

Speaker 1: I'm Chris Farrell and this is On Watch.

Speaker 1: Welcome, John. Watch everybody, the Judicial Watch podcast where we take a deep dive behind the headlines to cover news items that the mainstream media would rather you not know about, where we try to recover some lost history or we try to explain the inexplicable. We appreciate you taking time to join us and we'd like you, whether you're following us on the video version of this podcast or on the audio streaming version on Spotify or wherever you listen to your podcasts. We appreciate you taking the time to listen or to watch us. Please be sure to subscribe, leave us a rating that helps us out and also communicate with us. You can email us at [info@judicialwatch.org](mailto:info@judicialwatch.org). Give us your ideas on what you want us to work on, talk about what you'd like us to investigate and what kind of guests you'd like to have on the show today. A real treat for you. I'm joined by my friend and colleague, Bill Walton. Mr. Walton is the chair of the Resolute Protector Foundation, which is a media company, but he's got a long history as an entrepreneur, a business executive, a leader in the business community, but also a leader in what I'd like to call or what I guess I should refer to really as not just entrepreneurial efforts, but also in arts and culture and try to really raise the standards of America's public

Speaker 2: Trying

Speaker 1: Efforts or foundations

Speaker 2: Giving it a shot. Yeah.

Speaker 1: Bill Walton, welcome to On Watch. Well,

Speaker 2: Thanks Chris. It was great to see you. I had you here on my show about two weeks ago with I'm

Speaker 1: Sure that was a record breaking

Speaker 2: It actually. It was record breaking what you pointed out that I didn't realize at the time with your book about George Earl and the Foot Roosevelt administration. We had a problem of elite capture back then is not just now. So anyway, your book is a real treat. I highly, highly recommend it. Thank

Speaker 1: You very much. I appreciate that. Elite Capture is one of the topics we wanted to talk about today with you. You're one of the elite, at least in my view. You are a guy with a tremendous background and experience as a business leader, as a Wall Street guy, as somebody who understands business and finance and economics. You're connected people and people who know people and you're the kind of person, if you were on the other side of the political aisle, I think that there would be a lot of folks from different countries who'd very interested in being very good friends with you.

Speaker 2: Well, I'd like to think they want to be knowing me now. I have a terrible, terrible background. I was New York Stock Exchange CEO for 14 years, about a \$12 billion

company, and I was on all sorts of boards. I was on the Financial Services Roundtable board, which is all the big banks and all the big investment banks like Goldman Sachs, and then I even went to Davos, and so I seen that upfront in person. I was there with surgery, Brynn and his partner found of Google were there and we had lunch and they were just kids, but boy, listen to 'em talk and they saw themselves as masters of the universe. That's just even as 20 somethings. It's really interesting.

Speaker 1: So that's a set of experiences. I mean, you're smarter than the average bear. This is not something that everybody has access to or has awareness of. You did something else that I really find very interesting and that is given all your background and experience, you assisted the Trump administration as they launched into the administration with landing teams. Not everybody knows where the landing team is, but these are the folks that first go into agencies and you had responsibility for all those financial and economic departments and agencies, treasury, S-E-C-I-R-S. You came up with kind of the structure, the architecture, and the manning of who was going to go in and take leadership of those

Speaker 2: Departments when a new government comes in, his foreman, in this case, 2016 is when Donald Trump was elected even three or four months before the election, they stand up something called a transition team, and I was part of his transition team and I oversaw all of the financial agencies, the IRS, treasury Commerce Department, US trade representatives and all that whole alphabet soup of FCC and SEC and all that sort of thing. All the things we don't understand, but we ought to because they're up to no good. And so yeah, I had a chance to and I managed about 250 people who were actually doing the plans. We had a lot of experience in that area and it was eyeopening. And the issue we had with Donald Trump, who I'm still major supporter of, is that even though we'd done all this work when he came in from New York and came in with his business background, I don't think he fully appreciated how much more he needed to know about those agencies.

Speaker 2: I think there's a lost opportunity that we didn't in fact do all the things that we thought we ought to do, and we were actually beginning to gear up again in 2020. Now that he'd had all these wake up calls and realize that he didn't have control of his own government, we began thinking about how to change personnel, how to get regs, how to get things in place to permanently change all the damage the Deep State was doing. And as we circle back to right now, heritage as a group of Project 25, then I wrote the plan for treasury along with Steve Moore and David Burton who's a treasury,

Speaker 1: Dave. Well, the left thinks that you're one of the architects of the end of the Republic. I mean, because the left is hyperventilating about Heritage's 2025 project. Well,

Speaker 2: We're the end of their cushy jobs in Washington. I mean, the thing is they define democracy as they define democracy as the institutions and they control the institutions. And so anything that attacks the institutions that they've got in place for their power is against democracy. What we define democracy is about people,

Speaker 1: The sovereignty of the citizens.

Speaker 2: Somehow I got infected with this idea that all the really good stuff comes from individuals and all the good things that happen in the economy come from innovation and growth initiatives by entrepreneurs and ordinary people who become successful. And I happen to think that works and the closer you get to people who are actually doing things, the better things go. And now we've got is this incredible power structure in Washington and all the other capitals of the world, Brussels, London, I think Beijing would qualify in that and they want to control us all from above and we've got to stop that.

Speaker 1: People don't necessarily understand, I guess they're increasing their awareness, understanding of sort of this professional political class that really controls governmental agencies, departments, bureaus, and they're a fourth branch of government.

Speaker 2: It's the most important piece of the puzzle that people don't understand. I was really not that political. I became, I guess sort of radicalized if we will, running a public company. When I began to realize how much the government was against growth in the SEC and regulation and things like that were really, really negative instead of positive. But the thing about me getting involved is the first thing I did, 2010, I was involved with the Tea Party for a little while. I was chairman of Jenny Beth's Tea Party Patriots, which was fantastic, but we at the time were aimed at Congress. We thought if we could just get better congressmen, get better laws passed, things like that, we could transform things. And what I've come to realize in that 16 years or 14 years since then is the real action, the real thing. We've got to stop for all those administrative agencies. Correct? All those agencies I mentioned, and that's a permanent governing class.

Speaker 1: But the way I've described it, and people will remember this, Sally Yates is a figure from early in the Trump administration, she was the acting attorney general, and Trump had made some executive orders his so-called Muslim ban, which is not a Muslim ban. It had to do with persons coming from targeted countries. In fact, the most populous Muslim nation in the world, Indonesia, was that subject to this ban, which proves the point. But nonetheless, there was this Sally Yates, Yates' acting Attorney General essentially issued an order saying to the Department of Justice, do not follow the president's executive order, do not execute, which is mutants really. It's an outrageous act by somebody acting as the Attorney General. And so there was much hullabaloo. She ended up getting canned. That's a whole separate story. But I mentioned that because what I try to explain to people is that within the Department of Justice, there's an entire army of Sally Yates's, the rank and file membership of the Department of Justice are people just like that. And even if they're not actively opposing the president in this case, president Trump, then they just sit there with their arms folded and they take no action whatsoever. So they're not defying and they're not disobeying, but they're simply not complying. And that is a problem that Trump face, not just in DOJ, but in many, many other, like you said,

Speaker 2: Alphabet. Our friend Michael Pac, the very famous documentary filmmaker in our side, did a film about Rick over all sorts of interesting documentaries that had won a lot of awards. Well, he was appointed head of the agency that runs Voice of America.

Speaker 1: Right, the global, I'm going to get the name messed up, but it's global.

Speaker 2: I like Voice of America. It's easier to understand. Understand

Speaker 1: It's the Global Communications Office.

Speaker 2: Yeah, exactly. But what he discovered and when he finally got into the job that tried to block his nomination when he got in, he had one other person, maybe two other people, that he could begin to implement President Trump's agenda. And the other 2,500 people in the building did not want to do it. Correct. And they actively fought against him every step of the way. It was an incredibly eye-opening experience. Now coming back around to this time, we know we're up against and we can begin to think about getting some of those permanent government employees maybe out of those jobs and get more appointees in.

Speaker 1: You want to hear two solutions I have for that? I'll

Speaker 2: Hold, lemme give you another brief. You said, I helped put plans together for the Treasury and the IRS and they're all part of this one agency and the treasury supposedly employs 80,000 people. Well, not really. 75,000 of those people are employed at the Internal Revenue Service.

Speaker 1: That tells you what you need to know

Speaker 2: Right there. Okay, so you become the IRS Commissioner and there's some people that wanted me to try to do that job. Do you know how many political appointees there are?

Speaker 1: Three. Two. Two, okay. I was going to

Speaker 2: Guess. You get the commissioner and you get the General counsel, and other than that, you've got the whole permanent class in the IRS. I want to hear your two

Speaker 1: Solutions. Yeah, so two solutions to this. Number one is, and this has been talked about forever and ever, and I'd love to see it actually executed, and Trump I think is the guy to do it, is move these departments out of Washington dc. So take agriculture and put it in St. Louis, Missouri, take interior and put it in Billings, Montana. You simply break up the physical location of the government and you put it in a place that it kind of makes sense where it would be. The second thing if that was too drastic, too crazy. Is it administrative? That's a

Speaker 2: Pretty good idea,

Speaker 1: Is an administrative way. Look, I was an Army officer in my youth many moons ago, and I knew every three to four years I was going to move, I was going to change jobs. It's just the way it works. So every three to four years, all military officers, in fact, not even officers, all military personnel know that they're going to move. You're going to get a new assignment. And so what I would say, particularly in the Department of Justice, a

lot of people homesteading, right? They've been in this division or this department forever, is after four years we know you've been working on patent law. That's wonderful. Here's an exciting opportunity to go to St. Louis, to Chicago, to Albuquerque, and you're going to do criminal work. And if you don't want to do that, well this exciting opportunities for you out in the public sector. Go ahead and go. Well,

Speaker 2: The third solution is that these agencies, all these agencies have units in them that got started up in 1934 or 1956, or they got started up because of the real estate crisis or because of this thing or

Speaker 1: LBJ is great society and there

Speaker 2: Are all these agencies that got created at a time where there was need. They're still there. And so one of the things you need to do if you go in is you need to say, okay, we've got 20 different units in say the treasury, about half of them shouldn't even exist. And so you can shut those down and it leaves you with all the employees and you just put 'em on furlough rather have them. I'd rather pay 'em

Speaker 1: To do nothing.

Speaker 2: To do nothing than

Speaker 1: To actively than to

Speaker 2: Do what they were doing to actively be destructive. And I think that would

Speaker 1: Work. So I heard stories from people who were on some of these landing parties and when I sit here landing party, I think like World War II in the Philippines, a little bit like that, right? The first guys to go ashore and then they realize, holy cow, this island is occupied by the Japanese and they're there by themselves. And that really was kind of the stories they would tell. They would say, I showed up at State Department or I showed up at wherever ag and they came creeping ashore and all of a sudden they realized, hey, we're surrounded. And they had a situation where they had their own kind of small version of lawfare where the entire staff would say, we were in a meeting with you and when we gave you our report, you sighed and then you rolled your eyes. Well, that's a hostile workplace and we're not going to be subjected to your authoritarian hostile, vicious. And they would file complaints, IG complaints, EO complaint, any kind of complaint you could imagine. And that was just because a person sat in a meeting and went, what are we going to do? And that was offensive. Well,

Speaker 2: Here's the good news. We learned from that. We learned from that. And the Heritage Project 2025. And there's also, what's the other group headed up by Brooke Rollins American.

Speaker 1: It's always America first.

Speaker 2: Everybody's named America first. Now

Speaker 1: It's like 10 American first.

Speaker 2: I'm for America first. It's a good concept, but they're doing a lot of work with people who've been through that experience and we're working on plans so that when Trump's elected, we're not going to go in that naively again. And it would be pretty boring to go through all the bureaucratic technical things you've got to do, but there are ways to dramatically change that. And I think we now know what to

Speaker 1: Do. Yeah, it was quite a learning experience. And it's tough, I think for if you're really trying to make a difference and you go in with the very best of intentions, and even if you're a pretty sharp character, you know how Washington is played when the entire organization is against you. It's a tough climb.

Speaker 2: Yeah. Anybody suffers in that environment. It's tough to be a change maker.

Speaker 1: I'm looking at our debt, our national debt because of your extensive background in finance and economics. I get the feeling that we're teetering on the edge. I mean, we're whistling past the graveyard. Oh, the stock market's doing great. Oh, we had good return on investments last year. Oh, everything is grand glorious. But we are in very grave danger.

Speaker 2: Well, in the first place we have an administration that does not care, does not care. You've got the large group of people in the financial world. Modern monetary theory will tell you that you can just put an issue as much debt as possible, and as long as the world will take it, then you're just fine. You can spend anything you want that won't work.

Speaker 1: That's the Dick Cheney. Deficits don't matter.

Speaker 2: Yeah, exactly like that. And given what we know about Liz Cheney, I think

Speaker 1: We can stop there. We can

Speaker 2: Stop there, but they do matter. And that's one of the real issues with Janet Yellen's treasury, because one of the things I did when I did the plan for treasury last time is I am a geek. I studied accounting, I taught accounting, I know all that. I went on the website to look at her strategic plan, and you look at the five points on the strategic plan, and it's right there. There's really nothing in there about debt. There's nothing in there about a strong dollar. Do you know what's number one? Climate change,

Speaker 1: Which is science fiction

Speaker 2: And which is science fiction. And then the other one's diversity, equity and inclusion,

Speaker 1: Which is cultural Marxism,

Speaker 2: Which is cultural Marxism, and they're both based on fantasies, the client fantasy. And then the DEI cultural Marxism thing is that you don't have to worry about meritocracy anymore. We'll just select people based on identity. And ultimately that's going to destroy modern organizations.

Speaker 1: Actually, it will destroy the western world. I mean western civilization,

Speaker 2: Why stop There

Speaker 1: Cannot survive?

Speaker 2: No, it can't. It can't.

Speaker 1: Aggressive DEI or whatever critical theories.

Speaker 2: Well, you think about it, all modern organizations are complex. Most of the technology we work with is complex. The bridge in Baltimore was complex. We knew, for example that Tampa 40 years ago, there was a bridge at cleft and Tampa had exactly the same design and we didn't do anything about it. And if we had some people in the chart department of transportation besides Pete Buttigieg who were technical people who were hired on merit, that would've said, we've got to do something about that bridge before what happened happened. But let's circle back to your question about the debt. It's unsustainable and the breaking mechanism though is going to come when the rest of the world begins to react to that amount of debt and the dollar. We have something called a reserve currency, which is where most of the trade and most of the banking reserves of the world are held in dollars.

Speaker 2: Well, there are a lot of people because of what's happened in the last three years of the Biden administration that no longer trust the United States to manage itself starting with leaving Afghanistan. But in the financial world, we're behaving just as recklessly and they're beginning to think about currency blocks and other sorts of things as an alternative to the dollar. And if the dollar stops as being the reserve currency, that debt is definitely unsustainable and we're not going to be able to get people to hold it. The interest on the debt now is close to a trillion dollars. Well, that's more than almost all the other discretionary spending in the budget combined. It won't work. Right.

Speaker 1: So I guess Bloomberg last night that I saw an article that said that they ran literally a million computations of how our current spending could play out, how they could resolve it, and it doesn't. I mean, they tried every which way to do these computerized models of how they would, and it simply even they concluded and Bloomberg editorially even they concluded, were screwed. We're screwed. We can't do this. Bloomberg

Speaker 2: Would've been happy to have a good answer and they couldn't find one. Correct,

Speaker 1: Correct.

Speaker 2: Well, if you put that same question at chat GPT, it will come back with we're not authorized to give you the answer.

Speaker 1: That's right. Pick another topic to discuss. But

Speaker 2: It is just stunning to me that almost every cabinet secretary in the Biden administration is not paying a bid of attention to issues like that. And they're not paying any attention to what's spending. And instead they're spending paying attention to climate, which is a whole of government agenda and DEI whole of government agenda. We got to make a change.

Speaker 1: Something that I think is related to this, you touched on it briefly, is the idea of the US dollar being the reserve currency for the world. Sometimes it's referred to as petro dollars because rape, Saudi Arabian oil was priced at and traded at the dollar level. But you have other organizations like bricks, very mischievously, are trying to destabilize the dollar and trying to move people off of the dollar as being the standard. And I want to know whether you thought that. What's your estimation? What's your evaluation of bricks as a trading block as an entity?

Speaker 2: Well, let's break bricks down into the component parts B is Brazil, Russia,

Speaker 2: India, China. I don't know the I is for India or Iran, but if you start looking at all the countries, they don't like each other and they're going to have a very hard time pulling together a stable currency block and China, which as an economy almost equal to our size. In theory, their currency could be a substitute for the dollar. But because people justifiably do not trust the Chinese Communist Party to manage the money, manage their currency, people are never going to go to the wand unless something happens with China. So short term in the next year or two, three, I don't see those blocks mounting to much in terms of a currency, but we're in this kind of world where you put it into a computer, you can game out all sorts of scenarios, and any one of 'em is maybe equally likely and almost none of 'em are good.

Speaker 1: Elon Musk has a theory that whatever scenario you come up with, whatever one is most outrageous and sort of ridiculously sensational, that's probably the one that's going to,

Speaker 2: Yeah, to that to results. I subscribed to that

Speaker 1: And you gave a few examples as to why he felt that way.

Speaker 2: Well, the problem for Americans is we've had it. We've been protected by two oceans. We've been protected by the largest economy in the world. We've been protected by a constitution and a legal system, which has created an enormous stability. We've been protected by a stable culture based on Christianity. And now all that is oceans don't matter as much now, particularly when we no longer have a southern border and we would've, we've got 10, 12 million people flooding into the United States. We don't know who they are. In fact, we know a lot of 'em are Chinese. We know a lot of 'em are from countries that want to take us down. So this security that Americans have had, I

know people aren't feeling that secure right now, but you shouldn't because the forces that have protected us are being stripped away. And we talked about the trip to Davos and the global elites and that sort of thing. They're not interested in American sovereignty. They're interested in a globalist movement. And I don't think you've followed what's happening with the World Health Organization, but they're now in the process of renegotiating or among themselves, I might add a new international agreement. Then I also want to put out something called a pandemic treaty, which would be what would happen if there were another health emergency. Now, the thing that's in this agreement though is just in the first place, it throws most of the authority at President Pedro's first name, who was a

Speaker 1: Communist,

Speaker 2: Who's handpicked by the Chinese Communist Party. Exactly. The second thing, it lets gives him the power to declare what constitutes a health emergency. And they're now actively saying that climate could be a health emergency. They're actively saying gun violence talk of insurrection. And inside this document that they want everybody to sign would be requirements that countries surveil their people to determine whether people are speaking out against that regime or whether they're whatever they want to surveil, destabilizing.

Speaker 1: And that's what they like. Any good leftist, they want everything either mandatory or forbidden. They want to put everything in one of two boxes. The left always wants to, you must do the following under penalty of death, foreclosure, seizure, or you are absolutely forbidden to do something. And that's what they love. That's what they drive at.

Speaker 2: But we're talking about things that are not sustainable. I mean they, I think the good thing about, I'm part of a group called the Sovereignty Coalition, and we're basically aimed at what to do something about the World Health Organization's agenda, but it's a much bigger concern about American sovereignty and I, half of America, 150, 160, 180 million people have woken up to this attack, and we kind of got snuck up on by the 2020 Covid situation, they all of a sudden instituted all these measures and we didn't quite know what was happening to us. Well, now we do. And I think the first time they try to roll something like this out, it's going to be very interesting to see how people respond. I think they're going to be a lot of acts of civil disobedience.

Speaker 1: Yeah, I think what's, what was kind of creepy about the whole covid lockdown scenario was the large number, the large percentage of people that were compliant, they said, well, this is an emergency. And they all became very obedient. That kind of surprised me. I thought the American

Speaker 2: I did too, sort of

Speaker 1: Character was a little more, well, thanks for the advice, but I know how to take care of myself. Thank you very much. There wasn't a lot of that. There was a lot of obedience and compliance. But I also think that there's sort of an emotional cultural hangover from

that and that even people that were very compliant first time out on Covid, they're more skeptical now. And even if they kind of went through the motions, they did what they were told and they hi their houses and whatever else they were doing, they now look at it and go, wait a minute. That was heavy handed and crazy and I didn't need to. And so I think that increased healthy skepticism, at least I hope so, because otherwise,

Speaker 2: Well, the work you guys are doing at Judicial Watch is raising people's awareness of that.

Speaker 1: What would hope

Speaker 2: So, I mean, you're head of investigations and I think you see the way these things are being plotted out and built up, I mean, you're raising people's awareness before it actually happens.

Speaker 1: That's what we aim to do, to educate the public about the operations of government. And it's ordinary people. It's not all people who hang out at Davos, but also, interestingly enough, there's also, by the

Speaker 2: Way, it's not that great.

Speaker 2: It's not that great. The food's not that good, and mainly back in the, I was there 15 years ago, but it was mainly people with big ideas and plans, but now it's gotten a lot more sinister. And now they're doing things like they're rolling out credit cards. That could be your bio records. And so they could have a record of your health in this credit card, and they could also have something in there that wouldn't let you use the credit card if you didn't have your vaccine or if you didn't have this sort of thing. I mean, that's in the works. Those sort of things get unveiled at Davos. So I'm sort of, sorry, I'm not going anymore, but I could report back to you guys. I could say, look, they're serious.

Speaker 1: Yeah, that's not a bad idea at all. I know that there's some stuff that you want to bring up or chat about.

Speaker 2: Well, I think we have to talk about China, please. I mean, the threat is real. And the terrible thing about China from our standpoint is we really created China in 1990. China was six tenths of 1% of the world's GDP. Now it's over 20%. And that by and large was due to America trying to enable China engaging with China and make them financially successful. The theory was we'll make them financially successful. They'll become a liberal democracy like the United States. They'll join the world committee, world community. And again, this gets back to you and your intelligence background. We didn't see that the Chinese had a strategy they called hide and abide, hide and abide, which dang, which is one of their presidents back in the nineties came up with is, well, we know that they'll be asleep. They're going to bring us in. Let's use their technology, their capital, their knowhow to build the Chinese economy. And once we get to a certain size, only then can we reveal our true intentions. Well, Xi, the now president has revealed their true intentions and we're still seeing the spectacle of Janet Yellen and the

three or four or five other senior cabinet level officials with the Biden administration rushing over to China even this week. Yeah,

Speaker 1: Bowing,

Speaker 2: Bowing, and I hate to say this because of all, some of these people used to be my friends, these CEOs that went to San Francisco when President Xi came to visit, and what did they do? They gave a standing ovation, right? And this is one of the biggest mass murders if you count now, it is the biggest mass murder in

Speaker 1: History. It is the biggest.

Speaker 2: And they haven't changed and they're unrepentant, correct. And yet we've still got people going over. Tim Cook was there, they're opening a new Apple store and one of the provinces in China, that was last week, Walmart is opening a new Sam's Club in another province nearby. Starbucks has announced plans to roll out so many more stores. They'll have many more stores in China than they'll have here in the United States. And that's all within the last six weeks.

Speaker 1: This is the realization of Lenin's prophecy that we will sell them the rope that they'll hang us with. Well,

Speaker 2: We've already done that.

Speaker 1: And so we're in a position now, there isn't a sense of, our old friend Lou Dobbs used to scream about where is the sense of economic and corporate nationalism? Why aren't there CEOs of big Fortune 500 companies who have an America first mentality? Yeah, sure, we want to do trade. Absolutely, we want to, and when it's beneficial. But there was always a sense of, well, we're doing this because the business of America is business, but we can do it for the benefit of the country, not as a sellout to anybody who's willing to pay whatever the going rate is.

Speaker 2: But I do think there's even good news there where these CEOs, they're economic actors, but they also rule followers. And if they had political leadership in Washington that said, look, guys, that game's over, we've got to rethink how we're doing business here. And maybe you don't want to be there at all. And if we had somebody in the White House, let's see, what would his name be? Donald Trump, who could say to America American corporations, okay, that was fine. You made your money, but now it's time to rethink. If you're an American, you've got to do this. And I think we could shame those corporations to keep them from doing that. Right now, just the opposites happening with the Biden administration.

Speaker 1: Yeah, I'm always reminded of the records we got from the Secret Service on Hunter Biden's travel with his father, his 400 and some odd flights he was on with him. Secret Service provided this to us of those flights, 26 for the foreign countries with his dad. And of the 26 foreign flights, five were to China, what the hell was Hunter Biden doing at China? Well, we know

- Speaker 2: Now. We know what he was doing.
- Speaker 1: But that is a little anecdotal snapshot that gives you an indication of which way of how the story's being told, how you just made reference to these other companies that are saying, well, we got to make a deal. And there's not really a lot of leadership or guidance from above. There's nobody dying in the drum saying, it's great you're doing business and you should be selling your products and making new, better, faster. But what about the United States? And there isn't that kind of call
- Speaker 2: One other. This may be controversial, I don't think it is, but we talked about climate. The whole climate agenda is a hoax.
- Speaker 1: Of course it's,
- Speaker 2: It's a lie. And based in its essence, the lie is that CO<sub>2</sub> is a toxic poison that's somehow going to, it's causing, there's atmosphere to warm up. Al Gore tells us the oceans are going to start boiling. There's never been a more stupid statement than that. And CO<sub>2</sub>, I'm in part of another coalition called the CO<sub>2</sub> Coalition and filled with scientists a couple noble laureates. People are serious people. Now, the thing that's notable about these scientists, they're all sort of post-care men and mostly men, some women in their sixties, seventies, and eighties. And they're not tied into the funding mechanisms that most of the other scientists are. If you don't want to know why there's a consensus for these things. This client consensus is all these people depend on these agencies and these governments to provide funding for their jobs. Exactly right. So they got to go along and they're terrified to speak out against it.
- Speaker 2: But the fact is, CO<sub>2</sub> is a beneficial set of molecules. And the more CO<sub>2</sub> we have, the better plants do, the better the earth do. It gets a little warmer maybe, but CO<sub>2</sub> is a very minor element of that. Do you know what the most important element of the temperature or climate on earth, guess what? The sun and clouds, but it's not. CO<sub>2</sub> CO<sub>2</sub> is 0.04% of the atmosphere 0.04. If you look at this table here, it'd be a slim. It'd be just a little speck on this table here. And if we can turn people's minds around about CO<sub>2</sub>, not being a toxin, but instead being beneficial, that'd be a dramatic change in our energy policy. And I think that's one of the things we need to really start pushing. I know I'm working with some people to get the word out, CO<sub>2</sub>, as you look back over 500 million years on Earth, it's at the lowest level. It's been virtually in 500 million years, and we're at a point with CO<sub>2</sub>, it's about 440 parts per million. I think that's the way they calculate it. And if it drops to 200 or one 50, that's lethal for plant life. So we're dangerously close to a low level here to
- Speaker 1: Actually having a harmful effect. So
- Speaker 2: I want to start putting this idea out there. This is probably new to a lot of people who think about CO<sub>2</sub>. It's been demonized so badly. We need to turn our thinking on that one. 180 degrees.

Speaker 1: So two things that are related to what you just said. Number one is language of course drives an awful lot of this sensational rhetoric and the claims, hysterical claims. And so the left, in pushing this CO2 narrative, there's a couple things in action. One was they wanted to create a carbon exchange where they could sell. I mean, they want to monetize it, right?

Speaker 2: Goldman Sachs loves

Speaker 1: It. So they turn it into carbon credits and people trade on this. It's a way to make money. So that's one gimmick or racket to say with it. The other thing is the language used. They used to call it global warming, and then you can't say global warming because there was massive instances of fridge temperatures or record snowfall. And people would joke and say, yeah, look at the global warming outside. And so then they said, well, now we have to call it climate change. So now it's climate change, and that covers everything. So you could have a rainy spell dry, spell snowy, whatever, and of course it's change. So how could you ever possibly be wrong, right? This is capturing language is incredibly important, which takes me to this last thing I want to talk to you about with regard to cultural Marxism and capturing language. This goes back to the Frankfurt School, which ended up in Columbia. Its whole critical theory. It's a donno and Marcus and all these guys who decided to use this sort of radical deconstruction of society as we know it, with this critical theory, which ends up bringing you to this oppressed under oppressor format that you see that's templated and used everywhere, and people have really glommed onto it. And it's a narrative in our education system. No one even, it's virtually unopposed.

Speaker 2: It's deep in the system. Yeah, it's deep

Speaker 1: In there. So now we have to reverse this. We have to go back to, you know what, rather than Henry Herbert Moku and Adorno, let's go back and look at Thomas Aquinas, right? Let's look at some of the, exactly

Speaker 1: The found foundational pieces of Western civilization and not this post World War I, psychological political hangover known as the Frankfurt School and critical theory, because we really need to reject it. But it means down in elementary schools, little kids are taught this. It's a trick, it's a gimmick. An example was used a math problem. Johnny's parents want to take him to the amusement park and they get in their car and they drive. And so it's a word problem for math. Well, which seems pretty innocent except that the educators are being taught to use the math problem, a word problem about driving in a car to the amusement park to be, well, some kids don't have cars and maybe that car is polluting and well, Johnny, his parents have the money to take him to an amusement park. So everything's turned into an adversarial, oppressor oppressed situation. And so even doing a simple math problem, a fourth grader gets brainwashed into this way of thinking. And that's incredibly damaging. And I don't know how we,

Speaker 2: Well, I think shining a bright light on it, that's what you and Tom are doing here. That judicial watch. I mean, shining a light on that is a big part of it. And that's one of the, I guess I'm a silver lining guy. There's always something good that comes out of something horrible. What the good that came out of the school closures in 2020 2001,

his kids went home and they said, well, let's teach you on the computer. And the parents looked over their shoulder and they went, oh my God, what are you learning here? And all of a sudden what was sort of behind the closed door of the schools was now known to the parents. And that's when we ended up with all those school board issues in Northern Virginia and around the country

Speaker 1: And the FBI monitoring parents at school board meetings, taking out, well, they're still

Speaker 2: Doing that. I know we haven't talked about the surveillance state much,

Speaker 1: Which we, I'm happy to,

Speaker 2: But I think once you shine a light on that and this notion that it's oppress or oppressed, and the critical race theory talks about our whiteness and it's our whiteness is something we can never atone for. You can't say there's no forgiveness. You're just supposed to, I dunno what we're supposed to do, give 'em our money, our dignity and our freedom, I suppose. And even then, they're not going to be satisfied, right? There's no solution. I think shining a light on it, people are waking up saying, wait a second. No, this is evil and it's wrong. But it was so romanticized. I mean the whole Marxist thing that came out of Greenwich Village too, but it is pervasive. We have more DEI officers in universities. Harvard has what, 35 or 40 different departments or colleges in Harvard, and they don't have just a DEI head there at the university level.

Speaker 2: They've got a unit in every single college, I'm sure they in Harvard and they have thousands and thousands of people who are in enforcer in cultural conformity. And at the moment, people, they're just going along with it. But parents can do graduates of colleges because this is not just DEI at Harvard. I went to Indiana. In Bloomington, we have more DEI officers per student than any other university in the country. The little Bloomington, Indiana has become a hotbed of racial oppression, which I never quite realized. But we need to cut off the money to this and we can do that. This is again, getting the right people elected into the Senate and the house. But I diverge.

Speaker 1: These are Z. These is the political officers that used to the Soviet government would insert into military units. So you had a commander, and then you have the za, which is the political officer who could sometimes overrule the commander based on That's

Speaker 2: Exactly what we have. That's exactly what's going

Speaker 1: On. The party is checking you at all times. The surveillance state. I see that you have your personal beacon with you. You're omitting,

Speaker 2: This is being recorded. This is directed Beijing. I think

Speaker 1: Your

Speaker 2: Location, Silicon

Speaker 1: Valley, and your thoughts are being communicated. Talk about the surveillance that you mentioned,

Speaker 2: But that's an interesting issue here. We've got this phone here, and especially after January 6th and all this talk of insurrection and people being accused of trying to overthrow the government, things like that. Totally without any basis in fact, just because they know insurrection is a word in the Constitution, and therefore they can do something based on the constitution with that word,

Speaker 1: Of course, no one's been charged with that or convicted,

Speaker 2: Especially not President Trump. Correct. But I've noticed this just among friends and people like that. People are beginning to be careful about what they say because if they do something like Donald Trump says bloodbath, well, all of a sudden that gets picked up as another call for an insurrection, even in casual social speech. I was on a Zoom call with some activists in our Sovereignty Coalition, and one of the people on the call said something very fiery. We used to say all the time in our Tea Party speeches, we're going to go and we're going to throw Congress out. We're going to take it over. We say that now, and it gets interpreted in a way. You may see the FBI showing up at your

Speaker 1: Door,

Speaker 2: And there's a case now in front of the Supreme Court involving the censorship that was going on during Covid and where the White House, the FBI and the Department of Homeland Security, this is a group part of the Homeland Security that's supposed to be overseeing infrastructure. There were like 12 to 15 agencies that were actively convening the social media companies to say, this person is saying this. You've got to shut that down. You've got to get this person off your site. And there were direct instructions from the White House, and we've got the email trail and we know that's happening. That is correct. And that's another thing we need to call out and shine a light on because that's, and the surveillance state is something I think we can defeat, but only have enough of us know what's happening.

Speaker 1: And enough people in the house, since the house controls appropriations, decide to turn the money off and they don't pass 1.2 trillion spending bills that contain all kinds of things that you and I and our viewing and listening audience would be very offended, highly disturbed over, but well, we can't have a shutdown. They're terrified of a shutdown. Oh my goodness. We can't possibly, we have to continue to fund things that are not in our interests. I mean, that's the thinking. And I was having a conversation with a mutual friend and I said, well, you took an oath and you took an oath to represent the people that your constituents, and so how can you vote against your interests and the people that you represent, you know that they don't want you to fund ninth month abortion, so they don't want you to fund radical transgender surgeries on children. So why are you voting? Well, it's all bundled up then vote no. I mean, no, it's not very popular. It takes guts, but sometimes you have to actually do the hard things and not just go with the flow, what's convenient. So maybe we'll learn that the hard way, but at a certain point there comes a line, I guess. And we're there,

Speaker 2: We're there, we're there, we're there,

Speaker 1: Bill, what else do you want to talk about before

Speaker 2: We We've got it covered. I'm thrilled to be here because what you and Tom are doing, judicial watch is just such a tremendous service. I mean, you've actually unearthed a lot of the bad stuff I now know about because of the work you guys have been

Speaker 1: Doing. Well, we try to, and I appreciate your compliment. And it goes to the other 50 some odd judicial watch employees who are making it all happen day in, day

Speaker 2: Out. But I'm afraid a lot of things I've said on this show, I'm sure that I'm never going to get invited to Davos again. Most days are over Watch

Speaker 1: List. Yeah, the watch list for Davos. Yeah. You remain very active, very mischievous, very aggressive in pursuing all these topics we've been talking about. If folks want to follow your work and what you're doing, where can they find you? What's your

Speaker 2: We're on Substack, we're on Rumble, we're on YouTube, we're on all the podcast platforms. The website, this is Bill Walton show. We've also got some of the things we're doing with the Ute Protector Foundation, and it's a fascinating, I think with all due modesty, we have had almost 250 shows. And if you look at the guests we've had on, you can learn something about everything. I'm sure we had Bob Woodson on with his 1776 project, which is knuckling back the 1619 project. That's a full discussion of what that's about. Fed Arthur Laffer on talking about economics and the supply side. Had George Gilder on talking about the next future energy sources. So I guess what I try to do is to get these subjects which are not very well covered, a little bit about what you're trying to do, not very well covered even in a lot of podcasts, and go a little deeper with some experts

Speaker 1: And we will link all your stuff on your sites. We'll link this to the episode, so folks that are watching this or listening to it, just watch judicial watch site, find this episode and we'll link all your stuff in there as well so folks can find it.

Speaker 2: Chris, thank you.

Speaker 1: Thank you very much, bill. It was wonderful having you on kind of a mutual admiration society. This is

Speaker 2: Good,

Speaker 1: But this is important stuff.

Speaker 2: Completing each other's sentences,

Speaker 1: Important stuff to talk about, because frankly, there isn't a lot of really in depth, thoughtful discussion on topics. A lot of stuff is drive by superficial with what Rush

Limbaugh used to call drive by media, right? Yeah. It's very gloss and gone, but we need to remember stuff. We need to not let go. We just need to stick together. Absolutely. We do. And so first of all, thanks to our viewing and listening audience for tuning in. We appreciate it very much. And please be sure to check back, we try to knock out one or two of these a week, and we're very grateful today to have Bill Walton join us. Thank you very much, bill. It's great. Great to have you. Have fun. Good fun talk. Yeah. I'm Chris Ferrell on watch.