam De Boer | [BlendrNews.com](#)

If I were the devil and wanted to destroy Western civilization, **here's how I'd pull it off in fifteen simple steps**.

First, I'd destroy the family. I'd frame men and women as rivals instead of partners. I'd convince people that **fathers aren't necessary, children are burdens**, and the home is a place of strain rather than strength.

Second, I'd turn men into passive consumers. I'd shame **drive and ambition as toxic**, erase rites of passage, and turn potential builders into **spectators who drift through life**.

Third, I'd convince women that their ability to create life is a curse. I'd portray **soulless corporate work as liberation** and **motherhood as servitude**. I'd tell them the highest political good is **ending a life before it begins**.

Fourth, I'd confuse children. I'd tell them **their bodies are errors, identity is a costume**, and **sterilization is freedom**. I'd make sure uncertainty becomes the default state of the rising generation.

Fifth, I'd elevate sterile lifestyles as moral ideals. I'd praise same-gender unions while treating traditional families as suspect, ensuring the forms that **cannot**

create new life are seen as superior to the ones that can.

Sixth, I'd reward vice and punish virtue. **Failure would be subsidized**, and **success plundered**. Irresponsibility would gain protection, while competence would be treated as a threat.

Seventh, I'd turn politics into tribal warfare. I'd divide people by **every identity marker available**, ensuring they never unite around anything beyond raw power.

Eighth, I'd erode national sovereignty. I'd shift decisions to **distant bureaucracies, NGOs, and corporate bodies** that voters never chose and can never remove.

Ninth, I'd convince advanced nations to **import populations with no loyalty** to them. I'd shame resistance, ensuring civilization weakens itself under the banner of tolerance.

Tenth, I'd poison the food supply and sell the cure. I'd fill diets with **cheap toxins**, wait for disease to spread, then offer **pharmaceuticals that mask symptoms** while public health crumbles.

Eleventh, I'd demonize energy, **the lifeblood of civilization**. I'd convince people that **abundance is dangerous** and regression is moral.

Twelfth, I'd corrupt the information stream. I'd

replace **truth with narrative, journalism with activism**, and **debate with censorship**.

Thirteenth, I'd make people chronically distracted. I'd saturate every waking moment with **noise**, until silence—and **the self-knowledge it brings**—becomes unbearable.

Fourteenth, I'd detach people from their past and blind them to their future. I'd teach them that **history is a mistake** and that foresight is unnecessary.

Fifteenth, I'd collapse faith into meaning. I'd convince people that **nothing truly matters**, so that when chaos arrives, it's met not with resistance, but **indifference**.

Originally published on Instagram @liam_out_loud

COVID Truths the Mainstream Can No Longer Ignore

By John C.A. Manley

The truth about the scamdemic is slowly going mainstream.

Here are **three recent examples**:

On December 10, *The Telegraph* published a detailed article citing research that the COVID-19 jabs can cause immune cells to attack cardiac tissue, leaving micro-scars that interfere with the heart's electrical activity. Scientists found that the damage was long-lasting and could lead to sudden death years after

injection.

This is all coming from a **mainstream news site** that supported the scamdemic measures.

On September 26, 2025, a South Korean study examined the health insurance records of **8.4 million people**, comparing those who received the shot to those who refused. What they found was a significantly higher rate of cancer among the vaccinated:

- Breast Cancer: **20% increase**
- Colorectal Cancer: **28% increase**
- Gastric Cancer: **34% increase**

- Thyroid Cancer: **35% increase**
- Lung: **53% increase**
- Prostate: **69% increase**

Of course, some of this could be explained by the possibility that people who avoid vaccines may lead healthier lifestyles. Nonetheless, **it doesn't look like a great time to buy Pfizer stocks**.

And here in the Netherlands, attorney Peter Stassen is charging forward—despite his colleague being thrown in prison by Dutch paramilitary—with their lawsuit against Pfizer's CEO, Albert Bourla, Bill Gates and other sociopaths behind the global roll-out of the mRNA injections—alleging they have committed crimes against humanity.

People are becoming more and more receptive to hearing the truth. The medical police state that nearly emerged provided a concrete and hard-to-ignore example of inherent and inevitable corruption—on both sides of the political aisle—of so-called democratic governments, the “free press,” and the medical mafia.

On the other hand, the counter movement the COVID agenda generated provided a concrete and hard-to-ignore example of the power of individuals working together to protect and improve their own lives and the lives of their family and community.

John C. A. Manley is the author of Much Ado About Corona—the world's best-selling COVID-dissent novel. Praised for its sharp humour and moral clarity, the book explores the human cost of the COVID era through compelling characters set against a dystopian backdrop. Learn more or read a free sample at [BlazingPineCone.com/subscribe](#)

Druthers Community Classifieds

NEW BOOK. *Do-it-Yourself HOME CHRISTIANITY: How to Please God and Receive His Help, Without Preachers, Churches, or Money*, by independent, Canadian investigator Ralph T. Kenney. Be ready for whatever comes. First chapter & blog free at [ralph757.com](#). Click white tab on upper right of website.

In Calgary? Visit Angels Café — a cozy, freedom-loving hub serving coffee, teas, and delicious meals. Bow River: 4105 Montgomery View NW.

LEARN HOMEOPATHY EMPOWER YOURSELF Prepping isn't complete without health skills. Winter Course: Jan 6–Mar 17, 2026 Tuesdays on Zoom|Beginner-friendly Full notes included | Boiron remedy discounts + free storage drawers \$335 or Pay-what-you-can 50% of funds donated to Canada Health Alliance Past students say: “College level value,” “I now treat myself first,” “Shirley makes complex material practical. Email [ShirleyGuertin@protonmail.com](#) for details and registration.

FIND OUT what officials won't tell you about our history in the Bible & its predictions for our national security now. Read *The Death & Resurrection of the West Foretold in Prophecy*, by independent, Canadian investigator Ralph T. Kenney. First pages & blog free at [ralph757.com](#)

Brain Health [http://shop.truehealthcanada.ca/true-hope-products](#) 236-301-6444

MAN seeking accountability and common sense @ [www.Peace-Man.ca](#)

Life Sustainers - Natural Health Store
1721 Chiefswood Rd,
Ohsweken, ON. N0A 1M0
Store hours - Wed-Sun
10am-5pm, taxfree
Thurs is Senior Savings day,
15% off
Karen - owner offers Hair Tissue Mineral Analysis + Cell Wellbeing Hair Mapping [www.lifesustainers.com](#)

Have your ad printed in 200,000 or more copies and distributed all over Canada. [druthers.ca/ads](#)

What the Public Health Agency of Canada Isn't Telling You About Measles

By Ted Kuntz | VaccineChoiceCanada.com

A document recently disseminated by the Public Health Agency of Canada (PHAC), entitled—*Reduce the Risk of Getting or Spreading Measles* doesn't disclose critical information about measles and the measles vaccine. This is what the PHAC isn't telling you:

- The measles vaccine is a *live-virus* vaccine grown in cultures of chicken embryo cells. The measles vaccine is given in combination with mumps and rubella (MMR) and chicken pox (MMR-V). *These all contain live viruses.*
- Those who have been recently vaccinated with a live-virus vaccine, such as measles, are not permitted to visit cancer wards or have close contact with those with compromised immune response due to the potential *to transmit the live virus to others.* This means the recently vaccinated have the potential to infect others.
- While the measles vaccine contributed to the reduction of measles as a *childhood* illness, it has resulted in *an increase in measles in adults and infants.* The reason is that the measles vaccine does not confer lifelong immunity. Its effectiveness wanes over time, leaving many adults who were vaccinated as children without protection.
- More critically, mothers who are vaccinated and do not contract measles naturally *do not transfer robust maternal antibodies* to their infant, which protects the infant in the first few months of life.
- As a result of measles vaccination, *adults and infants are at greater risk of measles*, with the consequences potentially being more severe than when contracted in childhood.
- Natural measles exposure confers lifelong immunity.
- Dr. Richard Moskowitz, a physician with more than 50 years of clinical experience, deems the measles vaccine as “*an unhealthy reprogramming of the immune system that trades off the acute, vigorous responses to infection*” in favour of “*weaker, but ongoing, chronic responses that have rendered us a lot sicker than we would have been had we simply left well enough alone.*”
- The measles vaccine, in combination with the other live vaccines, may be causing neurological injury in some children. There is compelling evidence that

administering the MMR vaccine prior to three years of age can cause regressive autism.

- Those born before the introduction of the measles vaccine and who experienced measles naturally contribute to herd immunity, which helps to reduce measles outbreaks. As the population ages and individuals with lifelong immunity diminish, and those with temporary vaccine-induced immunity increase, susceptibility to measles increases. The herd immunity once common in Canada has been dismantled by six decades of mass vaccination.



- The increase in measles in infants and adults today is due to *vaccine failure*, not a failure to vaccinate. This was predicted by those who recognized the measles vaccine's limitations.
- While measles was once a serious illness, measles mortality **declined by 98.5%** and was no longer considered a public health threat *before* the vaccine was introduced in 1963. The pre-vaccine annual risk of death or permanent disability from measles for children under age 10 with normal levels of vitamin A and infected after birth was 1 in 1 million. This means the measles vaccine was unnecessary.
- Health Canada and public health officers imply that if everyone were vaccinated, no one would die or be harmed from measles. This statement ignores the known risks of measles vaccination, including disability and death, and the increased susceptibility to measles in infants and adults, when the consequences can be more severe.

- As of June 27, 2025, there have been more than **117,063 reports of measles-vaccine reactions**, hospitalizations, injuries, and deaths following measles vaccinations made to the U.S. Vaccine Adverse Events Reporting System, including **574 related deaths**, 9,080 hospitalizations, and 2,225 related disabilities.
- A 2010 U.S. Health and Human Services (HHS) study revealed that less than 1% of vaccine adverse events are reported. This means that the actual number of adverse events and deaths could be more than 100X these numbers, i.e., 11,706,300 reports, **57,400 deaths**, and **222,500 disabilities.**

- Approximately 40 cases of death and permanent injury from the MMR vaccine are reported to VAERS annually.

- A risk analysis comparing the increased risk of mortality in children (16 months – 19 years) from not being vaccinated for measles vs. the risk of mortality from the measles vaccine concluded that **the risk of death is more than 261 times higher in children vaccinated** with the measles vaccine.

- The manufacturer's package insert states, “*MMR II vaccine has not been evaluated for carcinogenic or mutagenic potential or impairment of fertility.*”

- The measles vaccine has not been proven harmless against a true placebo, and has not been proven safer than contracting measles.

More Information available at:

- Vaccine Choice Canada:** <https://vaccinechoicecanada.com>
- Physicians for Informed Consent:** <https://physiciansforinformedconsent.org/mmr>
- New Parents Guide to Understanding Vaccination:** <https://uptoeveryone.com/products/new-parentsguide-to-understanding-vaccination>
1. Vaccines: A Reappraisal – Richard Moskowitz MD, 2017. P 193
 2. petermcculloughmd.substack.com/p/association-between-childhood-hypervaccination
 3. physiciansforinformedconsent.org/measles
 4. medalerts.org/vaersdb/findfield.php?TABLE=ON&GROUP1=CA&T&GROUP2=AGE&EVENTS=ON&VAX%5b%5d=MEA&VA
 5. CDC wonder: about the Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System (VAERS); [cited 2024 Feb 12].
 6. vaccinechoicecanada.com/RiskOfDeath

Ted Kuntz is the President of Vaccine Choice Canada

Thailand Froze Over 3 Million Bank Accounts

By Martin Armstrong | ArmstrongEconomics.com

Thailand has become a **case study¹** for the **use of biometric data in every facet of life.** Every banking transaction is monitored and scrutinized. Any perceived discrepancy is flagged as fraud and punished without due process. **Regulations have overwhelmed the system**, leading to a full-blown banking crisis.

In September 2024, over three million **Thai bank accounts were frozen instantaneously** without warning as a result of government overreach.

Transaction denied. You contact your bank to see why the payment failed, only to learn that your account has been frozen—all of your accounts, for that matter. The bank is **investigating you for suspicious activity and potential money laundering or fraud.** There was no warning call or letter, and there is no clarification as to what transaction was flagged.

You're completely **locked out of your accounts** and have **lost the ability to purchase.** You cannot fill your gas tank, you cannot purchase groceries, you've been completely removed from the financial system, and you do not know when or if you'll regain access to your funds.

This is the **reality for millions of people bank-**

ing in Thailand. The Bank of Thailand (BoT), with the Cyber Crime Investigation Bureau and the Ministry of Digital Economy and Society, began an excessive **crackdown on perceived fraud** and streamlined the



process under the premise of safeguarding the banking sector. Thousands of accounts are frozen each week.

Panic² has ensued. Retailers are no longer accepting cards and are demanding payment in cash as they, too, are worried they will be removed from the banking system.

Assistant Governor of the BoT, Darunee Saeju, publicly stated that the central bank is working to “*immediately unlock wrongly affected accounts.*” Saeju insists that new measures will enable the banks to verify accounts in under 48 hours.

Confidence in the government and the entire banking system evaporated.

People rationally fear that their account will be targeted next, without warning. **Government overreach has backfired, and the people are removing themselves from the banking system entirely.**

This phenomenon is not limited to Thailand. **Vietnam recently erased 86 million unverified bank accounts.** Governments are demanding banks track every transaction, tracing each account back to individual citizens using biometric data.

The government believes these provisions will prevent capital from leaving the radar and, therefore, from being taxed. Instead, governments are propelling the cycle amid this private wave, as the **people cannot possibly trust the current financial system.**

1. armstrongeconomics.com/armstrongeconomics101/regulation/thailand-a-case-study-for-biometric-data-control
2. thepattayanews.com/2025/09/22/thais-fear-bank-account-freezes-amid-crackdown-on-mule-accounts-survey-finds

Originally published at armstrongeconomics.com

Whose Constitution Is It?

What Consent of the Governed Really Means

By Dion Klitzke

Canadians often assume they live under a constitution created by the people. Historically, that is not the case.

Unlike many nations, Canada has no constitution that was ever ratified by the people themselves. There was no national referendum, no constitutional convention of the people, and no democratic adoption. The Constitution Act, 1982—widely regarded as Canada’s foundational legal framework—was negotiated by governments and enacted without a popular vote.

This is not controversial among constitutional scholars, nor is it a fringe claim. It is simply a matter of historical record.

That reality raises a fundamental question: **do Canadians want a government that is accountable to them, or merely one that governs over them?**

Constitutions Define Political Identity

At a time when many Canadians feel politically fatigued, disconnected, and frustrated by a lack of accountability across institutions, this question is resurfacing—quietly but with growing urgency.

A constitution is not merely a legal document. It is a declaration of political identity. It defines who the people are, where authority originates, and what limits are placed on power.

Countries such as the United States, Switzerland, Australia, and Iceland all went through some form of popular constitutional process. Their constitutions emerged from citizen assemblies, conventions, or referendums that clearly expressed consent of the governed.

Canada never experienced this moment.

Instead, it inherited a system rooted in parliamentary supremacy and Crown authority—structures built by governments rather than explicitly affirmed by the people. This does not mean Canada lacks legitimacy, but it does mean something important was never completed.

And what is unfinished can still be renewed.

Consent of the Governed

The idea that political allegiance is chosen rather than automatic has long-standing legal roots. Early jurisprudence in the United States addressed this question directly during its break from British rule.

Cases such as *Talbot v. Janson* (1795), *Respublica v. Chapman* (1781), and *M’Ilvaine v. Coxe* (1805) affirmed several key principles: **allegiance to a Crown is not perpetual or inherited; political identity is formed by consent, not geography; individuals may withdraw allegiance and join a new political body; and communities of people may establish their own constitutional order.**

One principle emerging from *Talbot v. Janson* captures this clearly: **the Crown cannot compel continued allegiance where a person has chosen another political authority.**

While these cases arose in the American context, the principle they reflect is universal in democratic

theory: **free people define themselves.**

Canada recognizes this idea in theory. The Supreme Court of Canada has affirmed that popular sovereignty is a foundational principle of Canadian constitutionalism (*Reference re Secession of Quebec*, 1998). Yet Canadians have never been directly invited to express that sovereignty at the constitutional level.

That is the gap.

Why This Matters Now

Canada is experiencing strains that are difficult to ignore: declining trust in institutions, increasing centralization of power, unresolved federal-provincial ten-

what limits government must respect.

Renewal, Not Revolt

A citizen-led constitutional conversation is not rebellion. It is participation.

It does not seek to overthrow institutions, but to clarify the terms under which they serve. It does not reject Canada; **it asks how Canada can be completed.**

A citizens’ constitutional initiative would not replace existing law overnight. Instead, it would create a legitimate expression of public constitutional will, shape expectations, pressure governments toward accountability, and give Canadians a shared language for discussing power, rights, and limits.

This is how democratic renewal has always worked.

Imagining Constitutional Renewal

Such a process would begin modestly with a **declaration of political principles, an open and transparent assembly, a draft constitutional framework rooted in democratic norms, and an invitation for public discussion.**

Its value would not lie in immediate legal force, but in legitimacy. It would give Canadians something they have never had before: **a constitution written with them in mind, not merely applied to them.**

Canadians Should Talk About This Now

Across the world, many are re-examining the foundations of governance as states expand emergency

powers and centralized control. Canada is not immune to these pressures.

Many people feel unheard, unrepresented, and disconnected from political decision-making. Yet meaningful change rarely comes from anger alone.

We do not need revolt; **we need structure.**

We do not need division; **we need clarity.**

We do not need to tear Canada down; **we need to finish building it.**

A Closing Invitation

Constitutional renewal does not begin in Parliament. It begins when citizens ask a simple, powerful question: **who are we, politically, and by what consent are we governed?**

History shows that a small group can start that conversation. Communities can carry it forward. A nation can one day embrace it.

Whether Canadians are ready is uncertain. But uncertainty has never stopped history from being made.

If not now, when?

If not the people, who?

We don’t need anyone’s permission. **Canada’s future will be shaped by those willing to engage—not with anger, but with intention.**

Perhaps this is the moment to begin the conversation that Canada has never fully had: **a constitution written by the people, for the people, and ultimately ratified by the people.**

Dion Klitzke is an independent researcher.



sions, concerns over emergency powers and surveillance, and a growing sense among Canadians that political decisions are being made without meaningful public input.

These challenges are not unique to Canada, but our constitutional framework offers no clear mechanism for the people to initiate renewal or reforms.

This has led more people to ask an unusual but reasonable question: **if Canadians never ratified their constitution, could they?**

From a legal and historical standpoint, the answer is **YES—but only if we organize it.**

Constitutional Change Starts Small

History shows that constitutions do not begin with mass participation. They begin with declarations.

In the United States, fifty-six individuals signed the Declaration of Independence. In Switzerland, seven cantons initiated the federal constitution. In Iceland, twenty-five citizens formed a constitutional council. In Estonia, roughly sixty people drafted the post-Soviet constitution. In Liberia, a committee of twelve prepared the first constitutional draft.

In every case, governments followed rather than led.

Constitutional scholars consistently note that the initial spark usually comes from civic groups, local assemblies, or committed citizens willing to articulate a shared political vision. Broader participation comes later.

This is how a people formally define who they are, what rights they claim, what powers they delegate, and

Advertisement

RADICAL
DIGITAL AGENCY

- Website Design & Development
- “DIY Do-It-Yourself” Marketing Tools
- “Done-for-you” Marketing Experts
- CRM Customer & Prospecting Database

33% OFF DRUTHERS DISCOUNT

WEB DESIGN - DIGITAL MARKETING
United by a belief in liberty, freedom, and individual sovereignty.

- Graphic Design Print/Digital
- e-blast, e-Newsletter, e-mail campaign
- SEO Management, Google Ads
- E-commerce, Shopping Cart

We specialize in crafting tailored strategies that not only increase your online presence but also convert clicks into customers. Our team of digital experts combine creativity with data-driven insights, ensuring that your on-line presence is not just seen, but converts into new clients for your business.

- Ticket Sales, Appointment Calendar
- Social Media Management
- Graphic Design & Printing
- Trade Show Exhibits & Pop-Ups

416 695 0575 x330
www.radicaldigitalagency.com

Canada’s Great Political Illusion

How a Manufactured Democracy Keeps an Unwitting Nation Under Control

By Henry

Every election cycle, Canadians are invited into what is presented as the pinnacle of democratic participation. It arrives with the polish of a national ceremony and the sincerity of a stage play. Over time, as I watched this spectacle with the eyes of a researcher and the patience of a citizen determined to understand the machinery of governance, I reached an uncomfortable realization: **the process is not democratic but theatrical.**

What appears to be choice is in fact **choreography**. What is promoted as representation is, in truth, **a managed illusion**. The 2025 federal election merely reveals the continuity of that pattern: **a ritual orchestrated to maintain compliance**, not to express the will of the people.

Here, I explore the mechanics behind this illusion—their preselected political class, its media apparatus, its buried history, and the role the 2025 election plays in the broader strategy of national management.

The Election That Isn’t

The more closely one examines the Canadian electoral process, the more obvious it becomes that the public **never chooses its leaders**—they merely **ratify** them. Candidates emerge not from the grassroots but from **curated networks of influence**. Many have backgrounds that read less like résumés of public servants and more like **dossiers crafted by intelligence-linked organizations**, think tanks, activist foundations, or elite academic pipelines.

This is especially evident in the **Trudeau dynasty**. Pierre Trudeau navigated the political landscape with the quiet backing of imperial and intelligence institutions. His son—trained in theatre rather than governance—was ushered onto the national stage with timing so suspicious it resembled **casting rather than candidacy**. And the pattern extends far beyond that family.

The deeper problem lies not in who wins but in **how** they win. The tallies presented to the public bear **no trustworthy relationship** to the votes cast.

The people sense as much intuitively. Volunteers canvass entire neighbourhoods dominated by conservative voters—often 70% or more—yet watch those districts **magically swing left** on election night. These patterns repeat with statistical impossibility, suggesting **not organic outcomes but engineered ones**.

The political ritual also operates on **psychological sleight-of-hand**. The language of politics borrows from electrical and mystical symbolism: “elected,” “charged,” “power,” “current.” The voter is told he energizes the system, yet his energy is captured only to justify


decisions made without him. Meanwhile, the system transfers blame: if the country declines, the voter chose wrong; if corruption spreads, he did not participate hard enough; if he abstains, he is shamed. The ritual ensures the population **carries responsibility while holding no real authority**.

The Machinery of Compliance

The illusion could not survive without its principal accomplice—the **media**. In Canada, the majority of the mainstream press is funded by the same government it claims to hold accountable.

Hundreds of millions in subsidies ensure compliance. Outlets that refuse to echo the state’s narrative face regulatory pressure, financial exclusion, and public smearing.

Surrounding the media is



a vast constellation of “independent” organizations—NGOs, university centres, union groups, and ideological lobbyists—whose missions conveniently align with government messaging. Many participants in these institutions cannot identify the origins of the ideology they defend, but they enforce it with zeal because **their careers depend on it**.

Behind the media stands the true spine of the nation: the **bureaucracy**. This administrative class is not elected, not removable, and not ideologically neutral. Bureaucrats persist through every election cycle, forming a **permanent layer of governance that no vote can dislodge**. They hire in their own image and enforce the worldview of the managerial elite. What the public dismisses as inefficiency is often **a sophisticated mechanism of continuity**.

Scandals that appear to shake the system are rarely genuine ruptures. They serve instead as **controlled-burn operations**—clearing away disobedient actors and replacing them with compliant ones. The “Nazi veteran” fiasco in Parliament revealed exactly this dynamic: **a manufactured outrage** used to displace one Speaker and usher in another who aligned more predictably with prevailing ideological interests.

What looks like chaos is often choreography.

How Canada’s Past Was Buried

Perhaps the most extraordinary achievement of the Canadian establishment is the deliberate **erasure of the country’s true history**. Most Canadians can recite polite myths taught in school—European explorers, Indigenous contact, Confederation—but few possess even a rudimentary understanding of the **legal and financial structures** that shaped the land.

Canada was never built as a unified republic. It was **a patchwork of corporate territories** operated by private companies under royal authority. The Hudson’s Bay Company alone controlled a geographic expanse greater than many modern nations. Other regions were administered through proprietary charters—**commercial ventures, not sovereign colonies**.

Unlike the United States, the region now called Canada never formed a cohesive cultural foundation. The British ensured deep divisions remained between French, English, and Indigenous groups, preventing the emergence of a unified national identity that could resist imperial administration. **Fragmentation was not a historical accident—it was a management tactic**.

Confederation did not create a nation but **reorganized British assets**. Taxes did not emerge to fund public programs; they were established to **service debts owed to private financial interests**. Even the classification of Indigenous peoples as “Indians” was not a geographical blunder but **an administrative tactic**: by using the same terminology as in India, Britain folded North American peoples into an existing legal

category of imperial oversight.

The further one digs into Canada’s origins, the clearer the pattern becomes: the country was designed as **a managed territory, not a sovereign nation**. Its history had to be simplified, sanitized, and concealed to preserve that arrangement.

The 2025 Election Unmasked

The 2025 federal election is not merely another political cycle—it is a demonstration of the modern method of governing populations through **perception rather than policy**. Canadians sense something deeply wrong, yet most cannot articulate the problem. That confusion is not their fault. It is the product of a system that **overwhelms the population with distraction** while hiding structural truth.

In this environment, electoral outcomes are managed through **narrative engineering**. When the ruling party’s popularity collapses, the media reframes events to soften the fall. When activist groups supporting the dominant ideology lose resources, the leadership triggers a snap election to **freeze political timelines**. When a dissident party gains traction, petitions, smears, and ballot interventions materialize to halt their rise.

Even if a dissident manages to secure a seat, they become a lone voice drowned inside a chamber of obedient MPs. Parliament is not gridlocked; it is **insulated**. Debate becomes theatre. Dissent becomes symbolic. **The machinery rolls on uninterrupted.**

Digital platforms amplify this control. Censorship no longer requires silencing speech; it merely requires ensuring **no one hears it**. Algorithms bury inconvenient truths under layers of noise. Alternative views are not defeated—they are **smothered in irrelevance**.

What emerges is a form of governance that no longer depends on convincing the population—only on **distracting** it. The spectacle continues, election after election, because the ritual itself maintains compliance. The public need not believe the system works; they merely need to remain engaged enough to repeat the performance.

The Power of Awareness

After examining the structure, history, and operation of Canada’s political mechanisms, one arrives at a stark reality: the country’s **democratic image is a façade**. Elections are rituals of validation, not instruments of public will. Media exists to reinforce the chosen narrative. Bureaucracy ensures continuity regardless of outcomes. Education obscures the past to prevent the public from recognizing patterns in the present. The political class is not elected—it is **curated**.

Understanding the illusion robs it of its power. When one recognizes the design, the spectacle loses its enchantment. The 2025 election will pass, followed by another and another, each maintaining the appearance of change while preserving the machinery of control.

Yet individuals remain capable of stepping outside the illusion. **Freedom begins with discernment**. Awareness severs the psychological bonds that ritual politics seeks to impose. Canada may function as a managed territory, but its people retain the ability to reclaim clarity, responsibility, and truth.

The first step is simply seeing the illusion for what it is.

If you’d like to follow Henry, please visit soberchristiangentlemanpodcast.substack.com

Advertisement

WHEN THE GRID GOES DOWN..
YOUR POWER DOESN'T

Portable Deployable Military-Grade Solar
Solutions that work when others fail

CUSTOMIZED SOLAR PACKAGES FOR YOU

- 24.5% efficiency
- Works when cheap panels fail
- Field-tested in war zones and wildfire operations
- Backed by Canadian customer service

OFF GRID TREK Deployable/Portable Solar
www.OffGridTrek.com (403) 461-7173

Advertisement

The only civil liberties organization
to call for an end to harmful and
unscientific Covid lockdowns.

Justice Centre
for Constitutional Freedoms

@jccfcanada www.jccf.ca

Independent Lab Testing Could Settle COVID Vaccine Controversy Once and For All

By Nate Dempsey

A \$300,000 study could answer the **billion-dollar question**: Are undisclosed nanomaterials present in COVID-19 vaccines? Multiple independent laboratories across continents report detecting **graphene-like structures** in COVID vaccines using professional equipment. Regulators categorically deny these materials exist. **Both claims cannot be true**—yet neither side has conducted the definitive test to settle it.

The Unresolved Question

Using standard materials-science techniques—**micro-Raman spectroscopy**, **Scanning Electron Microscopy (SEM-EDX)**, and **Transmission Electron Microscopy (TEM)**—researchers in Spain, England, Germany, Canada, Romania, South Korea, and Argentina report finding carbon-oxygen structures with spectral signatures they interpret as graphene oxide. Dr. Pablo Campra Madrid at Spain’s University of Almería found **characteristic graphene peaks** in 8 out of 110 samples he analyzed. In England, the UNIT Group detected **ribbons, sheets, and nanotubes** with carbon-oxygen ratios consistent with graphene oxide. A German coalition of 60 scientists reported **rare earth elements** like gadolinium and yttrium—materials used in electronics and MRI contrast agents—that aren’t on vaccine ingredient lists. Meanwhile, the FDA, Health Canada, and European regulators insist **no graphene oxide is present**, based on batch testing and manufacturer declarations.

Does Standard Testing Miss Nanomaterials?

Here’s the problem: Standard regulatory batch testing checks whether **declared ingredients** meet specifications—potency, sterility, pH. It’s **not designed to detect what shouldn’t be there** at nanoscale. The methods independent researchers used can see structures **1,000 times smaller** than what standard testing detects. Micro-Raman spectroscopy (1 micron resolution) versus macro-Raman (50–100 microns) is like using a microscope versus binoculars to find bacteria. We already know standard testing has gaps. In 2023, Health Canada confirmed **undisclosed DNA contamination** in COVID vaccines—discovered by independent researchers Kevin McKernan and colleagues, not by regulatory testing. **If batch testing missed DNA fragments, could it miss nanomaterials?** The Pfizer Document Nobody Talks About A Pfizer cryo-electron microscopy study released through Freedom of Information requests states: “purified protein applied to gold grids freshly overlaid with graphene oxide.” Pfizer clarifies this was only for imaging during development, not in the final product. But the question remains: **If graphene oxide was used in manufacturing processes, what filtration removes it?** No removal validation has been published. Pharmaceutical stan-

dards require residual testing even for manufacturing aids—but **no graphene oxide residue limits have been established**.

A Simple Experiment Could End the Debate

The Graphene Verification Protocol (GVP-2025) would cost approximately **\$300,000**—less than **0.001% of government COVID vaccine spending**. The protocol:

- 200 randomly-selected vaccine vials from multiple



manufacturers

- 15 ISO-accredited laboratories worldwide
- Blinded analysis (labs don’t know sample identity)
- Professional methods: SEM-EDX, micro-Raman, TEM
- Controls: graphene-spiked samples, pure lipid formulations, blank vials
- Complete methodology published in advance
- All raw data made public regardless of results

Timeline: **15 weeks** to definitive answer. If regulators are right, independent researchers are proven wrong and **public trust is restored through transparency**. If independent researchers are correct, **billions of people need to know what’s in their bodies**. Either way, **the test answers the question**.

Why Hasn’t This Been Done?

That’s the **\$300,000 question**. Despite billion-dollar budgets, no regulatory agency has published **transparent verification** using the specific methods that detected materials. The FDA says “graphene oxide is not an ingredient” but hasn’t published **micro-Raman spectra proving absence**. The European Medicines Agency mentions “Raman spectroscopy input” but **no methodology, instrument parameters, or raw data**. Health Canada confirmed DNA contamination but hasn’t addressed graphene claims with equivalent testing. When Reuters “fact-checked” Dr. Carrie Madej’s findings, they didn’t commission independent lab analysis (\$500–1,000 per sample). Instead, they phoned

a Cardiff University professor who, without examining samples, said images “look like dust and fabric fibers.” That’s **authority substitution**, not science.

The Informed Consent Question

The Nuremberg Code states: “The voluntary consent of the human subject is absolutely essential... [requiring] sufficient knowledge and comprehension of the elements of the subject matter involved.” If undisclosed nanomaterials are present—whether as residues, contamination, or formulation components—**informed consent is violated**. The question must be **resolved, not dismissed**.

What About Biodigital Technology Research?

Graphene quantum dots (GQDs) are **2–10 nanometer particles** documented in peer-reviewed studies to cross the blood-brain barrier and persist in neural tissue. They possess **electrical conductivity, electromagnetic responsiveness, and piezoelectric properties**. The U.S. Army’s 2019 “Cyborg Soldier 2050” report discusses **injectable nano-interfaces** for neural enhancement. The Internet of Bio-Nano Things (IoBNT) research describes nanosensors inside the body communicating with external networks, with deployment timelines of **2025–2030**.

Policy Horizons Canada’s 2020 document “Exploring Biodigital Convergence” explicitly states: “Digital technology can be embedded in organisms ... This could be used to monitor our thoughts and behaviour.” Does this prove nanomaterials in vaccines serve technological purposes? **No**. But it establishes that the **capability exists**, research is decades old, stated deployment windows align with now, and detected materials possess relevant properties. **If materials are present, their source and purpose require investigation**.

The Way Forward

Science resolves disputes through **replication and transparency**, not authority and dismissal. The GVP-2025 protocol offers **definitive resolution** with established methods, trivial cost relative to stakes, and a short timeline. If regulatory bodies decline to fund verification, **crowdfunding could finance it independently**—eliminating concerns about institutional bias while demonstrating public demand for transparency. The vials exist. The laboratories exist. The methods exist. **The cost is trivial**. Declining to conduct this testing while asserting absolute certainty that materials are absent isn’t scientific confidence—it’s **faith-based administration**. Thirteen billion vaccine doses have been administered globally. **The question of their complete contents is scientifically answerable**. **It’s time to test**.

For more information, please visit refugeecanada.net/vaccine

The Real War of the Century: Artificial Intelligence

By Joaquim Couto | Brownstone.org

There was a time when debates about determinism and free will belonged to philosophy departments and late-night dorm room conversations. They were enjoyable precisely because they seemed harmless. Whatever the answer, life went on. Courts judged, doctors decided, teachers taught, and politicians were still—at least nominally—held responsible for their actions. **That era is over**. Artificial intelligence has transformed what once appeared to be an abstract philosophical question into a concrete issue of governance, power, and accountability. Determinism is no longer merely a theory about how the universe works. **It is becoming an operating principle for modern institutions**. And that changes everything. AI systems are deterministic by construction. They



operate through statistical inference, optimization, and probability. Even when their outputs surprise us,

they remain bound by mathematical constraints. Nothing in these systems resembles judgment, interpretation, or understanding in the human sense. **AI does not deliberate. It does not reflect. It does not bear responsibility for outcomes.** Yet increasingly, its outputs are treated not as tools, but as decisions. **This is the quiet revolution of our time**. The appeal is obvious. Institutions have always struggled with human variability. People are inconsistent, emotional, slow, and sometimes disobedient. Bureaucracies prefer predictability, and algorithms promise exactly that: standardized decisions at scale, immune to fatigue and dissent. In healthcare, algorithms promise more

See ‘Fundamental Confusion’ p.9

The Day The Narrative Broke: How Bill C-9 Collapsed Under Its Own Deception

By The Iron Quill | [TheQuillStrikes.substack.com](https://thequillstrikes.substack.com)

For years, Canadians have been told that resistance is pointless.

That Ottawa cannot be stopped—the government moves in one direction, and the people simply learn to live with the consequences.

But every once in a while, the curtain slips. Every once in a while, the machinery of narrative control grinds to a halt. And every once in a while, the truth forces its way to the surface.

That moment has arrived. Bill C-9 (The Combatting Hate Act), a bill that the government swore was harmless, necessary, and protected by moral authority, suffered a public and humiliating collapse. The very institutions expected to defend it were forced to admit the truth. And the Liberals found themselves exposed, cornered, and out of road.

For the first time in a long time, the people won.

The Bill They Swore We Could Not Question

From the moment Bill C-9 was introduced, the message from Ottawa was simple.

Critics were liars. Legal scholars were alarmists. Faith leaders were misinformed. And anyone who raised concerns about the removal of the religious-text exemption was spreading disinformation.

The Liberals insisted that no Canadian would ever be criminalized for quoting their own scriptures.

They assured the public that the bill was benign, surgical, and misunderstood.

They framed every objection as extremism. They believed the public would kneel. They believed the media would shield them. They believed the narrative would hold.

They were wrong.

CBC Breaks Ranks—The Moment The Dam Burst

There are moments that define political collapse, and one of them came when CBC journalists were forced to confront the truth live on air.

Not in a column. Not in a podcast. On national television.

CBC acknowledged that the concerns about Bill C-9 were real.

They acknowledged that the religious exemption *was* being removed. They acknowledged that the government's messaging had been misleading.

In a single broadcast, the illusion shattered. The Liberals were no longer debating skeptics. They were debating their own media. You could feel the ground shift the moment the fact-check landed.

A bill built on narrative control cannot survive when the narrative turns against it.

The Panic Begins—Liberal Damage Control

Within hours, the tone from Ottawa changed. Gone was the certainty. Gone was the arrogance. Gone was the accusation that critics were liars.

The justice minister appeared before the cameras and uttered the one word no confident government ever uses.

Clarify. Suddenly, a bill that was supposedly airtight needed explanation. Suddenly, a bill that was supposedly harmless needed rewriting. Suddenly, the government admitted—without admitting—that something had gone terribly wrong.

The political map changed overnight. Bill C-9 no longer had the votes to move forward. The Liberals could not push it through committee. They could not whip their way past public outrage. They could not hide behind media cover. The bill was deadlocked. Ottawa knew it. Canadians felt it. And the government had nowhere left to go.

Canadians Stood Up, And It Worked

This collapse did not happen because Ottawa grew wiser. It happened because Canadians spoke with clarity.

Churches united. Faith leaders refused to stay silent. Civil liberties advocates stepped into the fire. Ordinary Canadians wrote, called, shared, rallied, and refused to accept the lie that their concerns were imaginary.

The government underestimated the people.

They believed Canadians would sleepwalk through the most significant alteration to religious and expressive freedoms in decades.

Instead, the public forced a reckoning. Bill C-9 fractured because the people broke the narrative that protected it.

Why Bill C-9 Is Politically Dead

A bill dies long before it is withdrawn. It dies when momentum collapses. It dies when media coverage evaporates. It dies when the minister loses the room. It dies when opposition parties sense weakness. It dies when the public no longer believes a word the government says.

Bill C-9 has reached that stage.

It cannot move forward as written. It cannot be defended without contradiction. It cannot be sold to a public that now understands what is inside it. It cannot pass without political suicide for the Liberals.

The bill is not paused. It is not delayed. It is politically finished.

The Quill's Verdict

This is not the final battle. But it is a victory worth naming.

A government that believed it could criminalize belief by stealth was forced into retreat. A national broadcaster that once carried water for Ottawa was compelled to speak the truth. A population that was expected to remain silent found its voice.


The fog lifted. The truth broke through. And for the first time in a long time, the people proved that power still answers to them.

The Remnant should take note. Courage is contagious. Truth is resilient.

And when the people stand together, the machinery of control begins to crack.

Tonight [December 11, 2025], we celebrate a win. Tomorrow, the fight continues.

Originally published at thequillstrikes.substack.com



THE GREAT COLLAPSE OF C-9

This was not clarification. It was retreat.

Opposition Parties Smell Blood

Once the dam broke, Parliament shifted. Conservatives pressed hard on constitutional grounds. The Bloc refused to endorse criminal tools that threatened cultural and religious expression. NDP members began to express discomfort with the sweeping reach of the bill.

Fundamental Confusion

Continued from p.8

efficient triage. In finance, better risk assessment. In education, objective evaluation. In public policy, “evidence-based” governance. In content moderation, neutrality. Who could object to systems that claim to remove bias and optimize outcomes? **But beneath this promise lies a fundamental confusion.**

Prediction is not judgment.

Optimization is not wisdom.

Consistency is not legitimacy.

Human decision-making has never been purely computational. It is interpretive by nature. People weigh context, meaning, consequence, and moral intuition. They draw on memory, experience, and a sense—however imperfect—of responsibility for what follows. This is precisely what institutions find inconvenient.

Human judgment introduces friction. It requires explanation. It exposes decision-makers to blame. Deterministic systems, by contrast, offer something far more attractive: **decisions without decision-makers.**

When an algorithm denies a loan, flags a citizen, deprioritizes a patient, or suppresses speech, no one

appears responsible. The system did it. The data spoke. The model decided.

Determinism becomes a bureaucratic alibi.

Technology has always shaped institutions, but until recently, it mostly extended human agency. Calculators assisted reasoning. Spreadsheets clarified trade-offs. Even early software left humans visibly in control. AI changes that relationship.

Systems designed to predict are now positioned to decide. Probabilities harden into policies. Risk scores become verdicts. Recommendations quietly turn into mandates. Once embedded, these systems are difficult to challenge. After all, who argues with “The science?”

This is why the old philosophical debate has become urgent.

Classical determinism was a claim about causality: given enough information, the future could be predicted. Today, determinism is turning into a governance philosophy. If outcomes can be predicted well enough, institutions ask, why allow discretion at all?

Non-determinism is often caricatured as chaos. But properly understood, it is neither randomness nor irrationality. It is the space where interpretation occurs, where values are weighed, and where responsibility

attaches to a person rather than a process.

Remove that space, and decision-making does not become more rational. **It becomes unaccountable.**

The real danger of AI is not runaway intelligence or sentient machines. **It is the slow erosion of human responsibility under the banner of efficiency.**

The defining conflict of the 21st century will not be between humans and machines. It will be between two visions of intelligence: deterministic optimization versus meaning-making under uncertainty.

One is scalable.

The other is accountable.

Artificial intelligence forces us to decide which one governs our lives.

Dr. Joaquim Sá Couto earned his MD from the University of Lisbon and completed surgical training in the United States, becoming a Diplomate of the American Board of Surgery in 1989. He pioneered the use of pulsed Nd-YAG laser treatment for spider veins in Portugal.

Originally published at brownstone.org

Repeal of Section 230 Endangers Online Free Speech

By Christina Maas | [ReclaimTheNet.org](https://reclaimthenet.org)

A proposal in the US Senate titled the *Sunset Section 230 Act* seeks to dismantle one of the core protections that has shaped the modern internet.

Put forward by Senator Lindsey Graham with bipartisan backing from Senators Dick Durbin, Josh Hawley, Amy Klobuchar, and Richard Blumenthal, the bill¹ would repeal **Section 230 of the Communications Act of 1934**, a provision that has, for nearly thirty years, shielded online platforms from liability for the actions of their users.

Under the plan, **Section 230 would be fully repealed two years after the bill’s passage.**

This short transition period would force websites, social platforms, and hosting services to rethink how they handle public interaction.

The current statute stops courts from holding online platforms legally responsible as the publishers of material shared by their users.

Its protection has been instrumental in allowing everything from local discussion boards to global platforms such as YouTube and Wikipedia to operate without being sued over every user comment or upload.

A Law That Built the Modern Internet

The legislation’s text removes Section 230 entirely and makes “conforming amendments” across multiple federal laws.

“I am extremely pleased that there is such wide and deep bipartisan support for repealing Section 230, which protects social media companies from being sued by the people whose lives they destroy. Giant social media platforms are unregulated, immune from lawsuits, and are making billions of dollars in advertising revenue off some of the most unsavory content and criminal activity imaginable,” said Senator Graham.

“It is past time to allow those who have been harmed by these behemoths to have their day in court.”

Senator Graham’s statement reflects growing political hostility toward Section 230, but the premise behind his argument collapses under close examination of how the law actually functions.

The idea that repealing Section 230 would meaningfully hold large tech platforms accountable misunderstands both **the legal structure of the internet** and **the purpose of the statute.**

Section 230 does not grant “immunity” in the sense that companies cannot be sued for their own actions. Platforms can and routinely are sued for violating federal criminal law, intellectual property rights, or contractual obligations.

What the **statute prevents is liability for speech created by its users.**

Criminalizing the Act of Hosting Speech

Without that safeguard, **every website hosting user comments, reviews, or uploads would risk litigation for each post.** A total repeal would not just affect Facebook or YouTube; it would reach **tiny community forums, news sites with comment sections, local businesses that host user feedback, and nonprofit educational networks.**

The senator’s claim that platforms are “unregulated” also misses the regulatory reality.

These companies already operate under extensive regimes such as privacy laws, consumer protection statutes, antitrust oversight, and criminal prohibitions. Section 230 does not exempt them from any of these. Instead, it ensures that the legal responsibility for online speech remains with the speaker — an essential

distinction for protecting open communication.

When Liability Begins to Shape Speech

The notion that repealing the law would “*allow those who have been harmed to have their day in court*” ignores the consequence that **every user would become a potential source of liability.**

Faced with such risk, platforms would have **no practical choice but to prescreen or block vast categories of lawful expression** to avoid any potential lawsuits.

The outcome would not be a fairer digital environment but a **heavily censored one**, where only the most risk-averse, well-funded entities could afford to host public dialogue.

From Open Forums to Corporate Gatekeepers

From a free speech perspective, **Section 230 is the legal backbone that allows a diverse internet to exist.** It protects the capacity of ordinary people to speak, organize, and publish online without requiring corporate pre-approval.

Dismantling it in the name of punishing “behe-moths” would primarily hurt small and mid-sized sites that lack armies of lawyers. Rather than empowering individuals, a repeal would **consolidate control of online discourse in the hands of a few large companies capable of absorbing the new legal exposure.**

Senator Blackburn’s claim that Big Tech uses Section 230 “*to censor conservative voices*” misunderstands both the law and the First Amendment.

Section 230 does not require or authorize any specific content decision. It simply prevents lawsuits over moderation choices, whether those affect conservative, liberal, or apolitical content.

Even though major social media platforms censored conservative voices over the last decade, repeal of Section 230 would not create political neutrality; it would **compel platforms to err on the side of suppression**, further constraining speech across the spectrum.

When Liability Replaces Free Expression

Senator Blumenthal’s suggestion that companies “*hide behind Section 230 to dodge accountability*” overlooks existing accountability mechanisms. Platforms can already be sued for their own misconduct, such as defective design, deceptive practices, or failure to comply with federal reporting obligations.

Section 230 only blocks suits that attempt to treat a platform as the publisher of another person’s speech, a boundary drawn to preserve open dialogue while still permitting enforcement of genuine legal violations.

Graham went further on Fox News: “*These platforms are doing enormous damage to our country, pushing people to suicide and selling fentanyl-laced pills and tablets. It is long past time to open up the American courtroom to those who have been harmed by this out-of-control system, and to finally have regulations and accountability for the largest businesses in the history of the country. The courthouse doors are closed, and there is no meaningful regulation.*”²

Senator Graham’s argument combines real public concerns with a deeply mistaken premise about how the internet and US law operate.

Misplaced Enforcement

The harms he lists—suicide, drug trafficking, and unregulated digital power—are serious, but none of them exist because of Section 230.

The law he seeks to repeal is not what “*closes the courthouse doors.*” It is what keeps those doors from

being used to silence lawful speech or destroy the open nature of online communication.

First, the claim that “*these platforms are doing enormous damage*” rests on conflating correlation with causation.

While social media may amplify allegedly “harmful” behaviour, the existence of such content is not created by Section 230.

The statute does not encourage or condone drug sales, harassment, or suicide-related material; it merely allocates legal responsibility correctly.

Those who sell drugs or post illegal content are still fully liable under state and federal law. Section 230 does not obstruct prosecution or civil claims against the individuals and organizations that commit these crimes.

Second, the idea that repealing Section 230 would “*open up the American courtroom*” ignores what that would mean in practice.

Courts would indeed become more accessible to plaintiffs suing any website, app, or forum where another person’s illegal act occurred. A grieving parent, for instance, could sue not only the perpetrator but also the hosting service, the software developer, or even a search engine that indexed a link.

Each suit would require platforms to defend themselves against the speech of third parties, regardless of whether they had any knowledge or control over the content.

The result would be a legal system flooded with claims that **punish the medium rather than the offender.**

Third, the suggestion that “*there is no meaningful regulation*” is inaccurate. Major platforms are already bound by extensive federal and state oversight: data privacy laws, advertising regulations, antitrust enforcement, securities disclosure rules, and criminal statutes concerning child exploitation and narcotics.

Federal agencies, including the DEA and FBI, routinely use digital evidence hosted by platforms to be able to arrest and prosecute those selling fentanyl online.

The existence of Section 230 does not limit these prosecutions; it ensures that intermediaries can cooperate with law enforcement without becoming liable for every crime that passes across their networks.

If Section 230 were repealed, platforms would not become more accountable; they would become **more restrictive.**

Legal exposure would force them to **monitor and filter user activity on an unprecedented scale**, removing controversial, sensitive, or even tragic personal content to avoid potential lawsuits.

Far from opening access to justice, this would **chill public discussion** of addiction, mental health, and other social crises.

What Senator Graham calls an “*out-of-control system*” is in fact an information ecosystem dependent on a single legal distinction: **that people are responsible for what they say, and that the conduit carrying their speech is not the publisher of it.**

Erasing that line will not prevent tragedy. It will only replace open networks with **a censored and legally paralyzed internet where fewer people dare to speak at all.**

- docs.reclaimthenet.org/sunset-section-230-act.pdf
- foxnews.com/politics/graham-leads-bipartisan-demand-tech-reform-vote-bring-social-media-companies-heel

Originally published at reclaimthenet.org

Views of columnists and bylined feature writers as expressed are not necessarily those of DRUTHERS. All source links and references can be found at druthers.ca/articles

Special thanks to all those giving their valuable time to help freely distribute DRUTHERS.

Thank you also to all who have generously donated to make this free newspaper a reality.

Although the paper is FREE, it costs us to produce, print and distribute it. If you appreciate our efforts, please help us print more papers next month by making a donation.



Please donate kindly:
druthers.ca/donate

Or send an e-transfer to:
admin@druthers.net

Cash, cheques & money orders
can be made out to and mailed to:
Shawn Jason Laplante
P.O. Box 40531 Six Points Plaza
Toronto, Ontario M9B 6K8

Distributed independently & completely free of charge.

January 2026 circulation: 200,000 copies Canada-wide

Original content DRUTHERS 2026®

Publisher & Editor in Chief: Shawn Jason

Administrator: Christie-Lynn

Editor: Michelle

Layout & Design: Michael Choo-Chong

Ads Manager: Dr. Jeffrey Overall | ads@druthers.net

Extra Special Thanks to: Kristy, Bob, and many more...

Comments & General Inquiries: info@druthers.net

News Tips & Article Submissions: editor@druthers.net

“Please world, be kind to one another. We really are just one big earth family. Thank you. I love you. Keep on passing it on.”

– Shawn Jason

The Tent Cities We Pretend Not to See

By Marco Navarro-Génie | MNGHaultain.Substack.com

As Canadians gather to celebrate Christmas Eve and Christmas Day with their families in the warmth of their homes, **more than 60,000 people across this country will spend Christmas night in a tent, a doorway, or a shelter bed that was supposed to be temporary.** Some will have been there for months, perhaps years. **The number has quadrupled in six years.**

These are not projections or estimates designed to inflate a crisis. In October 2024, enumerators in 74 Canadian communities conducted the most comprehensive count of homelessness this country has attempted. They found **17,088 people sleeping without shelter on a single autumn night, and 4,982 of them were living in encampments.** The count excluded Quebec entirely and captured only those willing or able to be found. The real number is certainly higher.

A System in Freefall

What the data reveal is not merely a failure of compassion but **a collapse of policy competence across three levels of government,** each pointing fingers while the problem accelerates beyond anyone's capacity to manage it. In Ontario alone, the number experiencing homelessness increased **51 percent between 2016 and 2024.**

Chronic homelessness, the kind that traps people in a system designed only for temporary crisis, has tripled in the same period. **For the first time, more than half of all homelessness in that province is chronic.** People are no longer moving through the system. They are becoming permanent fixtures within it.

Toronto offers the starkest example. Between April 2021 and October 2024, the homeless population in that city more than doubled, from **7,300 to 15,418.** The street needs assessment released in July showed **202 tents scattered across 72 locations,** compared to 82 tents in 24 locations the year before.

These camps appear in places they were never seen a decade ago: under highway overpasses in suburbs, beside commuter rail lines, in parks where children used to play. The city has **9,594 people using its shelter system on any given night,** yet an average of **158 are turned away each evening** because no beds are available. **The arithmetic is brutal and obvious.**

Money Without Solutions

The federal government announced in September 2024 that it would allocate **\$250 million over two years** to address encampments, contingent on provincial matching. By January 2025, only four jurisdictions had signed agreements: Ontario, Saskatchewan, Quebec, and the Northwest Territories.

Ontario received **\$88 million for ten municipalities.** The Association of Municipalities of Ontario, in a report published that same month, calculated that ending chronic homelessness in the province would require **\$11 billion over ten years.** The federal contribution represents **less than one percent** of what is needed for one province alone.

Yet the same **federal government found \$50 billion for automotive subsidies and battery plants.** They borrow tons of money to help foreign car manufacturers build electric vehicles while tens of thousands sleep in tents. **The money exists. The question is not fiscal capacity but political priority.**

More troubling still is what the money would buy. Pouring billions into a bureaucratic system that has failed spectacularly to generate sufficient housing while failing to address the policies that created the crisis would be worse than useless. **It would entrench failure at a higher cost.**

Five years ago, tent cities were virtually unknown in most Canadian communities. **The problem is not ancient or inevitable.** It was fuelled by a specific set of policy choices made recently, and different choices can unmake it.

Immigration Without Infrastructure

Start with immigration policy. The **federal government increased annual targets to over 500,000** without ensuring there was sufficient housing capacity to accommodate them. Between 2021 and 2024, **refugees**

and asylum seekers experiencing chronic homelessness increased by **475 percent.** These are people invited to Canada under federal policy, then abandoned to municipal shelter systems that were already at capacity. **Cities absorb the fiscal and social consequences of federal decisions they had no role in making.**

This is not governance. It is passing the bill.

Then there is monetary policy. Pandemic spending drove inflation, making housing unaffordable for people whose incomes could not keep pace. Between 2010 and 2021, Ontario Works shelter benefits increased by **7 percent,** while market rents rose by **51 percent.** The federal government printed money, housing costs



exploded, and those on fixed incomes found themselves priced out of the market entirely. Shelter waitlists now contain **268,000 households in Ontario alone.** The average wait is five years. In some regions, it is twelve.

A System Designed to Stall

Housing supply remains constrained not by lack of demand or capital but by policy. Development charges, zoning restrictions, and approval processes spanning years prevent construction at the required scale. **Municipal governments layer fees onto new developments to fund infrastructure, making projects uneconomical.** Provincial and federal programs subsidize demand without addressing supply, thereby further inflating prices. **Every level of government contributes to the problem while pointing elsewhere for solutions.**

Shelter policy itself has become counterproductive. What were designed as temporary emergency refuges now function as long-term housing. The average shelter stay has increased from **39 days in 2015 to 56 days in 2022.** There are no time limits, no requirements, no expectations. People remain indefinitely because there is no incentive or requirement to leave.

Meanwhile, restrictive rules around curfews, visitors, and pets drive **85 percent of homeless people** to avoid shelters entirely, preferring tents to the indignity of institutional control without the benefit of actual housing.

The expansion of so-called harm reduction programs has substituted enabling for treatment. Safe supply initiatives provide drugs to addicts without requiring participation in recovery programs. **Sixty-one percent of those surveyed cite substance use issues,** yet the policy response is to make drug use safer rather than to make sobriety achievable. This is compassion only in the narrowest sense. **It keeps people alive while ensuring they remain dependent, homeless, and trapped in addiction.**

Treatment programs with accountability and expectations of recovery would serve the dignity of the individual far better than an endless supply of free drugs.

When Policy Fails, People Pay

The federal Housing Advocate issued a report in February 2024 calling for an end to forced evictions and the establishment of a national response plan by August of that year. The plan did not materialize. Encampments continue to be cleared, often with police involvement, and residents are offered temporary shelter spaces that many have already rejected as unsafe or incompatible with their circumstances. The

advocate invoked human rights law and the Charter. The evictions continue regardless. **Neither approach has worked because neither addresses the underlying policy failures.**

Indigenous people account for **44.6 percent of those experiencing chronic homelessness in Northern Ontario,** despite comprising less than 3 percent of the general population. This overrepresentation is exacerbated by current policies that fail to hold Indigenous governance and self-determination accountable. Billions allocated to Indigenous communities are never scrutinized for results or accountability.

The Cost of Inaction

The question Canadians might ask themselves this December, as they contemplate donations to food banks and toy drives, is whether charity can substitute for competent policy. **The answer is empirically clear: it cannot.** The problem has grown despite billions in charitable contributions and countless volunteer hours. What is required is not more money thrown at a broken system but a reversal of the policies that broke it. **When you are in a hole, you must stop digging before you set out to get out of it.**

- **Stop increasing immigration targets without corresponding housing supply.**
- **Stop printing money and driving inflation that prices people out of homes.**
- **Stop subsidizing demand while strangling supply through red tape and fees.**
- **Stop treating shelters as permanent housing without time limits or expectations.**
- **Stop enabling addiction under the guise of harm reduction when treatment and recovery are what dignity requires.**
- **Stop centralizing decisions in Ottawa that belong with provinces and municipalities, who bear the consequences.**
- **Stop doling out billions to Aboriginal communities without accountability measures that ensure the money reaches those who need it.**

Calgary recorded **436 homeless deaths in 2023,** nearly double the previous year. Most were preventable. All were predictable. The Ontario report projects that without significant policy changes, between **165,000 and 294,000 people** could experience homelessness annually in that province alone by 2035. The projection assumes governments continue doing what they are doing now, which seems entirely reasonable given the gap between rhetoric and action.

The tents are still there, in the cold, as Christmas approaches. They will be there in January and February too, unless Canadians demand that their governments stop making the problem worse. The data are clear. The solutions are known. What remains absent is the political courage to reverse course. That is a choice, not an inevitability, and it is one for which every level of government should be held to account.

Originally published at mnghaultain.substack.com

SUPPORT INDEPENDENT MEDIA WITH A

POSTAL SUBSCRIPTION

OF

DRUTHERS

newspapers straight to your mailbox

LIMITED TIME OFFER
GET \$9.95 OFF!

FOR \$86⁰⁵

WHEN YOU USE COUPON CODE: FREEME

for a 1-year subscription of Druthers, delivered monthly, using coupon FREEME
Papers are free, fee is for s/h.

SIGN UP AT:

DRUTHERS.CA/SUBSCRIBE

MAIL TO:
PO BOX 40531
SIX POINTS PLAZA
TORONTO,
ONTARIO
M9B 6K8

CHEQUES PAYABLE TO:
SHAWN JASON LAPLANTE

ETRANSFER ADDRESS (PLEASE
MENTION "SUB" IN MEMO):
ADMIN@DRUTHERS.NET


Absurdity Observer

Some of the Most Absurd Happenings in Recent Weeks

- **Ontario Premier Doug Ford tops the Canadian Taxpayer Federation’s annual “Naughty List” after restoring taxpayer-funded pensions for politicians and approving a 35% pay hike for MPPs—including a \$73,000 raise for himself.** The CTF says Ford “made Scrooge blush,” while Canadians face rising costs and record debt.
- **A leaked Food and Drug Administration memo reportedly confirms that at least 10 children’s deaths were deemed to be solely caused by COVID-19 vaccination,** while warning that the true number is likely far higher due to conservative attribution. The memo also flagged myocarditis risk in young boys, criticized regulators for downplaying pediatric harms, and questioned vaccine mandates for healthy kids. Despite rumours to the contrary, FDA Commissioner Marty Makary confirmed he has no plans to put a “black box” warning on the COVID shots.
- **The “Autism Is Genetic” narrative takes another hit.** A new peer-reviewed article analyzing 519 studies—published in *Molecular Neurobiology* (*Varia et al.*)—points to chronic inflammation, immune dysregulation, toxic exposures, and metabolic stress as key drivers, but did not find any evidence supporting a genetic cause. The study noted that the over 1 billion USD spent hunting for an “autism gene” has turned up nothing.
- A preprint study using Louisiana Department of Health data (*Jablonowski et al.*) finds that **infants who received all six vaccines recommended at two months of age were 68% more likely to die in their third month of life.**
- **An Australian court has ordered women’s rights advocate Kirralie Smith to pay \$95,000 AUD for “vilifying” two trans-women—simply for referring to them as male.** Smith warned the ruling effectively erases women from law and criminalizes truthful speech, arguing that Australians should be alarmed that public policy debate can now be punished to protect feelings rather than facts.
- **Tucker Carlson has been crowned “Antisemite of the Year” by a Jewish civil-rights group for talking to the wrong people on camera—while Ms. Rachel,** a beloved children’s YouTuber with nearly 14 billion views—found herself nominated for the “offence” of publicly expressing concern about children suffering in Gaza.
- **A major scientific paper long used to justify claims that glyphosate—the herbicide found in Roundup—does not cause cancer has now been formally retracted by Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology.** The Williams, Kroes, and Munro review, published in 2000, was relied upon by regulators worldwide—including Health Canada’s Pest Management Regulatory Agency (PMRA)—to support claims of glyphosate’s safety. The retraction reveals that the paper drew on unpublished industry data and raises serious concerns about conflicts of

interest and authorship, weakening the scientific foundation for past regulatory decisions.

- A peer-reviewed paper highlighted by the McCullough Foundation warns that **1–3% of COVID-vaccinated children may develop subclinical myopericarditis**—a hidden inflammation of the heart muscle and surrounding tissue that often causes no obvious symptoms. In some cases, children appear outwardly healthy, with the first manifestation being sudden cardiac arrest.



- Medical commentator Dr. John Campbell says **thousands of elderly COVID patients in UK care homes may have died not from the virus, but from aggressive use of end-of-life drugs** like midazolam and morphine. In April 2020, the UK’s National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) issued guidance recommending the combined use of these drugs to treat breathlessness in COVID patients nearing end of life—a protocol Campbell says was widely applied across long-term care facilities. The drugs suppress breathing, and Campbell argues their widespread use artificially inflated COVID death counts, helping justify lockdowns and mass vaccination campaigns. “Many would have recovered,” he said, calling it “*euthanasia on a huge scale.*”
- A newly published, peer-reviewed reanalysis (*Oller et al.*) of the largest real-world vaccinated vs. unvaccinated cohort ever analyzed in the US, the Henry Ford birth cohort study (*Lamerato et al.*), found that vaccinated children experienced higher rates of every single chronic condition measured. The reanalysis found that **vaccinated children had 549% higher rates of autism-related conditions and 54% higher rates of childhood cancer compared to unvaccinated children.** In total, all 22 chronic disease categories were more common in the vaccinated group—some by more than 10x! By age 10, 57% of vaccinated children had developed at least one chronic illness, compared to just 17% of unvaccinated children.

- **Canadians who rely on state broadcasters like the CBC and progressive media outlet Al Jazeera view themselves as the most “informed,”** according to a new Elections Canada report unearthed by *Blacklock’s Reporter*.

- **Emails reveal government-funded media helped school board spin “family is racist” fallout.** Newly released emails show that the Waterloo Region District School Board quietly coordinated with government-funded media to control the narrative after the public learned the school board’s 2023 training session branded the word “*family*” as harmful to racialized students.

- **Ontario school boards are paying American DEI consultants to re-educate Canadian teachers about race.** Despite having no shortage of homegrown “equity” experts, boards like Simcoe County and Halton Catholic spent tens of thousands on US-based trainers pushing identity-focused frameworks like “cultural humility” and “de-centring whiteness,” often led by consultants with no background in Ontario education—or classroom teaching at all. Meanwhile, Ontario has already poured ~\$500 million into Diversity, Equity and Inclusion programming since 2017, with no measurable improvement in student outcomes.

- New data cited by the Justice Centre for Constitutional Freedoms shows **self-rated “good” mental health among Canadians dropped sharply during**

the pandemic—from 64% pre-COVID to 58% during lockdowns. Young adults were hit hardest, with just 51% reporting good mental health. Meanwhile, the share of Canadians rating their mental health as “fair” or “poor” more than doubled, rising from 6% in 2015 to 15% by 2023.

- **Schools close as a “tidal wave” of flu sweeps across the UK, even as the government claims the flu is currently circulating at “medium levels”** and surveillance data shows flu activity and hospitalizations sitting squarely within typical seasonal ranges.

- **A bipartisan group of US senators wants to repeal Section 230—the law that allows the internet to function freely**—under the false claim that it will “*hold Big Tech accountable.*” In reality, scrapping 230 would punish *everyone but* Big Tech by making websites legally liable for what its users say, forcing mass censorship, comment shutdowns, and algorithmic speech policing just to survive lawsuits. Community forums, independent media, and small platforms would vanish first, while the biggest of tech giants with armies of lawyers would entrench their dominance—ending open online speech as we know it.

- **Greece has introduced new rules requiring taxpayers to spend at least 30% of their annual income through electronic payments,** claiming the measure will curb tax evasion and boost government revenue. Those who use mainly cash will face financial penalties on the shortfall.

YOUR AD HERE?

200,000 copy circulation,
Canada-Wide

Contact: ads@druthers.net