

Speaker 1:

Bobby Capucci:

Hello everyone, and welcome to the Jeffrey Epstein Show. I'm your host, Bobby Capucci and this is a special episode. What's up everybody? Welcome to part two with Dr. Steven DeLay. Hey Steven. What's going on?

Steven DeLay:

Not much. How are you, Bobby?

Bobby Capucci:

I'm doing great. Thank you for joining me for that last segment. That was absolutely mind blowing and a lot of information to process. I'm sure that I'm going to receive a ton of emails and questions on Facebook and Twitter about that exchange. I'm pumped about the second part of it. I'm pumped to hear what you have to share with us. I'm going to go ahead and just jump into it and we'll open up the floor.

Steven DeLay:

Okay, great. Thanks again for the opportunity to come on your show and discuss the situation with Jeffrey Epstein. I really appreciate it. I can't thank you enough for the work that you've been doing over the last year with the podcast. It's just been really encouraging and a point of personal inspiration to me to see the work that you're doing, so thank you.

Bobby Capucci:

Oh, that means a lot to me, Dr. DeLay, I mean, Steven. It's also important, like I said to you in our private conversations, that people that are involved in academia speak out. You're one of the bravest people going, because let me tell you, it's not easy to face your colleagues as the one man standing or as the person that is saying, "Look, enough is enough." I have a lot of respect for you personally and professionally.

Steven DeLay:

Well, the truth is its own defense. I think hopefully as has emerged in the course of our first conversation, or rather the first part of this second conversation, all this is public record, frankly. There's really no disputing it. I haven't done anything. The research has already been done by other people. I was just here to summarize some of it, and perhaps contextualize it a bit. I think that's what is, in some cases, so dismaying about the situation, is that no one really is in a position to deny the reality that we were discussing in this first part of our discussion regarding human trafficking and sex trafficking and child exploitation. There's no denying that Mark Dutroux was who he was. There's no denying the evidence that was corroborated by police investigators in Belgium who took the information that Regina Louf and the other victims supplied them in the X-Files.

Steven DeLay:

There's no denying what happened in Germany with this pedophilia ring that we mentioned with the German men. There's no denying what Helmut Kentler was doing in concert with the Berlin state government and frankly, the facts do speak for themselves. Of course, that raises the question about

why it is that, given the facts being that they are, there seems to be such a concerted effort on the part of certain people. I mentioned before the corporate media, but also in my own field in academia, there are those who are so resistant to being honest about the state of the situation and the degree of the problem.

Bobby Capucci:

I certainly think we are dealing with an honesty problem in academia and elsewhere when it comes to Epstein. I think you hit the nail on the head there.

Steven DeLay:

Good. What I would like to try to do here is by begin by identifying some people who I think are representative of the kind of discourse that we should be rejecting and identifying as counterproductive. If we really want to get to the bottom of this problem and address it and hopefully stamp it out. After I've made some remarks about those particular individuals and the way in which, in my opinion, they mishandle this problem, I then want to turn to more specifics about the various nefarious means that people involved in this kind of underworld, that you see Marc Dutroux involved in, that you see Helmut Kentler involved in. The kinds of means that they use to control others into living that way. There I'm going to get a little bit more personal and just rely on some of the experience that I've had at Oxford to kind of illuminate how that works.

Steven DeLay:

Then from there, the final thing I want to turn to is the question about how society functions with all of us, and how we're all a part of the problem. Not that every single person is a child molester or every single person is being blackmailed. No, it's not that every single person is involved in some secret conspiracy, rather it's an open problem. There's a philosophical puzzle, I think, about why it is that as a society we all know that there's a problem, and yet we act as if there isn't.

Steven DeLay:

Then I want to draw a little bit on Freud and Heidegger, Kierkegaard, Michel Henry, and Hannah Arendt, to explain some of the sociological problems that we're having, as far as not facing up to this problem. Then explain how the mentality behind the people who are involved in these sex crimes, involved in these blackmail networks, involved in these child, exploitation networks, tend to be the same kind of people who are these tech oligarchs, who are trying to create a very controlled society where we're talking about transhumanism. We're talking about a biosecurity state. We're talking about a society of mass surveillance. We're talking about a society with no civil liberties. It's all related.

Steven DeLay:

I think everyone has a stake in understanding the problem of sex trafficking and human trafficking and child trafficking, because sadly, the people who have captured so many of our public institutions are being controlled by those means. They're the ones who are transforming society in this deeply pernicious, anti-human when that's detrimental to everybody.

Bobby Capucci:

Yeah. I think you hit the nail on the head right there. It's like this concerted effort almost, by the so-called elite. It's scary to think that they have been able to get away with it, so brazenly, for so long.

Steven DeLay:

Correct. So to think back to what I mentioned in the first part of our conversation, I briefly mentioned professor Quassim Cassam, the University of Warwick's Philosophy Department. I quoted a comment he made in Nature magazine this month, where he had characterized conspiracy theory as a form of political propaganda. I've read a little bit of his work, and I also listened to a podcast he did recently with Ross Kemp, who's a British actor. On Kemp's podcast, professor Cassam explained further what he means about conspiracy theories being a form of political propaganda. Now, of course my contention at the beginning of our first episode was that the problem with human trafficking, or rather the problem associated with confronting it, is that it's being politicized.

Steven DeLay:

The first thing I would say is that I'm a little bit wary of the direction in which Professor Cassam wants to take things, when he immediately tries to situate conspiracy within a political frame, because from my perspective, one of the most alarming things about this situation is precisely that, namely the politicization of frankly everything in our society, but also even something as fundamental and human as sex trafficking. I really think it's an incredibly unproductive and unhealthy and dangerous habit that our public discourse has fallen into to try to politicize everything. I'm a little bit reluctant to concede to Professor Cassam the thesis that conspiracy theory is functioning as a form of political propaganda, because from my perspective, looking at cultural studies and media creation, it seems to me that his own move to explain the advent, what he takes to be the advent, of conspiracy theory as a political phenomenon, is itself just symptomatic of a deeper politicization of discourse that itself is the problem. Now, in his podcasts with Kemp, he produces the example of Sandy Hook, of something that he takes to be a conspiracy theory with a political agenda.

Steven DeLay:

His idea, or his rationale, is that people in America who are supporters of gun rights look at a shooting like Sandy Hook, and they basically have a vested interest in denying that the shooting took place. Since, in doing so, they hope to prevent further gun control enactments from being undertaken. Professor Cassam is saying that people in America who don't want gun control will be more liable to deny that Sandy Hook happened. If they can do that, then it undercuts the call for gun control. Then Professor Cassam makes the point, correctly I think, that the priority should be on the children and the violence and stopping the violence. In other words, it's bad to politicize an event like that and then try to turn it and use it to your own political objective, which in this case would be protecting gun rights.

Steven DeLay:

It seems to me that's precisely what people are doing in the case of human trafficking or sex trafficking or child exploitation. Because in that very interview when Mr Kemp asks Professor Cassam, "Could you give me maybe four or five of the most absurd or silliest conspiracies that you know of running today?" the very first conspiracy that Professor Cassam mentions is Q. Now, we've already talked about this in the last conversation, but my question is, what exactly does Professor Cassam take to be absurd about it? Is it absurd to think that there really are VIP pedophile rings? We know that there are. I just spent 45 minutes, or however long, laying out a bunch of examples that are undeniable, from Belgium and Germany and France and other places that these rings do exist.

Steven DeLay:

Is Q absurd because, presumably, it claims that it's high-powered Democrats in Washington, DC doing it? That would be absurd, for precisely the reasons I just mentioned, namely that it's not limited to Washington DC, much less Democrats. I mentioned Verastigui, who was a Republican politico. The problem of pedophilia, the problem of sex trafficking, the problem of human trafficking, goes well beyond what was going on in Washington DC. I don't understand why Professor Cassam is framing the problem of human trafficking in terms of Q, when Q really has nothing to do with the problem.

Bobby Capucci:

It's like Q latched on. People that believe in the Q phenomenon or a conspiracy theory, they latched onto that. They're not the ones who came up with it.

Steven DeLay:

Exactly. So let me put it this way. When I come back to England to visit Oxford, would Professor Cassam like to organize an event at Warwick and have some kind of panel discussion about the problem of human trafficking and sex trafficking and VIP pedophile rings? We could separate fact from myth. I would love to do that because what I don't understand is what exactly is the priority, or the motivation, or the objective, in deflecting from the existence of this problem by talking about Q, rather than actually facing up to the genuine existence of these rings and trying to actually stop them? That would be my question to him.

Bobby Capucci:

Just another way for them to muddy the waters.

Steven DeLay:

Well, like I said, I've never met Professor Cassam personally. I've only read a little bit about his work. I'm basing my questions I have here from the comments he's made on the public record, including most recently last week and on the podcast with Ross Kemp. I just don't understand why Professor Cassam is worried about talking about Q when we know about Marc Dutroux, we know about Helmut Kentler. We know about Jimmy Savile. Let's talk about that. It seems to me that's much more important.

Bobby Capucci:

I would think so too. It's one of those situations where you just scratch your head and you say, "How in the hell isn't this the number one conversation in the public discourse at this point?"

Steven DeLay:

I have to agree. Now, here's a second individual, I might mention, who again, I think from what I've seen thus far, seems to be addressing, or rather failing to address, the problem of human trafficking and sex trafficking by deflecting, again, by trying to make this about Q. The individual I have in mind is Professor Jason Stanley at Yale University, a philosophy professor. Professor Stanley has had a number of things to say in recent years about propaganda. He has a book actually called *How Propaganda Works*, and he also has a more recent book about fascism that's been released. He's very concerned with things like white supremacy and patriarchy and these sorts of bad problems in our society, as he perceives it, but he has virtually nothing to say, virtually nothing to say, so far as I know, about the problem of human trafficking or sex trafficking, and it is particularly troubling in my opinion because Professor Stanley took his PhD at MIT.

Steven DeLay:

Professor Stanley, from my perspective, as a public intellectual, internationally known, has the platform as a prominent Yale professor and as an alumnus of MIT, to come out and demand that MIT as an institution and his friends and colleagues there come out to the public and be honest about what was really going on at MIT and how Jeffrey Epstein was there. Why was Jeffrey Epstein there? Not only did Professor Stanley not offer to sign any of the letters that I sent in to MIT (which is fine because that's his prerogative), but he never wrote any letter of his own. I would like to understand what exactly Professor Stanley's priorities are when he won't talk about Jeffrey Epstein, stalking the halls of his own alma mater at MIT, and how that happened.

Bobby Capucci:

It makes you wonder what the motivations are.

Steven DeLay:

I don't know. See, only Professor Stanley could say, but he won't. When we talk about institutional accountability, we talk about institutional transparency, or we talk about political agendas interfering with social justice, I don't think it's social justice to have children in Belgium snatched off the street and pimped out for snuff videos. I don't think it's social justice to have orphans in Germany pimped out to Catholic priests, or orphans sent into pedophiles homes through German foster care. I don't think that's social justice.

Bobby Capucci:

No, I don't either. It's pretty sad that there's not a more powerful voice in a position such as the position that he holds.

Steven DeLay:

Yeah. Again, it's not just to put the spotlight on Professor Stanley; I just do so given his own interest in political and social concerns, and his personal connection to MIT, and his intellectual interest in propaganda which, according to Professor Cassam, is exemplified by the kind of discourse that both of them are deeply concerned about when it comes to Q. My point said simply is just that whatever concern one has about Q, why wouldn't one have an equal or much greater concern about actual sex trafficking and actual child exploitation, which we do know happens?

Bobby Capucci:

Right? So basically it's like, what is this fixation with Q? Why are they so fixated on this QAnon phenomenon?

Steven DeLay:

From my perspective, what it seems to do is it seems to be the deliberate politicization of a discourse that shouldn't be politicized. I don't think that the problem of human trafficking or child exploitation should be perceived through the lens of political discourse or a political party, but that's unfortunately due to the over politicization of our public discourse, precisely what public intellectuals do when they try to address the problem.

Steven DeLay:

I think that's why they have this unhealthy fixation with Q, because frankly they don't actually have the intellectual or conceptual resources, in terms of their own work, to actually deal with a problem like this. Because everything they've been doing is about reducing every problem in society to this very atrophied, limited set of concepts. The problem of human trafficking and the kind of institutional corruption involved in that just doesn't lend itself to this form of analysis that they're trying to bring to bear when they address the kind of issues that they are interested in.

Bobby Capucci:

You can really tell that there's a concerted effort to make Q the number one topic, the thing that people are discussing. I said recently to somebody, I was talking to a friend of mine, and I said to them that it's really suspect to me that all of a sudden this whole Q thing is such a big deal. They're using it and basically having it be a fulcrum to divide society once again, another lever for them to complete their control over the narrative. Because if everybody's fighting with each other and you're calling your cousin a QAnon conspiracy theorist, and he's calling you a communist sympathizer, well, the people at the top who are really benefiting from all of the things that we talk about, these sex rings and this abuse, well, they're laughing all the way to the bank until their next party.

Steven DeLay:

I agree completely. I mentioned I think three individuals who I think could be kind of representative of the way in which my colleagues would approach the problem with human trafficking. I've mentioned two of them, Professor Cassam and Professor Stanley, in the context of their concern over what they consider to be conspiracy theory within the overarching context of propaganda.

Steven DeLay:

I mention a third individual who had the opportunity to circulate the letters that we send to MIT and Harvard and didn't do that unfortunately. He runs a blog that is very popular in the academic community, and which is a place of one address for scandals and issues of importance in higher education. A place which has a habit of giving people the opportunity to join a cause that's worthy of interest and of redress. Not only did he not sign the letter himself, but he never let his colleagues know about the existence of the letter. In fact, and this was September 8th, I think it was, of 2019. A few days before my colleagues and I sent the first letter to MIT, right before Joi Ito resigned as director of the MIT Media Lab, the individual in question emailed me and said, "Please stop bothering me about the Epstein stuff. I'm very busy."

Bobby Capucci:

Very busy painting half of society as domestic terrorists. Okay. I got it.

Steven DeLay:

Well, he didn't start doing that until later. I guess at the time, then the idea we just to ignore the problem and hope nobody pointed out that there was one.

Bobby Capucci:

The concerted effort to ignore what Epstein was doing for so long is so maddening.

Steven DeLay:

My question would be, again, it's a question of priority. What scandals have been occurring in higher education for the last year and a half that deserve discussion when the problem of Jeffrey Epstein at MIT and Harvard doesn't deserve discussion?

Bobby Capucci:

You would think that it would be in the forefront of a blog such as that.

Steven DeLay:

I would think so too, but it just wasn't unfortunately.

Steven DeLay:

Now, I have views about why that is, which we're going to get into here, but let me take you back to Oxford, because I think thus far what I've done is I've mentioned back cases that are in the public record, cases in Europe, going back many decades, which no one denies the reality of, but I haven't said necessarily very much about my own experience and how, from my perspective, given what I've seen at some of these institutions, how it is that a Helmut Kentler as a psychology professor could have been allowed to do what he did. Or how Jeffrey Epstein at MIT and Harvard was able to do what he did.

Steven DeLay:

Let me give you just a few examples from Harvard, sorry Oxford, recently. My first concern is an individual named Jan Joosten, who many consider to be maybe the most important Hebrew Bible scholar alive today. Professor Joosten was at Christ Church, my college at Oxford. I never met him personally, but I knew of who he was, very famous. Here's an article from The Guardian, just recently this year, maybe last year. Headline: "Oxford Professor sentenced to jail in France over Child Abuse Images." It says, "Former Pastor Jan Joosten receives year sentence for downloading 28,000 images and videos."

PART 1 OF 4 ENDS [00:25:04]

Speaker 6:

Steven DeLay:

"An Oxford University and Hebrew Professor and former pastor who downloaded 28,000 child abuse images and videos has been sentenced to a year in prison and placed on the sex offender register in France. Jan Joosten, 61, holds the prestigious Regius professorship of Hebrew at Oxford. He's considered one of the most distinguished biblical scholars of his generation. The academic, who lives in the Basse-Rentgen region of France was sentenced by a court in the city of Saverne last week, over possession of about 27,000 images and 1000 videos after he admitted the facts of the case. Prosecutors said the material downloaded by Joosten, who spent six years as a pastor in his native Belgium, included depictions of child rape. The images, downloaded over a six year period, were discovered through a lengthy police investigation by cyber crime specialists in Strasbourg.

Steven DeLay:

"Joosten, a father of four, accepted the facts of the case and told the court he was relieved to be arrested, describing his addiction as quote, 'A secret garden, in contradiction with myself' end quote. Joosten was not immediately committed to prison. His sentence would be supervised and maybe amended by an independent judge. The court also ordered a three-year program of treatment and barred him from any activity bringing him into contact with minors.

Steven DeLay:

"The defense had said that his family were aware of his offenses and argued he should not be imprisoned because he was a first time offender, presented little risk of re-offending and had sought psychiatric help voluntarily. Joosten, who studied in Belgium, the U.S. and Israel, taught at the University of Strasbourg for 20 years before joining Oxford in 2014. He still holds a role in Strasbourg and was until recently Editor in Chief of *Vectis Testamentum*, a leading journal of old Testament studies. Christ Church College sent students a statement saying that it is 'fully committed to transparency and has robust policies and processes in place' and added quote 'our thoughts are with anyone effected by this news.' A statement issued by Oxford university said, 'we can confirm that following a conviction in France of Professor Jan Joosten for possession of images of child pornography, he has been suspended by the faculty of oriental studies and Christ Church pending further action.'"

Steven DeLay:

And then here's another headline, "Prominent Oxford Theology Professor and Former Pastor Sentenced over Child Abuse Images." "A professor deemed by many to be the world's most preeminent scholar of the Hebrew Bible has been convicted on charges of child pornography. Police say Jan Joosten who held the prestigious position of Regius professor of Hebrew at the university of Oxford had downloaded 28,000 images and videos depicting the most serious forms of child abuse." And then it just summarizes the facts that I already read from the first article.

Steven DeLay:

Now, there is a second case concerning a philosophy professor at Oxford named Peter King. Now, Christ Church is on St Aldate's, and across the street on St Aldate's is Pembroke College. So Pembroke College and Christ Church are right across the street. So here you have Jan Joosten at Christ Church busted for possession of 28,000 child abuse images. And then right across the street, the same year, you have a philosophy lecturer at Pembroke College also busted for possession of child abuse images. And thinking back to what was going on in France with the petition into the French Parliament concerning the attempt to decriminalize sex with minors and then also the bit about Helmut Kentler trying to normalize sex with children, it's also worth noting that the professor here at Pembroke had a history of saying things that could be interpreted as basically sympathetic to the legalization of sex with children.

Steven DeLay:

So here the headline says "'I Wanted the Whole Set'" Pembroke Professor Jailed for Child Pornography." "Former Pembroke philosophy professor Peter J. King has been sentenced to seven months in jail and given a sexual harm prevention order to last 10 years. King was dismissed from Pembroke College on 19th February, following a report by the Oxford Blue that revealed he had scheduled a court date on charges of child pornography. The former tutor compared himself to 'someone who starts a sticker collection and wants the whole set of images,' a court heard. Girls as young as five were pictured in the indecent images found on his computer, images that King claimed to have been using for quote, 'research purposes.'

Steven DeLay:

"In 2008 King published a paper as revealed by the Oxford Blue in which he claimed there was 'a possibility of a morally acceptable form of child pornography.' Presiding Judge Maria Lamb said two interviews with police in 2018 and 2019 appeared to show King has accepted his guilt 'rather late.' Prosecutors said that despite having been cautioned after indecent search terms, King continued to download thousands of indecent images in a quote, 'repeated pattern of behavior.'

Steven DeLay:

"Police also discovered that he had visited a Russian file-sharing website. A spokesman for the Crown Prosecution Service said quote, 'almost 3000 indecent images of children and more than 300 prohibited images were found on his computer. Peter King was found with access to a number of websites known for sharing indecent images of children.' King, who taught at Oxford University's Pembroke College had previously been cautioned by police for looking up search terms like 'schoolgirl' on his computer.

Steven DeLay:

"They also said that 'analysis of his computer and hard drive showed regular access to indecent sites and his search history included quote, "schoolgirl.'" Philosophy lecturer, Peter J. King, 63, taught at several Oxford colleges from the 1980s until last month. He will be subject to the sexual harm prevention order for 10 years. The conditions may include no contact with anyone younger than 18 years old and no access to parks or other areas where children may be. He was found guilty of possessing over 3000 indecent images of children from as young as five."

Steven DeLay:

And then there's just another headline here from the BBC about it. I won't read the article, but the headline says "Oxford academic, Peter J. King Jailed on Child Abuse Images." Now, I don't know Peter personally; he was on a selection committee for a job at Pembroke College that I applied to when I was still at Christ Church. So, I was familiar with him, just the name, but never met him in person. But I have to say it is a little interesting that within a span of a few months two professors at Oxford at colleges literally right across the street from each other were both busted for possession of child pornography. You have to wonder whether there could have been some kind of connection there or whether there's some kind of existing ring among these Oxford professors. I mean, I can't say for sure, but it certainly seems like it's not outside the realm of possibility.

Bobby Capucci:

Yeah, one thing that I have learned during my investigations here in this Epstein case is I can't discount anything until evidence is provided to approve that it didn't occur at this point because the absurd is the regular, it seems.

Steven DeLay:

Exactly. Now, the reason I mentioned those two professors is because I think there are, as far as I've been able to see given my own experience, there are three primary ways that these institutions, the small subset of persons at these institutions who are guilty of these kinds of crimes, used to maintain order and control one another. And the three main methods are blackmail, bribes, and threats. And I've seen all three of those at work in my own career in academia, beginning at Oxford. And I'll just take you

quickly through some of the examples that come to my mind when I got to Oxford in 2014, which would have been the same year apparently that Joosten got there as well.

Steven DeLay:

So when I got to Oxford in 2014, I was engaged at the time to my wife and she was staying behind in America because she had to finish her own degree. So I spent the first year at Oxford alone and I was put in graduate housing for my college, which is right across the street from the college down the street from Pembroke. And there are, I don't know, about maybe a hundred of us there, graduate students from all around the world. And the layout was that it's kind of like a dorm setting where each person had his own bedroom and then there were like two other dorms in the unit and then there was a shared kitchen and a shared bathroom. So we were all in close proximity and of course everybody's coming from different places and nobody really knows each other and so the first few months we're there, there's a lot of organized events and everybody's trying to kind of make friends among the incoming graduates in class before they kind of branch off and go about the rest of their time in the city.

Steven DeLay:

And I noticed immediately in the time I got there that there were women who were making advances on me, and it was weird because it was really synthetic and almost comical. It was just really, really, really silly. And of course I had no intention or desire of cheating on my fiancee anyway, but the point is that something immediately spooked me about it, because the way that these things were happening and it seems so synthetic and staged. And there were a number of these situations that happened and over the course of the year my fiancee would come to visit me, and I remember this one time, this would have been about maybe six months or so into being at Oxford. It was winter time, and I went to check the space heater, the wall heater, because my fiancee gets cold, it was winter and I wanted to make sure it was working.

Steven DeLay:

I didn't use the wall heater when I was alone because I would just put a sweater on. So I go over to the wall heater and I look, and there's a pair of lace girl panties in between the wall and the space heater. And I said, what in the world is this doing here? And so there was a Facebook group that everybody in the graduate housing would share news on and stuff so I just sent out an email and that was like, "Did anybody play this practical joke and sneak into my room when I was gone?" And right after I posted that into the Facebook group, a couple of guys that I knew barged into my room and they're like, "What are you talking about?" And I showed them and they said, "Dude, that so weird."

Steven DeLay:

And so I realized what was going on is that because I was faithful to my fiancee and I wasn't involving myself in a lot of the behavior that other people in my graduate cohort were, whoever was maybe trying to compromise me or blackmail me, basically tried to frame me for cheating, and just left a girl's panties there so if my fiancee comes in from America and goes to use the space heater and there's women's underwear there, I mean, what am I supposed to say? I mean, "I don't know where that came from?" So I mean, luckily I caught it and I told her about it she's like, "Whoa that's weird," but that kind of stuff happens all the time, right. And that was kind of my first experience that there's this like weird behavior going on where people kind of play practical jokes at you or get you to do things that later on you'll regret. It's pretty harmless, but it got a little bit more intense as I went on.

Steven DeLay:

And so I'll give you two other quick examples. There was, not a dining society, but a regular set up, that was being hosted by a certain theology professor at Oxford who is actually appointed by the Queen of England. So he's very influential, very powerful. And he would have these dinners at his house, and everybody knew it was kind of something of an honor to be invited, because he would sort of hand pick who he would invite to the dinners. So a lot of the theology and philosophy students wanted to be able to go to the dinners. And so eventually a friend of mine, who was in the graduate housing with me as a theology student, who had spent time at Cambridge before coming to Oxford, I was over at his dorm and he told me, "Oh, well, you know, this professor wants you to come to our next dinner." And I said, "Okay, yeah. Sounds good."

Steven DeLay:

Now the friend of mine who invited me to this dinner, he is the son of a really, really famous prominent Bollywood director, and this friend of mine who was the son of this director, kind of had political ambitions. And so when I started to get to know him, he told me that at some point he actually wants to run for Prime Minister of India. Now I know that sounds kind of stupid because, you know, when people are in third grade they said they want to be president or something one day, but it wasn't like this because this is a man well-advanced into his twenties, he has a Cambridge degree, he's going for an Oxford degree, he comes from a very prominent political family in India, his father's a major Bollywood director; it's not at all outside the realm of possibility to think that this friend of mine could have had a national political future in India.

Steven DeLay:

Well, the reason I mentioned this is because a few times when I would go over to his dorm, he would have friends of his who were coming from Cambridge to visit him, and they would talk about how, when they had been at Cambridge, they had had homosexual relations with each other. Now the point isn't that to discuss whether that's right or wrong. The point is just that when he's coming from a very conservative Indian family, and he has political ambitions, that's not the kind of behavior that he could afford the public in India to know that he had been engaged in. It would destroy his campaign, and it would end his political future. And so I was kind of a little taken aback when these guys were openly talking about that kind of stuff, because they were supposedly kind of conservative theologians, and yet they were just kind of making a joke about it and how everybody did it. And I said, "I don't know, whatever."

Steven DeLay:

So when I went to these dinners, the second or third dinner, the same group of students started making jokes about the stuff that had been going on in the dorms back in Cambridge when they were undergraduates. And it was kind of weird, because I noticed that the professor who was hosting the dinner just sort of, kind of laughed about it. He didn't say, "Oh, we shouldn't be talking about that at dinner," or anything like that. And so what I realized is that this is the grooming process. So you have this super selective dining society run by this major Oxford professor, who's handpicking these promising young theologians and philosophers who are engaging in that kind of behavior, and that's the sort of gateway into whatever kind of society that they have.

Bobby Capucci:

And that's their hook. Now they have the hook on them.

Steven DeLay:

Yes, exactly. So here's the thing, you have to kind of take all this together, right? You had them throwing these women at me, and that's not working so they can't get me on infidelity. So then they tried this other line, which is like, well maybe we can get him into this homosexual activity to get me into this kind of network where I'd be beholden because of the power that comes with it, right. Because you have to understand all the people who are getting the invitations to these dinners, they kind of flaunt it and all the other students know it. So the power dynamics it gives you the advantage over your peers to be able to say, "Well, you know, so-and-so's having me over," right?

Bobby Capucci:

Right.

Steven DeLay:

So I'm going to those dinners, but I'm not playing along because I'm not engaging in some of the things that are supposed to come with it. So what happens is that I start becoming a threat, because I'm seeing things that I'm not supposed to see, and because I'm not going along with it, that's a danger. So after a couple of those dinners, the same son of the Bollywood director went over to a dinner at a mutual friend's and I was there, I was invited, and they gaslight you. It was just the three of us and the guy hosting the dinner, he looks at me and says, "Oh, well you know Steven: he thinks that there's all these conspiracies and secret societies." I thought, why in the world are they even talking about that? It's like, I'm supposed to just come over for dinner with a couple of guys who were supposed to be my friends, and I get over there and all of a sudden they're playing this joke on me about how I supposedly think there are secret societies.

Steven DeLay:

But see, that's the gaslighting, if you think about. It's kind of funny, because you just get used to whatever is normal to you, but there is a secret society in a way, because I mean, here's highly supposedly elite doctoral students at Oxford with the kind of connections that my Indian friend had into Bollywood, being groomed at these elite exclusive dining parties, and they think like, "oh, well you think something secret is going on." What percentage of the population is even in a position to go to one of these dinners and see that that's what it is really like.

Steven DeLay:

So it's this weird thing where it's like this kind of Orwellian double think where they all kind of poo pa the idea that there are supposed to be secret societies even when anybody else looking at their behavior would say, it's all a secret. Because I mean, you can't just walk off the street in Oxford and go into Christ Church and walk into one of these dinner parties. It doesn't work like that.

Bobby Capucci:

And we all know about organizations like Skull and Bones that are on record.

Steven DeLay:

Right, so my point about mentioning all this is that the way that the recruitment process works in my opinion, is that they try to get you to advance your career, and then you find out that this ordinary academic network that requires you to go to events where that kind of stuff happens. Now, I'm not

saying that every person at Oxford is a child molester, that would be absolute nonsense, of course not. But what I am saying is that if you look at Peter King and you look at Jan Joosten, and you look into Germany with Helmut Kentler and these others, we know that there are people who are involved in that kind of behavior, and we know that they use that behavior as a way to control their colleagues.

Steven DeLay:

And I've seen for myself how one of the ways that they try to control you is by compromising you sexually, whether it's through affairs or some of this other behavior, and it wouldn't at all surprise me that the gateway long-term into one of those child abuse rings starts at a dinner party like that, where they see whether or not you're willing to have an affair or do something else. And then they just escalate it from there.

Bobby Capucci:

You know, and that goes to the situation with Epstein and Brockman and the billionaire's dinner and the Edge Foundation. That seemed like the perfect place for them to get people caught up in this whole entire scheme.

Steven DeLay:

Exactly. And so, if you look at what Brockman was doing with Epstein, and then you also think about what Louf was saying, what was being done with Louf and Dutroux. Again, the contention isn't that every single person that ever went to a John Brockman event is a child molester or being blackmailed or something like that. That's not the claim, but the claim is that there is some kind of force at work where some of the people there are involved in that activity, and they're grooming and looking for other people who potentially might also be interested in doing so.

Bobby Capucci:

Even in seedy operations, there's always an underbelly and that's exactly what you see here. There's always a subgroup within the subgroup it seems that's working over time to push forward some nefarious plan or some evil action. And you definitely see it in these sorts of groups.

Steven DeLay:

Exactly. So to continue the point about the three main mechanisms by which, in my experience, it seems to me that this kind of nefarious behavior is modulated: I mentioned blackmail, which primarily is sexual, but there could be other things too. Of course, there's also financial crimes involved in this too, because a lot of the people who eventually go down, go down for financial crimes. So you have your blackmail, and then you have bribes, which I'll get to in a moment, but then you also have threats.

Steven DeLay:

So again, without dwelling too much on my own experience, what happened to me in Oxford is that, I think when they found out, the people who were involved in this kind of behavior, that I understood that there is a group of people who are involved in it, and they know that I don't want to be involved in that, I become a threat. And so they tried to drum me out, and there was a massive defamation campaign that was run against me in the local Oxford press. They sabotaged my viva, and tried to ruin my work, and I had to appeal the decision and have the first result overturned so that my work could be fairly evaluated, so that I could get my PhD. And I was also attacked on the streets on the High Street by

a group of people that in my opinion were paid to attack me, because they have to try to create controversy.

PART 2 OF 4 ENDS [00:50:04]

Speaker 2:

Steven DeLay:

So if they're trying to label me as crazy, and I get into a street fight, and I get arrested by the police, that plays into their narrative. So I was being attacked on the streets, I was being bullied and harassed at my college, I was being ridiculed and mocked in the press. I had my academic dissertation defense sabotaged. Finally, the university had to overturn it. And to give you an example about how just a small group of people can just flout the rules. I'll give you one example about the dissertation. So I had my original dissertation defense in...It was February of 2016.

Steven DeLay:

At that point they'd already been running a defamation campaign against me. I was already getting harassed on the streets. It was just brutal. So my examiners claimed that my dissertation isn't even good enough for a master's degree. Put it in perspective. I came to Oxford with peer reviewed work already published. And my doctoral dissertation included three articles that had already been published. And yet my examiners were trying to claim that my work wasn't even good enough for a master's degree. But it gets worse, because the paperwork they sent me, it wasn't even real. The way that Oxford works is dissertation decisions and degree decisions are supposed to be formally communicated by what's called the Exam Schools. The Examination Schools is on the High Street, and they're the ones that process all the degree paperwork. And so when you sit for a dissertation defense, your examiners put forward a recommendation, and then your faculty considers the recommendation and either decides to approve or not their recommendation.

Steven DeLay:

And then if they decide to approve your examiners recommendation, which is to give you a degree, that paperwork goes to the exam schools, and then the Exam School sends you written notification of your degree results, both in email, and then also by just ordinary posts. And they'll send the paperwork to your mailing address at your university college. Well, I never got the right paperwork. My paperwork came from a faculty administrator, not from the Exam Schools, and the paperwork was completely unsigned and undated. And so it was basically fraudulent paperwork, and it took me two months of arguing with the proper authorities at Oxford, even to get them to send me authentic paperwork. That's the kind of power that the people involved in these kinds of groups have. When they have to, they can completely circumvent standard operating procedures, completely just disable ordinary redress mechanisms to the point where they can just offline a dissertation defense and not even send you the real paperwork.

Bobby Capucci:

And all of that because you refuse to play their game?

Steven DeLay:

Yeah. All of that because they knew that my work, I think, was going to go on academically to leave a mark that they wouldn't be able to control me because I wasn't compromised. They couldn't blackmail me, they couldn't threaten me because they knew I wasn't afraid, and they couldn't bribe me.

Bobby Capucci:

So all that's left for them is absolute destruction?

Steven DeLay:

Yeah. So then what happened is when my wife and I came back from Oxford, I was in this weird position where I had a PhD from Oxford, which you think should open all these doors, but I couldn't get a single academic interview at any university in the entire world. And I was working on what was then my first book, and it took me two years put on my first book, which was a success. When I was working on that first book in Houston, I was attacked multiple times on the streets by random people. I had a guy in an SUV follow me for 20 minutes around my neighborhood when I was out for a walk, and he cut me off in an intersection down by my house and got out of his car, then approached me and took out a cell phone and took a photograph of me and then got in the car and drove away.

Bobby Capucci:

There's no length that these people will not go to.

Steven DeLay:

Oh, it's crazy. And then later I got jumped, and I went to the police, and I talked to the detective and the detective there thought that the two events were probably connected. But it's like so often when people tell stories about this sort of thing, that police didn't do anything about it. Now thankfully that was a few years ago when I was able to get my work out. I put a lot of that behind me, and I don't feel in danger anymore, and I'm not attacked like I used to be, and I don't get defamed and that sort of thing; they basically just leave me alone. But I had firsthand experience about how they'll set out to ruin your life. If they suspect that you know that these sorts of nefarious things are going on, and you have no intention of joining them, and especially if they think that you might want to speak out about them, then they'll really go after you.

Bobby Capucci:

Yeah. It really becomes a no-holds barred situation when they feel like you might tell some of their dirty secrets. There's literally nothing that they won't do.

Steven DeLay:

Yeah. Yep. Now, to kind of round out the conversation, I think it's one thing to draw on personal experience with these institutions and speak a little to some of the kind of pernicious, nefarious things that are done. They try to control people and to recruit people into this kind of criminal activity, and what's done to people who might be potential threats to it, whether they be whistle blowers or others. But then of course, that leaves the question about, well, if most people actually aren't involved in this behavior, and I think that that's clearly true, most people aren't. How does it then that this small group of people engaged in this terrible kind of behavior are able to continue on with it and control the rest of us?

Bobby Capucci:

That is the question, right? How is it that they're able to continue on with their behavior, their brazen behavior and have everybody else seem to just ignore what's right there in your face if you just pay a little bit of attention?

Steven DeLay:

Exactly. Now I feel fortunate in that I think that there's direct applications from the kind of philosophy I'm interested in to answer this kind of question. I'm really interested in phenomenological philosophy, which is a philosophical movement that originated in the 20th century in Germany with a man named Edmund Husserl and then became famous with later figures like Martin Heidegger and Jean-Paul Sartre and others. And it's also associated with existentialism. So if you look at the work of someone like, for example, Martin Heidegger, who some take to be the most important philosopher of the 20th century, he wrote a really incredibly influential book that was published in 1927 called *Being and Time*. *Being and Time* was a work that was originally envisioned to consist of three divisions or three parts, but only two of them were ever published.

Steven DeLay:

In what's called division one of the work, Heidegger provides what he calls an existential analytic. Now what's an existential analytic? The existential analytic is the term that Heidegger gives for the basic account of what he takes to be the fundamental structures of human existence, of what he calls everydayness, or average everydayness, being-in-the-world. Now I say human existence, even though for Heidegger it's not quite that simple, because in the German he has a special word that he uses to pick out you, and me, and other people, and that's called "Dasein." So when Heidegger's writing in *Being and Time* about us, he calls us Dasein. And so the idea behind *Being and Time* is that in that first division of the work, he wants to provide an existential analytic of Dasein, a phenomenological accounting of the fundamental structures at work enabling us to have the form of experience with the world that we do.

Steven DeLay:

And one of the things that Heidegger unpacks in the course of that first part of *Being and Time* is what he calls inauthenticity. He thinks that most of the time Dasein sort of conforms itself to whatever standards are taken to be normal or acceptable. The idea is that we have this inherent tendency to just conform to whatever is considered typical. So what I would argue is that, if Heidegger was right about that or to the extent he's correct that a basic feature of everyday human existence or basic feature of human interaction in the world is a sort of tendency to conform ourselves to what others are doing. Then you see how it'd be in principle very easy for a small group of people to manipulate a bunch of other people into acting in a way that's pursuant to what this small group of people want.

Steven DeLay:

So what do I mean? Well, I think Heidegger was concerned with mass culture or mass media, or technology. This is a concern that you see even beginning in the 19th century with another philosopher who was a major influence on Heidegger, Søren Kierkegaard. Kierkegaard is actually sometimes considered to be the father of existentialism. Kierkegaard was living at a time in the mid 19th century where you see the advent of mass media, specifically the newspaper, and this created what he called "the public." And he was concerned about the public, because he thought that it was this place or this space of discourse where people weren't authentically themselves, and instead of actually thinking for themselves and living for themselves, they would just kind of offload or arrogate responsibility to the

newspapers, and basically allow the newspaper to tell them what to think. And he was worried that it had this effect where it would level-down the standard of human existence to the lowest common denominator.

Steven DeLay:

And I think when you look at what Heidegger says about the human being's natural tendency to conformism, and you couple that with Kierkegaard's concern about mass media, the newspaper, you see how if you control media, it's very easy to lay out a standard as what's taken to be acceptable that people would just conform themselves to without even really questioning it or wondering why they're doing that.

Bobby Capucci:

And it's easy for that to occur when most of mass media is owned by a handful of corporations.

Steven DeLay:

Precisely, you see this is what I'm saying is like you have a ring within a ring, a very relatively small group of people who might actually know what's going on, you see what E. W. Griffith talks about with the Milner Group, with Cecil Rhodes back in Oxford. But exactly, so not everybody has to be a child molester getting blackmailed by Jeffrey Epstein to control us. I mean, if you have that, the executives of the major six corporations that control basically every single mass media outlet, that would be enough.

Bobby Capucci:

Absolutely. Because when you go to the very top levels of power like that, you're bypassing all of the other issues that usually pop up. And if you have the head of one of those six, you have a hook on them. Well, it makes things a lot easier for you to conduct your business.

Steven DeLay:

Right, and it's not even just about sex crimes, I mean, it could be any crime, right? Like-

Bobby Capucci:

Gambling or infidelity, like you said.

Steven DeLay:

Yeah, we are talking about financial crime, so it could be anything. The whole idea is that it's like poker, it's you're buy in. And the buy in is doing something criminal. And once you've bought in, you have your seat at the table, but if they have to get rid of you, they just popping for whatever you did.

Bobby Capucci:

Yep. And then that way they're able to exert the proper amount of control over you and get you to dance, to whatever sick sadistic tune they want to play.

Steven DeLay:

Right. So let's take what I just mentioned about Heidegger's analysis of everyday existence in Being and Time, coupled up with what Kierkegaard had already said about his concerns regarding the public or the

newspaper. And then let's just consider the state of mass media now here in the 21st century. In terms of someone like Michel Henry who is a very famous French phenomenologist who died in 2001. He was writing concerning at the time about the advent of artificial intelligence and things like that.

Steven DeLay:

But of course, when Kierkegaard was working, Kierkegaard was only talking about a newspaper. Now we have much more than that, right? Because we have the Internet and all kinds of other things, which makes the control much easier. In fact, now what Henry had is a concern with what you might call a hyper-reality, where you now have this virtual reality, or this Internet reality, where people are immersed in social media and in blogs, and all these other kinds of discourses where they're now not even really living in the real world as authentic individuals, but they're now living through these sort of mass cultural movements from which they are now deriving this kind of false identity. So it makes it even easier to control what people think, because now people are basically investing their sense of self and orienting their sense of identity through this hyper-reality through culture creation due to mass media.

Bobby Capucci:

Yeah, the effect that we see by mass media, legacy media, and the way that they just inundate us with messaging that is obviously prepared. And for me, I learned my lesson when we first went into Iraq the first time with George Bush, et cetera, et cetera. I really learned a very valuable lesson about gaslighting. And so I'm able to see the forest through the trees a lot of the time and the mass amount of gaslighting that's occurring right now is very scary to me.

Steven DeLay:

Well, I think you're precisely right for mentioning what you just had about that specific period in American history. Because as I'm going to maybe just mention in a moment, we can see how, in a way, what they're doing is they're repackaging and extending the war on terrorism, but now domestically in this really a concerning way. Before I mention that specifically, and turn back to a fourth example, I mentioned Heidegger, I mentioned Kierkegaard, I mentioned Enrique, but there's also, of course, Hannah Arendt, who's famous for coining the idea of the "banality of evil." Arendt's point was that, and here she's thinking specifically about the war crimes committed by the Nazis in the Second World War by these sort of bureaucratic officials like Eichmann. She said that there could be evils that are done by incredibly kind of shallow, unthinking people who are not necessarily evil themselves, but are just kind of cogs in the machine, more or less doing what they're told.

Steven DeLay:

And I think again there, and you look at the bureaucracy of these institutions and the way that everybody's able to relieve themselves of any personal responsibility by just saying, "Well, that's just how things are," "That's just how the system works." You can see how given that tendency to conformism that Heidegger identified combined with this potentially pernicious influence of mass media, that Kierkegaard had identified, which had been exacerbated into this kind of hyper reality, that Arendt notes. And then you combine that with the bureaucratic kind of mechanization of decisions where no one's really personally responsible for anything which Arendt mentions. That's exactly how you get Jeffrey Epstein, a convicted level three sex offender, back on Harvard campus with an office, even though everybody there knows he had already had to abandon the fellowship he never should have had before when he got busted down in Palm Beach.

Bobby Capucci:

It's when you look back on it and you put everything into context and you see it all unfold with the benefit of hindsight, it is truly disturbing what occurred at Harvard.

Steven DeLay:

I mean, my question is, I'll give you an example a few weeks ago, they unsealed some of these documents from Maxwell, and among the documents was a deposition from 2016 with the detective Joseph Recarey, and in the deposition there Recarey said that everybody as early as 2006 knew what Epstein was doing because of the media coverage. That's a lead detective saying that-

Bobby Capucci:

They ignore that though.

Steven DeLay:

Well, that's what I'm saying. How can these professors at Harvard or MIT who had known Epstein for 10, 15, or 20 years, who were literally working with at Harvard on a fellowship they know he should have never had. Harvard have to cancel the fellowship, not renew it for a second year because he gets arrested down in Palm beach. Some of these guys even went to go visit him in jail, and then he comes back after being convicted, and he's back on campus!

Bobby Capucci:

The only sin in so-called polite society is being broke, unfortunately. You can molest children, you can be a human trafficker and you'll be welcomed right back into society. They'll help you refurbish your image. They'll help you get all of that stuff back. But if you're broke, well, forget it. That's the one sin that the elite in this society cannot abide by and that really makes me sick.

Steven DeLay:

Well, we talked about this last year when I spoke to you initially, and we talked a little bit about the psychological profile of the person that would be involving themselves with Epstein, and I mentioned the DSM-5, and I spoke a little bit about clinical narcissism and psychopathology. And I think that that's an important feature is a lot of these guys; they think they're more important than they are.

Steven DeLay:

The problem is that when you have this kind of malignant narcissism that's also sadistic, you see this compulsion to control. And I think that's also why a lot of these guys are interested in joining these abuse rings, because they have this really sick and twisted desire to crush other people's wills. And I think the thing that's so alarming to me is that a lot of the psychological abuse that you see that used to be confined to these terrible abuse rings is now actually being universalized through society. And so that through mass media, you see this kind of trauma that's been inflicted in the public, where we're always being gaslit, and we're being manipulated and we're being lied to in the same way that these abusers would mistreat an actual abuse victim within one of these rings.

Bobby Capucci:

It's the same thing. We're all being groomed to accept this as a normalized process in society.

Steven DeLay:

Exactly. And I mean, that's again the thing you see the normalization, and we talked about the attempted normalization by intellectuals in France and Germany to normalize pedophilia. I talked about this normalizing tendency that Heidegger identifies: the average person going about his business in everyday life tends to just conform himself to what is to be the kind of standard of acceptable behavior. And again, how that can be weaponized through mass media in a way to control people. And I would look through something like now I kind of close to human feature, a transhumanist future where they're going to try to transcend human biology. You see this right now with the COVID rollout. So when we talked last year, the lockdowns had just started. They were just implementing mask mandates and there wasn't even really any talk about vaccinations and look where we are now a year later, they're talking about lockdowns being around forever, indefinitely.

Steven DeLay:

They're talking about how you have to keep wearing a mask even if you take a vaccine. They're talking about how you should take a vaccine even if the vaccine doesn't work. They are talking about travel restrictions. So you're looking at this complete restructuring of society, right in our face, being accomplished through mass media and promoted by these types like Bill Gates, like Jeff Bezos, like Elon Musk, and Jeffrey Epstein was intimately involved in all of that. I would say that even if people think, "Well, I'm not necessarily interested in the kind of sex crimes that these people are committing in secret," I think you should be. But I would say that everybody has a vested interest in identifying and pushing back against the danger that these people present to our society, because it's clear that they have this very anti-human, authoritative fascist, feudalistic vision of how they want everybody to be controlled by these deeply corrupt institutions in which we'll have no say.

Bobby Capucci:

Yeah, it's always been their dream to have power in the hands of a very few, because they all know better than us, obviously. Just look at how great the world is.

Steven DeLay:

Exactly. I would conclude things by just referencing some examples in this regard, the first is a small little blurb that I came across in the London Times a couple of weeks ago. Apparently someone had written in to describe a journal that a doctor there had been keeping, and I'll read quickly what this doctor had to say regarding what he'd been witnessing over in the United Kingdom with some of these lockdowns. It says here, "Throughout COVID, I have been neither a lockdown skeptic nor an ardent supporter. The question seems finely balanced to me. My doctor friend, who reports from the frontline is constantly assisting those with severe COVID. So I'm struck by his latest dispatch."

Steven DeLay:

"Although lockdown has almost certainly averted a disaster this time around, I'm concerned that its costs are not being counted. Therefore I'm slowly compiling examples of harm that I have witnessed one such. An 88 year old man who has been married for 62 years to the girl next door. He came into hospital, very frail. His wife had gone into a nursing home before the first lockdown with dementia. He could not see her because he was not allowed out and no one was permitted into the home. They're fused Zoom conversations didn't work due to their mutual deafness and her dementia as she was dying in July alone among strangers, he begged to be with her, but was not allowed.

PART 3 OF 4 ENDS [01:15:04]

Steven DeLay:

"It broke his heart and he declined rapidly. When he got a letter inviting him for a vaccine, he said, 'Why am I allowed to go out for a vaccine, but not to see the woman I loved more than life itself?' He refused the vaccine and days later became very unwell with a urinary tract infection. He has now died." Now, I mentioned this anecdote from the United Kingdom regarding this elderly couple not being able to just engage in the normal human experience of saying goodbye to one another, because I think that kind of story is representative of a broader trend that we're seeing within society that has actually been identified for some time by a really famous Italian philosopher named Giorgio Agamben, who's done work on what he calls bio-politics, and has more recently been talking about what he calls the bio-security state.

Steven DeLay:

This is the kind of stuff that Bill Gates was investing in. I think that's probably why Gates was working with Jeffrey Epstein, and that's why Jeffrey Epstein was at Harvard and MIT, because a lot of these researchers in nanotech and these other things are developing the kind of systems that are going to be used to surveil us and track us and monitor us. This is kind of what's going on. I want to just read very briefly from an op-ed or an essay that Agamben wrote in February of last year.

Steven DeLay:

I think that the title is something like "The Invention of a Crisis." He says here, "The disproportionate reaction to what happened according to the CNR is something not too different from the normal flus that effects every year is quite blatant. It's almost as if with terrorism exhausted as a pretext for exceptional measures, the invention of an epidemic offered the ideal pretext for scaling them up beyond any limitation. The other no less disturbing factor is the state of fear that in recent years has evidently spread among individual consciousnesses and that translates into an authentic need for situations of collective panic, for which the epidemic provides once again, the ideal pretext."

Steven DeLay:

"Therefore, in a perverse vicious circle, the limitations of freedom imposed by governments are accepted in the name of a desire for safety that was created by the same governments that are now intervening to satisfy it." That was from February of last year. Now, again, back to your point about the Patriot Act, I think what you're seeing is the attempted normalization of this permanent or indefinite state of emergency, this time put in terms of bio-security that's going to be used as a pretext to try to further erode our civil liberties.

Steven DeLay:

In March, or a month later, Agamben then wrote. "It's evident that Italians are prepared to sacrifice practically everything, normal living conditions, social relations, work, even friendships and religious or political belief to avoid the danger of falling ill." Then, he concludes his essay by saying, "What will human relations become in a country that will be accustomed to living in this way for who knows how long and what is a society with no other value other than survival?"

Steven DeLay:

"The other thing, no less disturbing than the first, is that the epidemic is clearly showing that the state of exception which governments began to impress on us a few years ago has become an authentically normal condition. There have been more serious epidemics in the past, but no one ever thought of declaring a state of emergency like today, one that forbids us even to move. Men have become so used to living in conditions of permanent crisis and emergency that they don't seem to notice that their lives have been reduced to a purely biological condition. One that is lost not only any social and political dimension, but even any compassionate and emotional. A society that lives in a permanent state of emergency cannot be a free one."

Steven DeLay:

It seems to me that part of the reason why Jeffrey Epstein was at Harvard and MIT is because he had an interest in funding and promoting a vision of the future that these technological elites are currently trying to force us into. I think that's why he was interested in Edge. I think that's why he was at that organization. I think that's why people like Jeff Bezos were working with Ghislaine Maxwell. I think part of the issue here isn't just that these people are operating sexual blackmail rings, but that they're also right now trying to radically change the way in which we interact with each other as human beings, and Harvard and MIT have a central role to play in that. That's partly as well why Jeffrey Epstein was there providing the funding that he was.

Bobby Capucci:

It's very obvious about Epstein and his connections and you talk about Harvard and MIT and the Santa Fe Institute is another place that really rankles me. When I went to the Santa Fe Institute, I was actually escorted off of the campus. They had an idea of who I was and they didn't want to talk or nothing like that. The Santa Fe Institute is another one of these institutions that certainly needs a very deep dive.

Steven DeLay:

Well, the number of the people who were working with Epstein at Edge and/or at Harvard or MIT or indeed elsewhere also are affiliated with the Santa Fe Institute, like you said. Of course, that's out of New Mexico where Bezos had that Campfire event, which Maxwell, I understand, was attending all the way into 2018.

Bobby Capucci:

Yep. She absolutely was.

Steven DeLay:

Yep. I know we've covered a lot of ground. I just want to maybe mention one final point. An aspect of the conversation that Professor Cassam was having with Ross Kemp on this podcast that I mentioned at the beginning of the second part of our conversation was, again, as I mentioned, the attempt to sort of characterize conspiracy theories as a form of political propaganda. I gave some reasons for at least in the case of human trafficking and sex trafficking for thinking that that's a faulty analysis, and that there is a legitimate problem here that can't just be swept away by trying to focus on Q while ignoring the actual issue of child sex trafficking. Another aspect of that conversation, which I hadn't mentioned, which I think has kind of emerged in the natural course of our discussion here anyway, is mass media's attempt to try to normalize people to accept what are called experts.

Steven DeLay:

At the very end of this podcast between Kemp and Cassam, Kemp says something like to the effect, "Well, the lesson here is trust the experts." Professor Cassam says, "Yes." I have to say, I could understand how that sort of advice I might expect from an AstraZeneca rep or something like that, but that shouldn't be coming from a philosopher. I mean, surely philosophers should have more to say to the public than "Trust the experts." I mean, that's not, that's basically telling people to not think for themselves, to not think critically, to not follow the evidence, and to basically just be intellectually lazy. I just don't think that's at all the kind of advice that philosophers should be giving the public. Part of the reason why I think it's such bad advice is that it isn't at all bizarre to sink that expertise, in certain contexts, can actually be bad.

Steven DeLay:

We're seeing that right now with this kind of technocratic takeover of society with this billionaire class that's sort of dictating public policy without any kind of legitimate civil intervention on the part of actually elected officials, whether that's Parliament in the United Kingdom or Congress in our country. I want to just mention some comments that Dwight Eisenhower gave in 1961 in his farewell presidential address. He says "Today, the solitary inventor tinkering in his shop has been overshadowed by task forces of scientists and laboratories and testing fields. In the same fashion, the free university, historically the fountainhead of free ideas and scientific discovery, has experienced a revolution in the conduct of research, partly because of the huge costs involved, a government contract becomes virtually a substitute for intellectual curiosity. For every old blackboard, there are now hundreds of new electronic computers. The prospect of domination of the nation's scholars by federal employment, project allocations, and the power of money is ever present and is gravely to be regarded."

Steven DeLay:

Then he says, and here perhaps is the key point, "In holding scientific research and discovery in respect, as we should, we must also be alert to the equal and opposite danger that public policy could itself become the captive of a scientific technological elite."

Bobby Capucci:

Prophetic almost.

Steven DeLay:

That's Dwight Eisenhower, 1961, warning the American public about what now public intellectuals are saying we should all just accept, and if you don't accept that, somehow we all have mental illnesses and potentially could be dangerous to the state. In the name of public safety, we'll have to be blown up by a CIA predator drone to save democracy.

Bobby Capucci:

Exactly. Is that the next step for these people? I mean, not that I'm a fan of-

Steven DeLay:

Look at John Brennan who a few weeks ago on MSNBC basically gave up the game and he said, "Yeah." He said, "Well, our federal agencies and even Department of Defense officials are moving in laser-like fashion to root out all these potential domestic terrorists." Then, when he goes through his big list of people, he says, "even libertarians."

Bobby Capucci:

I know, I know. It's scary to think. They've already drone striked and American citizen without any due process and killed him. That was Anwar al-Awlaki. Not that I'm a fan by any means, but he was an American and he deserved due process, but Obama and Biden thought it was all right to just drone strike him. I'm not okay with it. I've never been okay with the drone or the program, the way it's run. I'm certainly not okay with any American citizen, even someone as disgusting as Anwar was to be drone striked without having a trial and due process.

Steven DeLay:

This is why I think people who consider themselves to be on the American right or conservative should also be very wary of attempts to classify Antifa as a domestic terrorist organization.

Bobby Capucci:

Agreed.

Steven DeLay:

I think that every American has a vested interest in not allowing that to happen to anybody, because it's very dangerous for us to allow the state to classify political dissent as terrorism.

Bobby Capucci:

For sure. I mean, what did Franklin say? We either hang together or we all hang separately. It's the truth. We need to make sure that we're protecting speech and we're protecting the rights of people that we don't even agree with, because at the end of the day, how long before they come for you?

Steven DeLay:

Exactly.

Bobby Capucci:

So-

Steven DeLay:

So, oh, sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt. What were you going to say?

Bobby Capucci:

It's just, for me, at the end of the day, there's a lot of people that I disagree with the things that they have to say, but I'm of the mind that those conversations should be held in the public forum so that we can have the debate in a public way to show that these ideas are crazy.

Steven DeLay:

I agree entirely. I've noticed a change since when I was a kid growing up in the 90s, and I'm sure you've probably noticed this as well, but it seems to me that our discourse and mass media (and this goes for public intellectuals as well), it's so vitriolic and it's so antagonistic, and it's sometimes so rude and combative and it makes everybody so defensive and nasty. I don't understand it. I can remember a time even in my own life where people were able to disagree, and everyone didn't get so offended, and

didn't have the desire to destroy someone just because someone disagreed with them. I think that's a deeply unhealthy kind of pathological response to disagreement. It's a very pathological mentality that I see our institutions and even my fellow philosophers to a large extent sort of condoning and promoting and inflaming. I just think it's so damaging and so counterproductive. It really is in everybody's interest if we just avoid it.

Bobby Capucci:

Yeah. You couldn't be more right. It's not, they have it, they have a setup to where it's always, were specified and broke up into groups. Then, they say that you should hate this one and they should hate this one, and that one should hate that one. That message is pumped via the media with their rage porn and their nonsense. Like you were saying, in the 90s, when we were growing up, the conversation would be had around the water cooler at work, or maybe in your college classroom. Then, everybody would go on with their lives and well, okay, agree to disagree. You'd discuss policy and move on. Now, it's an all or nothing game. It's a game of absolutes. When you start playing a game of absolutes, you are on the a path of destruction.

Steven DeLay:

Exactly. I think the final comment I would make is I would turn to Michel Henry who I mentioned earlier. His concern was with the over politicization of society. What do you call it? The publicness of society, the sort of vulgarization of discourse through mass media, where people are sort of no longer going to be individuals and they become so one-dimensional. I'm really concerned especially with children today growing up who have access to social media, who are using smartphones and all these sorts of things at such a young age, that they're not going outside and playing like they used to. They're not learning life skills to negotiate problems and disagreements with others. They're not being allowed any innocence. They're being exposed to all kinds of terrible evil things at such a young age.

Steven DeLay:

They're being trained to think in such extreme terms of other people who disagree with them, that I think it's going to have a longterm consequence that is going to just be incredibly bad if we're not careful about it. I think it's just really important for everybody to tune out and plug out as often as they can and just remember that human existence isn't all about politics, not about Joe Biden, it's not about Donald Trump, it's not about Nancy Pelosi. It's not about Adam Schiff. It's not about Ted Cruz. It's not about CNN. It's not about Fox. Just get back to basics, go outside, go for a walk, read a book, spend some time with your family, make your life about more than arguing with people online about politics.

Bobby Capucci:

That's something that I've been pushing on the podcast for quite some time. I think it's time that we step out of the I'm this or your that, or you're left and I'm right and we start getting back to, hey, look, we all have a lot of more in common than the media would let on. All you have to do is go outside, go to the grocery store, talk to your neighbors, and you'll understand that people don't hate you and you don't hate anybody else. This is a bunch of propaganda that is being spilled into our minds on a regular basis. That oblong box in your living room is the culprit.

Steven DeLay:

Exactly. We should all be able to come together and common ground and say we, as a society, can protect children.

Bobby Capucci:

Yeah. That shouldn't be a divisive issue.

Steven DeLay:

Yeah. We, as a society should stop human trafficking. We should stop sex trafficking. We should not have the exploitation of children. That's not a political issue. It has nothing to do with politics. Trying to frame the problem in those terms as a conspiracy that's supposedly political propaganda is a deeply misguided and fundamentally flawed way of thinking about it. It's just a way of thinking that we should I would say more generally be conscientious of trying to try to avoid

Bobby Capucci:

For me, I'm at the point where if children and the most vulnerable amongst us aren't worth protecting and standing up for, then what is our society worth? I mean, I'm certainly not somebody who has a reach or a voice like some of these other folks that that might have podcasts or news shows, but I will tell you this, this is the mountain that I chose to stand my ground on. If this is the mountain that I die on, then so be it. I will not sit quietly anymore and sit back while society itself crumbles around me due to propaganda and the control of the very few.

Steven DeLay:

Amen.

Bobby Capucci:

Steven, it is always a pleasure to have you on the show. You bring such a fresh perspective from the other end of academia and a perspective that we don't get to hear enough. I think most people out there listening and most people who come across the podcast and might hear you for the first time, I think that most people feel the same exact way that you and I do about this small group, this handful of people really who have their fingers on the levers of control and the way that they got there and the blueprint that they use is indisputable at this point. With that said, I'm going to close out this second part of our two part series with Steven DeLay. We're definitely going to have Dr. Steven DeLay come back and join us again. Maybe we'll make it a monthly type thing or every other month, if your schedule will let you do that. Because having you on, I feel like, is a big boon and a lot of information being shared that my audience really could hear, and really needs to hear.

Steven DeLay:

Well, thanks again for the opportunity to chat with you today. As always, I really appreciate the opportunity. Hopefully some of the information that we've discussed today will be useful to others. I just wish you continued success with the podcast. I hope that you're able to continue to shed light on this important issue, and that we continue to see progress and additional people who are involved in this brought to justice.

Bobby Capucci:

My commitment has been and will be to see this through at the very least until the Maxwell trial concludes. I'll be in New York for the trial. Once the trial is concluded, obviously, I'm still going to stay on top of the case, but we'll start the probably peel back from two episodes a day to two or three weekly updates as I move on to other things professionally. The commitment has been and always will be that I

will be here every single day, at least one time a day until this trial is finished and Elaine Maxwell is prosecuted. To have people like Stephen come on and offer their expertise, it gives you folks a perspective different from mine. Right? Me, I'm certainly not a PhD in anything besides sarcasm, perhaps. My field of study obviously is in the near East, the Middle East, when it comes to what goes on geopolitically there.

Bobby Capucci:

I can only offer you so much when it comes to looking at things from a philosophy angle. That's why I'm very grateful that we had Steven on for these two segments, that we had him on previously, and going forward we definitely will have Steven back. Again, thank you very much for being with us and I appreciate your time.

Steven DeLay:

Thank you. Take care.

Bobby Capucci:

All right, everybody, that's going to wrap it up for this second episode. Boy, we were marathoning today. I hope you all really sit down and listen to what we talked about in these two episodes, because I believe it's very important and I think that you will all benefit from it. With that said, if you'd like to contact me, you can do that at bobbycapucci@protonmail.com. That's B-O-B-B-Y-C-A-P-U-C-C-I@protonmail.com. You can also find me on that cesspool we call Twitter at B-O-B-B-Y, excuse me, B-O-B-B-Y_C-A-P-U-C-C-I. All of the links that go with this episode can be found in the description box. All right folks, I'll be back later and we'll pick it up where we left it off. Thanks again, doc.

PART 4 OF 4 ENDS [01:38:46]