



Eugenics and Technocracy: Paving the Highway to World Dictatorship Exclusive Interview with Tom-Oliver Regenauer



Is there a plan to achieve world dictatorship? Tom-Oliver Regenauer's analysis reveals a faceted crisis that is multifold in order to reorganize humanity. There seem to be conflicting power structures and states, in the end, however, everywhere they are heading towards technocracy and eugenics. In this context, Regenauer also explains aspects such as platform economy, war and the financial system as a means of implementing this agenda. He says: "Get active, get off the sofa, don't consume the crisis as if it were some movie! It is the life of all of us and we can shape it, because the future is not predetermined, it can still be changed now."

And you see they are all pursuing the same agenda. But that doesn't mean this cannot cause war. Because unfortunately, war is the best business for the ruling caste. What we are being presented with publicly is just a soap opera. If I want to continue to present this model of democracy in the media, saying it is the best democracy of all time, then of course I cannot say that there is a world government of eight elderly gentlemen meeting in some back room and deciding for the whole world. Of course, it does not work this way. So get active, get off the sofa, don't consume the crisis as if it were some movie. It is the life of all of us and we can shape it, because the future is not predetermined [determined in advance], it can still be changed now.

[Kla.TV:] Today I went to Switzerland to talk to a special man. He is well acquainted with both the details and the bigger picture, someone who is able to tie the various aspects together into a common thread. Born in 1978, he is a musician, author of various books, business manager, radio presenter, entrepreneur and management consultant. He has lived and worked in 20 different countries, speaks five languages and has thus gained a comprehensive picture of the world. He is not a person who just parrots other people's opinions or well-pleases narratives, he is someone who gets to the bottom of things himself. Welcome to Studio Chur today, Tom-Oliver Regenauer.

[Tom-Oliver Regenauer:] Thank you for the invitation.

[Kla.TV:] With pleasure. Today we'll be talking about the topic "Power structures" or "Who rules the world?". My first question – let's start with the world situation – there is war in the world again, in Ukraine, in the Gaza Strip, in Yemen, armaments are being built up everywhere. The EU has now decided again to spend 150 billion to set up production capacities for weapons and logistics. At the same time, there are these tensions between the major powers USA, Russia and China and are increasing enormously. But Europe, the Middle East, India, Pakistan, Iran - there is also a lot boiling everywhere. And at the same

time, we are heading towards the peak of the machine age. Everything that can be digitized is being digitized - from currency and CBDCs even to artificial intelligence, which is meant to ultimately permeate everything.. We have heard about brain implants turning people into some kind of cyborgs [a living being that is technically augmented or enhanced] – a human-machine or a machine-human, if it is still a human at all. And my first question I'd like to ask is: are these developments random and independent of each other or is there some kind of agenda or plan behind them?

[Tom-Oliver Regenauer:] It always depends from which perspective you look at it. I always call it – or people like to call it – the polycrisis [several crises at the same time that influence or reinforce each other]. So on the one hand, there is the technological aspect, which goes in the direction of transhumanism [efforts to expand human boundaries through technological possibilities] or which principally results from the technocracy movement. It started in 1917 on the US East Coast with the technocracy movement [advocates of a form of government in which technical knowledge is the basis of power], which then – if you follow it in detail – developed into the digitalization industry, the platform economy [business model that enables the exchange of products, services or data by means of digital platforms] or the observation economy [recording, evaluation and commercial use of (purchasing) behaviour through constant observation and data analysis] – depending on what you call it. That is certainly the technological aspect.

On the other hand, there is of course the military aspect, the military-industrial complex, as you call it. War has never disappeared. You cannot say there's war again now. There has always been war. If I remember correctly – since the foundation of the USA, there were something like 17 or 14 years with no wars. That speaks volumes. Therefore, we actually have a situation, and that is 5G warfare, i.e. fifth-generation warfare. And it's not just kinetic warfare [military, physical combat operations], it's also cognitive warfare [aimed at influencing the mental and emotional processes of the opponent], which is being talked about again and again. NATO has its own website called NATO Innovation Hub. It's about cognitive warfare. And that quickly brings us back to the technology aspect, because we're all familiar with what I like to call "smombies" – smartphones and zombies – when they're walking around on the street. Most people are busy with their smartphone, even when they are walking the dog or taking the child for a walk. And that is just invasive [intrusive] technology. And of course this has an effect on our brains, on our physical bodies and also on our mental states.

That is why we have a so-called isolation epidemic. People are increasingly lonely, focusing on this colorful, digital world, which I then call the "Truman Show", just like my last book is called. So it's actually difficult to answer this question in a nutshell. Because this 5th Generation Warfare has such a broad based agenda which on the one hand is clearly moving towards kinetic warfare and therefore to disruptions [drastic changes] of the world's economic or the world's monetary system. And on the other hand, there is this very strong component of cognitive warfare, which is being worked on at all fronts. Be it on part of NATO, on part of the big tech companies and then in the progressed form, this transhumanist agenda, for example, where we then quickly come to Neuralink [US neurotechnology company] or similar. Where Elon Musk's company wants to create brain implants and the connection with AI, with the cloud. This is the bio-digital convergence, i.e. the merging of humans and machine, in the broader sense. And then of course at some point the question is, to what extent will you still be human?

So this is a very complex question, and I would be happy to give a two-hour lecture on it. So it's actually difficult to answer in a nutshell. To break it down, however, we are in a polycrisis and are probably facing disruption on an unprecedented scale. The question is, how quickly will it happen and in what form will it be disruptive? This digitalization – or the technocratic-transhumanistic – will certainly be a gradual process, a gradual change that will take generations to gain a foothold. The other, kinetic war, basically can happen more quickly. In principle, the decisive fire is missing in the right place and then it can trigger a conflagration – whether it's in the Middle East or whether the scenario is Taiwan, China, the USA or whether it's Russia, NATO, Ukraine, we are certainly facing disruptive times and "unpleasantly" probably also warlike times.

[Kla.TV:] Yes, let's come back to the national level. There are these conflicting nations: USA, Russia, China. Do they all serve a different agenda or is it basically the same thing?

[Tom-Oliver Regenauer:] From the overarching perspective, I always call this the 2D and 3D or 4D level of politics or geopolitics. On the 2D level, we see actual conflicts of course, between Ukraine and Russia now – where people are dying, far too many people, in a kinetic war that is actually being waged. On the level above, on the 3D level so to speak, there are institutions such as the UN or the Bank for International Settlements in Basel. And if you look at the history of the First or Second World War, for example, it is these institutions and organizations where negotiations take place. So where there is no war, it's these places where the relevant decision-makers meet and see what they will do.

In other words, from the perspective of the normal working, and in the end warring part of the population, it naturally looks like and is the case that there is a kinetic conflict, and there is a danger of war. China, America; a war raging in Ukraine. On the other level, however you must see that these 193 UN member states have all committed themselves to the 2030 Agenda and are supporting and implementing it accordingly. This can be seen very clearly in the fact that America is currently introducing an "Immigration OS", i.e. a migration operating system, with Palantir, which basically accumulates an unprecedented amount of data, it does big data pooling and thus makes the idea of the transparent citizen almost look beautiful. It's even worse. Everything from fitness trackers to smartphones – everything that is somehow available in terms of data is "pooled" and then, basically rolled out via the topic of migration, so then combating the problem of migration with it.

Of course, the same thing is happening in Germany currently in a similar way, in saying we are getting the digital ID and the digital wallet [electronic wallet on the smartphone] in Germany. We then need appropriate payment cards for the migrants. All of this will then be fully monitored and Russia will do exactly the same. Two days ago, there were reports that the topic of migration is now also being hotly debated in Russia, that the digital ID is also being introduced there, that digital money will also be introduced there in digital roubles. So the agenda is basically running – if you look at the 17 sustainability goals and then the sub-goals. Point 16 in particular is very interesting, because it deals with institutions and so on. Then you can see that they are all pursuing the same agenda. But that doesn't mean that this can't cause any war.

Unfortunately, war is the best business for the ruling caste. On the one hand in armaments, where the corporations, just like the pharmacological-digital-financial complex, can enrich themselves beforehand by driving armament, ReArm Europe [new: "Readiness 2030", aims

to strengthen the EU's military capabilities and increase its strategic autonomy] etc. with von der Leyen. These are billions, hundreds of billions, which then flow into these corporations and into a bloated stock market infrastructure causing rising share prices. On the other hand, war itself is of course good business for the people on the third level above. For one thing, they can introduce things that would never be possible in normal peacetime. In war and in love, everything is allowed, and unfortunately that's the way it is. In war, they can implement things that would otherwise never be feasible, such as the Bretton Woods financial system after the Second World War.

Or rather, that was just two days before the official end of the Second World War, when the new world financial system was already being negotiated. This also shows that this was obviously the priority. Not to end the war and the people dying, but that this system would be implemented [introduced]; Bretton Woods [an international monetary and financial system adopted in 1944] and thus today's world financial system and therefore – you have to see this at a higher level – also the Bank for International Settlements (BIS). While wars are waging, the delegates and representatives of these countries meet in a very harmonious atmosphere and have their board meetings, where completely different things are decided and planned: What do you do with and after the war and who earns the most? I can refer you to my article, which is called the BRICS Bluff [association of important emerging economies such as Brazil, Russia, India, China, South Africa and other countries since 2024]. This is about the conglomerate at the financial level, i.e. the Asian banks, the Bank for International Settlements, the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and how they are connected.

And there's a nice quote in there from the former head of the Chinese central bank, who said: "The initiative of AIIB is not to reinvent the wheel. Rather it is intended to be a supplement to the current international financial system..." And when people always say: "Yes, but there is an alternative system, the alternative SWIFT system of the Chinese", that is so alternative that it simply has a different name and runs on the SWIFT network. Technically, it is simply the SWIFT network with a different name. There is no alternative. They work together at a very harmonious level and see to it that they finance wars on both sides, just as they used to. That they finance disruptions [radical changes] on both sides and organize and structure them in such a way that it benefits everyone involved.

[Kla.TV:] Yes. So are these – you've now talked about different disruptive events – do they belong together or are they things that – as I've already asked – are they parallel and just happen to have something to do with each other? Or can you recognize a common thread that runs through all of this?

[Tom-Oliver Regenauer:] So you can clearly see the common thread and that is basically depending on how far back you go. So if you go back to the end of the 19th century, the beginning of the 20th century, then one of the defining topics is certainly eugenics [the idea of "improving" the human population through targeted reproduction or preventing undesirable characteristics]. Eugenics was an invention of the British. This was basically racial theory, the breeding of the human species and the optimization of the human species. That was also what spilled over from Great Britain to America. There was also a eugenics movement and a Eugenics Council.

So these were official government institutions that took care of optimizing the species. And of course, from the caste that was instrumental in steering and favoring this – this model of

eugenics – naturally, the goal was, in principle, to have a relatively dull, unaspiring, obedient working class and a ruling caste that would take advantage of these disposable masses. So certainly a determining factor is eugenics, which we encounter today as bioethics, as bio-digital convergence. [Fusion of man and machine] And the term transhumanism in particular was coined by Julian Huxley, the head of the British Eugenics Society. He was twice Director of the British Eugenics Society and later the first Director-General of UNESCO. The term eugenics appears very frequently in the UNESCO founding document and then, of course, this is basically a common thread that has run through the whole of history for over 100 years. And when, of course, after Adolf Hitler and the NSDAP [National Socialist German Workers' Party under Adolf Hitler] regime and the Nazi period in the world, people realized that it was better not to talk about eugenics anymore – because that was of course also what Adolf Hitler advocated in his racial theory variant – they then said, well, Julian Huxley said – we call that transhumanism.

That sounds much more progressive, less suspiciously like a racial doctrine, but these are basically the agendas that we encounter today in a new guise. In the end, they are all based on eugenics. And the second component is technocracy [a form of government in which technical knowledge is the basis of power]. This is what emerged in New York in 1917 and then became Technocracy Inc. in the 1930s. And these are the two dominant, I think, underlying – I'm not saying plans, they are concepts – they are ultimately concepts that have been used again and again over the generations and packaged in different ways. But in the end, these are the determining factors in kinetic warfare, in cognitive warfare, as well as in change and disruption on a societal, social and psychological level, and they determine the times. So if you want to break it down, it's eugenics and technocracy.

[Kla.TV:] Of course, these are now two movements that are ultimately directed against people. People talk about improving people, precisely through brain implants, because they are being turned into this "dumb mass". You can see that people are deliberately exposed to things that are not good for them – like the smartphone, which turns them into "smombies" – in order to then offer them a solution that ultimately goes against people again. What kind of people are driving this forward?

[Tom-Oliver Regenauer:] Difficult, yes. You can't look into the heads of the people concerned and just make assumptions. But you can glean a lot from the writings. And in the end it still has something of this – yes, people like to say that now – neo-feudalism [feudalism was a political hierarchical system in the Middle Ages in which land ownership was the most important basis for power] or neo-colonialism. And I always say that this is actually the same colonialism and the same feudalism that has always existed, only the tools of this caste have changed. So what you can do today, of course, in terms of propaganda, media manipulation, which in the end is cognitive warfare. After all, it's usually not about the content of the message, but simply about the mass of information. So very few people can actually prioritize what news they take in and filter what is important and what is not important. So from that point of view, the literature of this caste, which writes very openly about what it is planning, supports in principle again and again the fact that there is a self-image of feudalism, that one feels chosen. People also like to say "the blue blood", the nobility who think they are above the normal population, whereas I always say that there is no right to rule. Nobody has this right, there never was, there never will be such a right. Everyone is equal and these people obviously don't see it that way.

[Kla.TV:] Yes. The alternative media very often talk about a new world order – in the sense of an authoritarian, centralized government – that certain clubs or clans agree on things in back rooms in order to benefit the world. The mainstream media naturally castigate this as a conspiracy theory. The question is, what is your opinion on this? What is right now?

[Tom-Oliver Regenauer:] Yes, I mean, the term conspiracy theory goes back to a CIA document. The link can be found in the current article. This was of course launched at the time in order to silence critics of the John F. Kennedy story – i.e. anyone who had any doubts about the official narrative and the Warren Report etc. was then vilified as a conspiracy theorist, so that in principle an attempt was made to silence dissenting voices. So that is of course a framing [putting a term in a certain context to evoke certain emotional evaluations] term, just like the term corona denier was in the corona crisis. This is not to be taken seriously. Besides, you have to look at it this way, conspiracy is the rule and not the exception. If I'm an employee in a company and I'm somehow bothered by my boss, what do I do with my five colleagues? I coordinate and somehow try to form a unit that can either do something about it or express that you are not alone. You could even call that a conspiracy.

But in the end it is a cooperation. So cooperation is what makes us human. That is spontaneous order. If we want to organize something in the community, in our circle of friends, then we also have spontaneous order by calling who can help us and then we form a small group that does something. So these people do the same thing. And there are countless circles, of course. We know many of them by now. The well-known one is the World Economic Forum. For me, that's more like the marketing department, it's very public. Then there are the Bilderberg conferences. Then there is Bohemian Grove. There is Le Cercle. There are tons of such institutions, think tanks, foundations where people meet in smaller groups to basically form an agenda – which follows eugenics and transhumanism – in a broader sense. And I simply call that cooperation. It's the most normal thing in the world.

The problem is, of course, that we as a normal population focus on other things. That we focus on the positive. whenever we set up partnerships, then we want a cooperative, then we want to make a difference in the circle of friends, perhaps do something in the community and in the local council. Those are positive aspects. This is cooperation for the benefit of the group you are in. While it is quite clear that these circles, which meet in private to cooperate, usually work against the normal population. Because they are pushing through an agenda that none of us voted for and that we often know nothing about unless we actively seek it out, research it and deal with it. In other words, for me this has nothing to do with conspiracy. To a large extent, this is organized crime.

Because if I have a mandate as a politician and am supposed to represent what the will of the people is – if you take it that way – then of course I would have to listen to the will of the people. But there is this well-known Princeton study, which I like to mention, from 2017 – I think or 2015 – which examined the correlation [agreement] between the will of the voters and real politics, and this is zero. At the time, the headline in a US publication read: "America is no longer a democracy, Europe should beware of what is coming." So you can call that a conspiracy theory, but that's just people who are either actively engaged in propaganda and want to discredit us with it. Or it's the people who haven't looked into it and are trying to understand, in a broader sense, what cooperation means when you think you're in a caste that owns or at least controls the majority of the means of production, the technology, or the industry. So yes, I tend to laugh at the term. I don't really take it seriously.

[Kla.TV:] Well, it is fact that this caste is not united among themselves either, because the power tempts them to take more and more for themselves – always in terms that I am the one. How does it even hold together? How can you imagine it that there seems to be a plan that they have been following for generations, even though they are not in a position to really cooperate – like, for example, at community level, where they want to do something for the village. How should we imagine this? How does such cohesion work?

[Tom-Oliver Regenauer:] In management, people like to say management by policy. So you set up guard rails and in principle it's something like transhumanism or eugenics or technocracy. In other words, you move in one direction on the basis of a narrative, an ideology, a concept. Of course, there are junctions and obstacles in between.

Of course, there are also internal conflicts. You can see this very well in America, where there is the conservative bloc, which at the time consisted of George Bush and Dick Cheney and so on. And this whole clique is the conservative power bloc and a family clan that has been wielding power in America for over 100 years – the Bush family in particular. And then of course there is the more democratically oriented power bloc – for example Biden (now in the younger case), George Soros and Bill Gates, these are the financiers of this more left-wing bubble. It is currently the conservatives who are in power. Then we tend to have financiers like Peter Thiel, who sees himself as a liberal-conservative.

There is of course an internal power struggle, because in the end it is of course about who sits at the head of the table and who has the say in said new world order or in the current ruling system. So there are certainly conflicts between them. But what is very consistent [in itself stable, constant] is that you always act on the basis of an agenda. In other words, it is always moving in the direction of technocracy. You can also see that in Germany now. In principle, it doesn't matter who is in power, even now after the election. What is being pursued further is the green economy with CO2 tracking and emissions trading. None of this will be abolished or changed. On the contrary, there is now full-time biometric surveillance with E-ID and digital citizen wallet [electronic wallet on the smartphone] and similar instruments. Reasons: We now have this migration crisis, we need to promote internal security and position ourselves better.

So now we are introducing biometrics and e-ID to prevent electoral fraud, etc., just like America, whereas the previous government rolled out the same system, the same biometrics, the same mass surveillance, because of a different potential risk, namely the virus. So then it was said that we urgently need, for our health and for global health, biometric monitoring and test or vaccination tracking and QR code dystopia [a fictitious, mostly gloomy vision of the future]. So you end up with the same model, it doesn't change at all. In principle, the only thing that is changing is the marketing instrument. How to make it somehow palatable to the population.

[Kla.TV:] This means that the various groups, although not "agreeable" with each other, have a common goal. I have the feeling that they want to take as much as possible away from the normal population. Be it cognitive, be it material, to keep it for themselves. Are they individuals, families or large corporations? What do these power structures look like?

[Tom-Oliver Regenauer:] Oh, how long is this lecture going to be? There's a huge network,

it's impossible to answer that precisely. So on the one hand, of course, there are family clans, like the Bushes, who have, in principle, been spreading their wings in American politics for 100 years, cobbling together resources and are, in principle, a criminal clan that comes to power or has been in power from time to time. The Kennedys are not much better. They made their money with opium, weapons and alcohol smuggling and grew in this. That's the whole US East Coast, basically based on successors to the East India Company [former British trading company with a monopoly on the Indian trade] and on opium trade. You can easily read in the mainstream media that Harvard and Princeton and all these universities were basically founded by ex-opium barons.

And the Kennedys can't be taken out of that group. On the one hand, there are certainly these family clans. On the other hand, there are these networks, such as the Bilderberg Conference. Of course, it is interesting that on the one hand you have a George Soros or a Peter Thiel or an Eric Schmidt, who in principle very publicly represent opposing ideologies. One is left-wing democratic – in the case of Eric Schmidt, ex-Google boss – and the other is right-wing liberal-conservative, a Peter Thiel. So they are diametrically opposed to each other in public and in the media, but then meet at the Bilderberg Conference, where they are both on the Steering Committee. Which then implies that something different is being discussed there than what we see in the media, where most of it is probably just for show, or people are just publicly trying to secure voter share or power. While something like digitalization and transhumanism are being pursued in the background and these people get along very well. So these people are usually also friends in their private lives. You can always see that in the Bundestag, when it's said that they're arguing in the talk show – somehow the Greens against the CDU and the Left and AfD. And then, at the end, they're standing around somewhere at a panel, laughing together and having fun. This is basically a club. And what is presented to us in public is usually something like a soap opera.

[Kla.TV:] Yes. You are very active in making these things public. How do you get people to listen to you?

[Tom-Oliver Regenauer:] First of all, I don't want anyone to listen to me. I actually want people to listen to themselves and their intuition, their inner voice and their own conscience. Because as I said earlier, there is no right to rule. There is also no one who has to dictate anything to you or me. The only thing that should guide us in life is our personal understanding of reality. And everyone has to decide this very subjectively for themselves. In other words, what I do is basically gather information, then make it available – and, above all, with all the sources I use to come to my conclusion – so that you as a reader can understand it yourself and then decide whether you come to the same conclusion. I generally find them very logical and don't see how you could come up with any other. But everyone is free to decide for themselves.

I don't want people to believe me at all. The worst thing you can do is to simply adopt and adapt opinions and believe someone. You should only listen to yourself. And what I think is important is that we also use the right terms. So if I call myself a corona-denier, a conspiracy theorist or something like that, of course I'm doing people a favor. You won't find these terms in my texts. Because it's always not about conspiracies, but organized crime. And there is basically the very simple sentence: Follow the money. So you follow the money, which any criminal investigator would do, any detective who wants to solve a crime. I do the same. And you can take any of my articles to court and have a good chance of winning, because in

principle everything is proven. And not with some YouTube video by Mr. XY, who once heard from someone that this might be the case, but usually with the original documents from UNESCO, the CIA, etc.

Then you can read for yourself what these people actually do and write, what they announce, what they retrospectively admit and concede – which often only happens decades later. So you also have to use the right terms. That's why I use terms like observation economics [recording, evaluation and commercial use of (purchasing) behavior through constant observation and data analysis]. This is basically not just full-time surveillance, but earning money with full-time surveillance. After all, the big tech companies that are mining the gold of our time which is data, are of course making huge amounts of money from it. However, they also pass this data on to the government or intelligence agencies. These, in turn, thus gain access to the individual heretic, the non-believing critic who somehow utters something delegitimizing the state. In other words, it's a very unhealthy network.

And Benito Mussolini described it at the time as the perfect form of fascism: "Corporatism. When the state and corporations merge into an unhealthy power structure." And that is exactly what we have. That's why this power structure is so huge, confusing and difficult to pin down, because in principle politics has long since ceased to decide anything. Those who have been deciding for us for a long time have been supranational organizations, their agents, their think tanks and something like the UN which then presents us with an Agenda 2030 and sustainability goals that none of us have ever voted for, but which are then implemented and enforced by the respective national government, in principle, against the will of the people, who neither voted for it nor have any say in it. So for me, politics is just the executive arm of a supranational structure that is not called world government, but global governance. And at some point, this will certainly lead to an ever stronger global governance structure. At the latest when we have to pay a sustainability tax to the UN at some point, which has already been discussed. But the national governments will of course continue to exist. Because that's what you see. That's where I can simulate democracy and vote and still give voters the feeling that they're participating, but in the end that's not true.

[Kla.TV:] So that means that the feared one-world government, which will then sit somewhere in Geneva or New York, will probably not exist, but rather these subdivisions that we already have?

[Tom-Oliver Regenauer:] Exactly, that's not for sale. If you want to continue to present the model of democracy in the media and say that it is the best democracy of all time, then of course I can't go around saying we have a world government here of some eight elderly gentlemen meeting in the back room and deciding for the whole world. Of course that doesn't work. People know that, of course. That is why of course national governments will continue to exist, but there will always be new instruments that demand and ensure supranational sovereignty. Like this WHO treaty, which of course ensures that in the healthcare sector it is no longer the national governments but a supranational construct that dictates what happens in the individual countries.

[Kla.TV:] Yes. Why do you think people put up with this? More and more people are realizing that they are dissatisfied with their governments and would perhaps even welcome a fresh start and even agree to a world government.

[Tom-Oliver Regenauer:] Yes, there are a surprising number of people who don't think it's so bad. But these are usually the people who don't take a closer look. Anyone who sees themselves as a democrat – especially now in Switzerland, as a grassroots democrat – wants to exert influence in their community.

That means he wants to have a say, put forward his points - pro and con - and then somehow find a consensus. That is actually what democracy is. It is a process, often also a conflict, a discussion, a discourse that has to be resolved somewhere. And of course that doesn't happen. I think a lot of people don't really have an overview because they simply don't have the time in their normal working lives. Who has time to spend four, six or eight hours in the evening researching something if it's not well presented in a book?

[Kla.TV:] When you talk to people on the street, you get the feeling that they're all just going along somehow, that they're latently dissatisfied but not really doing anything. The media tells us that freelance journalists like you and me make up at most 20 percent of the population. Is that really the case?

[Tom-Oliver Regenauer:] No, I don't see it that way. I always like to cite the example of the referendums in Switzerland – back then on the subject of coronavirus and the Covid law. There was the first referendum, which initially even rejected the law. I looked at these projections – or the forecasts – and at some point, I think the result was: 47 percent rejected this law, which then meant that it was accepted after all. But in the first referendum even 47 percent of the population voted against the implementation of this regime – this surveillance tracking and ultimate control system. And I believe that much of the media's portrayal of this critical bubble is completely exaggerated.

Because of course you have to give people the feeling that they are somehow the weird, crazy, critical part of the population and that they are the absolute minority, yes. Then you feel powerless. Of course, this creates a feeling of powerlessness and helplessness and ensures that people continue to sit at home on the sofa in apathy and are of course annoyed that they can't do anything. But I see it very differently, because as I said, when you're out and about in the city, in the analog space and talk to people, it's rather rare to meet someone who really thinks it's all good, who is really enthusiastic about the German government, the American government, whether it's Trump or the one before him, whether it's the Swiss government. You will hardly meet anyone in public spaces, in the pub or on the train who is completely enthusiastic.

My observation is that the people you meet who really speak positively about it are the minority. That's 20, 18, 25, 15 percent, depending on where you go, maybe even 30 percent. But I believe that this is the minority. And I believe that 60 or 70 percent of the population have realized that they are being deceived, that this is a facade and that this dissatisfaction is big. I believe that of these – let's call it 60 percent or 70 percent – a large proportion of this block is not yet confident enough to voice this publicly. Because of course there's the fear that your employer will find out about it, that you'll have disadvantages at work, that you might no longer be allowed to join the tennis or shooting club socially, that you might be seen by your friends as the leper who advocates some strange theories. But I believe that if you talk about it openly – and this is my experience – you quickly realize that a lot of people are very critical.

The important thing is not to use the terms suggested by the ruling caste, the propaganda apparatus. So don't talk about climate change, if someone talks to you about climate change, talk about environmental protection. When someone talks about capital accumulation and evil billionaires like Elon Musk, talk about the evil billionaires like Soros and Gates who also end up criminally organizing and collaborating to implement things that none of us voted for. And try to describe things with terms that are more appropriate. It's not about conspiracy theories, it's about organized crime and investigative journalism, it's about criminology. The surveillance state is not necessarily about the surveillance state, but about the observation economy, because it is a very close interaction between the corporations and the state apparatus and the secret services. So, if you try to approach people with the right vocabulary, you can even talk to the so-called 'other side' – in a very constructive way.

I experience this myself time and again when I talk to people who would be described as completely "woke" [heightened awareness of racism and a lack of social justice] or "from the completely opposite shore", who can have a great conversation with me because I'm also in favor of environmental protection and nobody likes microplastics in their food. I am also not in favor of super billionaires like Musk, Soros or Gates, who can buy so much influence with their money that they kill people in Africa with drugs through campaigns that are basically only detrimental. From sterilization to deaths, all those kind of things that happened in the past.

So if you simply try to connect to people where they are at – and I think everyone has to start with themselves – because, of course, a lot of people are still very disappointed by the corona crisis, by their neighbors, by their employer. But if you have some more information and have a bit more insight than the others and have seen through these things, then you also have the responsibility to give in a bit and be the more sensible one and still approach people. Because we are one species, we have to somehow share this habitat together. And if we continue being divided into pro- and anti-corona, pro- and anti-migration and pro-Trump, anti-Trump and Merz and BlackRock in Germany. The more such divisive narratives are brought into the population, the more we have to deal with ourselves and with horizontal conflicts. While the problem - as we saw in 2008 with the Occupy Wall Street movement – the problem is at the top. And the last time people looked to the top together, left and right, was Occupy Wall Street. There was a great momentum across the spectrum, where people realized: It's the central banks, it's the big banks that we have to save with our money, with our taxes to the tune of billions. And they didn't have this horizontal conflict. And then after that, especially in America, there was the Tea Party movement again and what became the progressive "woke" [progressive heightened awareness of racism and lack of social justice]. And again, people are in horizontal conflict and bashing each other's heads in instead of actually addressing the problem and that's usually looking upward.

[Kla.TV:] Yes. And to what extent are we now at the mercy of this process or can we defend ourselves, arm ourselves against what it is supposed to be done to us? If we agree with this, we therefore give it the power. On the other hand, if we take the power to ourselves, we take it away from them – these opportunities, so to speak. The more people do this, the larger and more extensive this process becomes. What do you advise people to do?

[Tom-Oliver Regenauer:] So first of all, of course, you have to understand that the more propaganda there is, the more questionable, schizophrenic narratives are thrown out there, the more outrage management takes place. So today is topic A, you have to be outraged

about it. The next day is topic B, so you have to be outraged. The more this happens, the more it is a sign that there is a certain panic up there in the ivory tower because, of course, trust in politics and the state has been falling for decades. Trust in public service broadcasting is falling.

Voter turnout is falling and declining. In other words, more and more people are obviously realizing what they are being governed by and that it doesn't really have much to do with democracy, are disappointed and are turning away. And of course most people do it in a certain resignation – in other words, in disappointment – so that they simply don't want to deal with it anymore, but instead focus on their private life, on the things they can influence. And that is actually correct. If I wasn't involved in journalism, I often wouldn't watch the stuff, because it's often the case that the grotesque storytelling [transforming dry facts into captivating, but not necessarily true stories] simply insults your own intelligence. But what you actually have to advise people to do is to recognize that: We are still more! So if you take the relations of a government with its police forces or the civil service and then compare them with the number of people living in this country as a population, then we have a huge discrepancy between the apparatus – state apparatus, system, whatever you want to call it – and the population, which actually has the power.

That is actually the idea of democracy, that the sovereign decides. This feeling is particularly prevalent in Switzerland. And you very quickly get the feeling that you are somehow being dictated to from the federal government if you are not asked. Now we have these EU framework agreements, which means: "They're trying to get around the referendum somehow and it doesn't have to go before the Council of States." They try to get out of it somehow. And people simply have to actively participate. Democracy is a process. If you already have this as the "best model" – and it is probably one of the best models that we know and have and also have a certain amount of practical experience with it – if you want to get involved and actively bring it to some kind of positive result, then you have to get involved, and you have to do it locally. Because you can't influence the Federal Council in Bern from Chur. What you can do, however, is to make the municipal administration sit up and take notice, provide input and set the tone. And if enough municipalities do this and enough municipal leaders then take action in the canton and the canton then takes action in Bern, then you do have the power to make a difference. Corona would certainly have gone very differently if there hadn't been so much free media and so much opposition. So get active, get up from the sofa and don't consume the crisis as if it were a movie. It is the life of all of us and we can shape it, because the future is not predetermined [determined in advance], we can still change it now.

[Kla.TV:] Yes, thank you very much for your assessment and for sharing your knowledge with us. Do you have anything else you would like to address the audience with at the end?

[Tom-Oliver Regenauer:] Yes, that was almost a closing statement, you definitely need to realize that you yourself are the power, the change, the positive future and that life is beautiful. Life is beautiful and everything else that people try to convince us of – whether it's fear, whether they want to make us afraid of wars, fear of digitalization, etc. – it's all a means of domination. Life is beautiful. You should lead a motivated, happy, fulfilled life with your family, with the local environment that you have, and under no circumstances should you allow yourself to be pushed into this attitude of fear attitude of resignation that the media – that the propaganda apparatus wants to push us into – because then in the end they will

have achieved their goal. So the future is not there to be predicted, but to be shaped – as Antoine de Saint-Exupéry once said. And I believe you should do that by being active and living a happy life, because a happy life is the real revolution.

[Kla.TV:] Thank you very much for this interview. All the best to you, Mr. Regenauer.

[Tom-Oliver Regenauer:] Thanks for the invitation.

from L. dec./sl.

Sources:

Order „HOPIUM“ by Tom-Oliver Regenauer, 3. Edition of his series „Texte zu Zeitenwende, Technokratie und Korporatismus“:

<https://shop.tredition.com/booktitle/HOPIUM/W-647-217-513>

Website of Tom-Oliver Regenauer

<https://www.regenauer.press/>

Biography of Tom-Oliver Regenauer

<https://www.regenauer.press/profil>

„Machtstrukturen & Medien – Wer regiert wirklich?“ Interview with Tom-Oliver Regenauer

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5VkRni0dbNY>

This may interest you as well:

#politics-en - Politics - www.kla.tv/politics-en

#NWO-en - NWO - www.kla.tv/nwo-en

#GreatReset-en - Great Reset - www.kla.tv/GreatReset-en

#Cyborgs-en - Cyborgs - www.kla.tv/Cyborgs-en

#Transhumanism-en - Transhumanism - www.kla.tv/Transhumanism-en

#TomOliverRegenauer -en - www.kla.tv/TomOliverRegenauer-en

Kla.TV – The other news ... free – independent – uncensored ...



- ➔ what the media should not keep silent about ...
- ➔ Little heard – by the people, for the people! ...
- ➔ regular News at www.kla.tv/en

Stay tuned – it's worth it!

Free subscription to our e-mail newsletter here: www.kla.tv/abo-en

Security advice:

Unfortunately countervoices are being censored and suppressed more and more. As long as we don't report according to the ideology and interests of the corporate media, we are constantly at risk, that pretexts will be found to shut down or harm Kla.TV.

So join an internet-independent network today! Click here:

www.kla.tv/vernetzung&lang=en

Licence: [Standard Kla.TV license](#)

Kla.TV produces all programs on a voluntary and non-profit basis. The distribution of our products by you is our only reward! More under www.kla.tv/licence