

The Desperate Cling to Keep Orthodox Thinking Alive

Shôn Ellerton, December 22, 2021

When absurdity and madness becomes so extreme, it is the time for the heterodox to rise and bring a new age of enlightenment again.



Will we ever wake up to the reality that it's time to question some of the things which we are forced to believe or accept? Unquestionable things. Things that, if questioned, can get one into trouble, because they must not be questioned. I am being speculative here and I am being cautiously optimistic about this, but perhaps, we may be seeing a new light in the not too distant future. The rise from the pit of single-minded ultra-orthodox thinking to a new period of enlightenment where heterodox thinking is accepted and, maybe even, revered?

Clutching at straws

Things could get worse proving me wrong, but how much worse can we go? Surely, the threads of orthodox thinking have become so thin that they're going to snap at any moment. It's as if there is a sense of sheer desperation of those whose power that depends on maintaining orthodoxy are clutching at straws or grabbing anything from the aether to keep it alive. Anything at all. All that is absurd from silencing highly skilled and experienced doctors on social media platforms while celebrities attack and debunk them. From maintaining the stance that the Capitol Hill 'takeover' on Jan 6th was the worst day of democracy in the US while nationwide riots destroyed hundreds of millions of dollars of damage and cost many lives due to 'racial inequity' issues. From suggesting that being punctual and timely is a 'white thing' to transgender activists shutting down the Boston Gay Pride earlier this year. Seriously.

Something must give. I have my fingers crossed that more of us will wake up to reality.

Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy explained

But first, let's see what's happened. How did we arrive in a world of narrow-minded, compliance without questioning, dogmatic, lemming-like, and religiously orthodox thinking? As Gad Saad paraphrased this, it's as if a parasite has taken over the minds of so many of us throwing them into an age of darkness not far removed from fifteenth-century Europe. We live in a world where those infected by this 'parasite' would rather take the advice of our beloved celebrities rather than the advice of experts in their own fields who oppose views from those dictated by our politicians who we are constantly reminded that they are giving us the best possible advice by *their* experts.

Let's quickly run through the definition of orthodox and heterodox thinking. For those not familiar, orthodox is defined as following or conforming to generally accepted rules, narratives, dogma, or a set of beliefs. Heterodox may be defined as 'thinking out of the box', challenging a narrative, looking at both sides, or just unconforming. Extreme or ultra-heterodoxy is not a good thing where *everything* must be questioned, usually in the name of belligerence and rebellion. Likewise, ultra-orthodoxy is not a good thing either in which anyone who thinks outside of the accepted narrative, even if it makes absolutely no sense, is cast into heresy, and punished by the powers at be. Tyranny depends on forcing others to adopt orthodox thinking, much like the Catholic Church did in bygone years.

Grouping people into thinking classes

What's startled me during the last two to three years is the gradual change of thinking and behaviour by many of those I know and interact with from balanced, rational, and logical to herd-like, unquestioning, and almost religious zeal. It's not certain how this has happened, but I suspect much of it has to do with Trump and the pandemic. Others I know have kept quiet and out of the limelight while some have enlightened themselves by breaking new frontiers and adopting more heterodox thinking. Some will remain firmly seated in reptilian, flat earth, New Order, and highly conspiratorial territory, although they do add a bit of zest and entertainment at times.

We can divide those who I know into three groups, well four, if you count the conspiracists, but we'll leave them aside.

First group include those, once curious and questioning thinkers, that have curled up into a sort of proverbial snail's shell preferring the comforts of keeping their heads below the battle trench edges in refuge from orthodox inquisitors taking little pot shots at them. They let life slide by before them with the confidence that everything will be just fine. Let Nature take its course. There's no use in getting involved. Let others worry about it. There're other important things to think about. And so on. This is only natural, and it would be wrong to condemn those that don't wish to raise their heads. After all, it does take energy and some degree of fortitude to challenge and be in risk of being confronted.

The second group are those who have abandoned lateral, out-of-the-box, critical, rational, and questioning thinking to spaniel-like, unquestioning, devout, and obedient to the point of religious zealousness subservience. Worse still, are those, who want to be 'approved' by parroting those who preach the common narrative; for example, to post a meme or message on social media that you should do this or that and if you don't you are one of *them*. They certainly do not like to be challenged by commentary often resorting to such tactics like citing '*stay-in-your-laneism*' and '*whataboutism*', terms which are basically synonymous with pigeonholing and making comparisons respectively. Incidentally, case law would not flourish without some degree of 'whataboutism'. This group's way of thinking promotes the collective shaming of those who think alternatively, out-of-the-box or against the majority.

For this group, whether this alternative or heterodox thinking is right or wrong is irrelevant because it is must *never* be given an audience to challenge the views of the orthodox in the first place. Orthodox thinking must prevail at all costs. One must not be able to debate with someone of differing views or listen to an interview or read a book or article contrary to the commonly accepted view. They would rather search for a rebuttal of the offending piece and preach its 'overriding wisdom' to bunker up confirmational biases rather than to read the source material and elaborate on it. Hundreds of years ago in parts of Europe before the Enlightenment period came into being, mentioning anything against the teachings of Catholicism was dangerously heterodox. There were those who challenged its dogma, but most were ostracised or punished, sometimes by death, usually in a somewhat unpleasant manner.

And then, the remaining few comprising the third group are those who have embarked into or continue to strive for enlightenment willing to challenge things which either don't make much sense or of those things which do not have a reasonable explanation as to why. These are today's heterodox thinkers, and although, there is little fear of being burned at the stake, there is a genuine fear of being 'excommunicated' from mainstream society. Many within this group keep their heterodox beliefs under the radar or within a very small social network of those who can be trusted not to share their blasphemous secrets and inner thoughts. In general, very few will take the plunge and openly challenge orthodoxy.

The threads of ultra-orthodox thinking may snap

After nearly two years of a pandemic that nobody seems to really understand, what is clearly apparent is a desperate attempt, as if taking that last gasp of air before the cyanide kicks in, by the devout orthodox to quash the blasphemy of wrong think in the misguided notion that doing so would benefit the greater good. Are the threads of conformed and collective thinking unravelling? Are we more and more unwilling to keep being hoodwinked from knowing the internal machinations of what's really going on? Will we enter a second age of Enlightenment? Unless we truly descend into an age of abject despotism based on absurdity and total control; a sort of cross between a technocracy and medical tyranny (the movie, *Alphaville*, and book, *Brave New World*, are good examples respectively), I think the threads of ultra-orthodox thinking are beginning to untangle and ready to snap.

Praise to our online mercenaries

Our world of Internet has given the ability to explore viewpoints from any perspective. And let's face it, during the past few years, we've had a lot happened which has created so much division and controversy that we simply need to have access to alternative viewpoints to know what the hell is going on. Investigative journalism has virtually died of death. The days of sending out journalists and knocking on people's doors has been replaced with large mainstream outlets regurgitating material, often tired and outdated, from local news sources or through a myriad of social media posts and videos. Moreover, these news sources are heavily biased to suit the reader's preference. Bari Weiss, once a journalist for the New York Times, revealed that most NYT

journalists simply made an easy buck by spinning a story to suit the newspaper's narrative. Anything alternative, regardless of its veracity, is much harder to get past the editor. Most journalists working for these outlets are fortunate enough to get a job with such outlets like the NYT or the Washington Post and seldom wish to make their lives that much harder by writing articles which don't fit the editor's viewpoints.

Enter the world of the online mercenaries who provide an outlet of alternative viewpoints which our mainstream is reluctant or even refuse to give airtime to. Many are well-educated and highly intelligent individuals possessing the ability to think rationally, objectively, and logically. There are others, of course, who are just plain weirdos, the so-called conspiracy theorists, generating waves of controversy or, frankly, just to have a laugh, especially to those who take their stuff seriously and take offence. Kind of like poking a stick through a fence at an angry dog.

The IDW and their 'nemesis' topics of discussion

Several years ago, the rise of intelligent alt-speak had become quite popular with those genuinely wanting to challenge themselves and others with new ideas and perspectives on current affairs. One of the most prominent examples is of the cohort known as the Intellectual Dark Web (the IDW for short), consisting of such characters like Jordan Peterson, the Weinstein brothers, Ben Shapiro, Claire Lehmann, Gad Saad, Sam Harris, and Joe Rogan. I wrote a more comprehensive article on the IDW in an article titled, [*The Vanguard of Free Thought and Reason*](#). They all share quite different viewpoints; but they do have one thing in common, or, at least, *had* one thing in common. They are heterodox thinkers. The ability to think critically and listen to all perspectives with impartiality. Sure, they all have personal biases, but they all air a general civility to those who felt brave enough to be interviewed by them, let alone challenge them.

However, ultra-orthodoxy had begun to infiltrate the ranks of the IDW, notably with Sam Harris on Trump and Claire Lehman on vaccines and unevidenced science; what I describe as their 'nemesis' topics. Although, more recently, the topic of vaccines can now be added as one of Sam's 'nemesis' topics.

Peculiarly, neither Sam nor Claire could maintain a civil discussion or write up an impartial post if their 'nemesis' topics came up. Sam made his opinions very clear on matters pertaining to Trump resorting to cussing and swearing in a

hyped-up emotional way that, somehow, seemed genuinely out of character for a podcaster with such a calm and collected style of delivery as it usually comes across in his *Making Sense* podcast series. With Claire, it is her stance with vaccinations during the coronavirus pandemic and her extreme mistrust with unevidenced science, without which, much of today's technology would not be with us today as you cannot extend science without breaking new frontiers. We often understand the science *after* the invention.

She also shut herself completely off to alternative views on mandates, masking, and lockdowns. It did not matter if those views were discussed by eminent scientists, doctors or professors who have had decades of experience under their belts. It did not matter if those countries or states which did not impose strict mandates were doing no worse than others. Claire simply shut herself completely off from such viewpoints and, furthermore, consigned all of them to the ranks of the nutty conspiracist. However, subject material not associated with vaccinations, or the pandemic is usually treated with good analysis, objectivity, nuance, and intelligent thought, much of it demonstrated in her interesting [Quillette](#) publication. We are all human, but it's striking that when normally heterodox and nuanced thinkers stumble upon a 'nemesis' topic, their mindset plunges into dogmatic orthodoxy that simply must not be challenged. It's as if a sort of rabid-like anger overtakes them when such topics are mentioned fogging out any ability to have a meaningful, intelligent, and nuanced discussion.

Let me just say that I like Sam Harris and Claire Lehmann very much and I follow them avidly. They have both enormously contributed in enriching the knowledge of their followers and we need people like these. In any case, I would assume that most of Sam's and Claire's followers are more of a heterodox persuasion than orthodox and are less likely to unfollow them at the drop of a hat because they happened to touch on certain topics of discussion which are not in agreement. More of this to be discussed later.

Gauging through commentary

Twitter, despite its problems by providing a platform which can get a little overheated with emotion and lacking the ability to express context and nuance, is an effective gauge in measuring out what subscribers of their favourite podcasters and vloggers think of the latest productions. For example, a podcast that aired in December 2021 with Sam Harris and Nicholas Christakis titled

[What Have We Learned from the Pandemic?](#) was decidedly disappointing in what transpired to be two guys agreeing on the same thing; mainly to discredit alternate views and bounce off each other that what they say is undisputable fact. Most of the Twitter feedback was negative unsurprisingly and, to be sure, many of Sam's regular listeners seemed frustrated with his increasingly orthodox thinking style. As for Claire, many of her regular followers on her Facebook page have expressed their disappointment on her rants against those who hold alternative views on vaccines. Rather than take the opportunity to listen to other experts in the field, she goes for the jugular making out that any view contrary to the mainstream narrative is uninformed right-wing, QAnon, tin-foil hat, Trump-loving, flat-earth, New Order, conspiracy theory, the likes of David Icke and Alex Jones would approve of. But as aforementioned, these are those 'nemesis' topics which just happened to twinge that nerve. The commentary from disenchanted followers of Sam and Claire on these topics were generally civil and, to be sure, they will continue to be followers. They were only sending a message out to them to keep their rational thinking caps and not get sucked into mainstream orthodox thinking.

The narrowing repertoire of the orthodox thinker

Now for those who have been regular subscribers to their favourite alt-think personality, particularly those of the IDW, many of which I have been introduced to through others, there's been an interesting change of sentiment in some who have been regulars over the years. It seems that many regulars have turned to the 'all or nothing' mindset inasmuch that they no longer tune in to their once-favourite podcaster because they do not agree with *everything* their once favourite podcaster now says. What tends to happen is that their choice of podcaster is narrowed to such an extent that they are often left with one or two regulars which exhibit all the same biases as they do. More often than not, the regulars who remain and have survived the gauntlet of disapproval are usually orthodox and parrot-like in nature quick to accuse the heretical heterodox lot without confronting them directly while their subscribers are enjoying having their confirmation biases fulfilled. Furthermore, these subscribers tune out to any discussion or refuse to watch an interview or debate in which they *know* there are going to be opinions revealed in which they don't agree with. They would much rather wait it out for their favourite personality who shares their same biases to critique that interview.

This intersectional approach of choosing people to listen to is extremely limiting and self-serves to the requirements of truly single-minded orthodox thinking. Think of a Venn diagram where all confluences point to an extremely small area of thought and opinion. It takes a degree of resolve, tolerance, and impartiality to listen to or read material from sides which we *think* that we *know* that we will not agree with. In the world of the judiciary, it is prudent that we take in material from *all* sides of the debate. The judge who does not exercise these attributes cannot be impartial which often results in an unfair trial and a miscarriage of justice.

The well-roundedness of the heterodox thinker

One would think that orthodox thinking is endemic to those who are less educated and intelligent than those who possess heterodox thinking. This is not true; however, the more heterodox of us may be a little more well-rounded in terms of experience, travel, and wisdom, in general. On the flipside, many heterodox thinkers are often ‘jack-of-all-trades’ and ‘master-of-none’, which gives those orthodox thinkers the illusion that they have a decided advantage in terms of backing up their arguments *specific* to their knowledge set. However, there’s enough research to suggest that stuffing a bunch of scientists *within the same* field of expertise in a room to solve a problem is not nearly as effective as having a wide range of expertise from different fields working together. To quote an example, Riitta Katila, a professor of management science and engineering at Stanford, published an interesting article in the Harvard Business Review titled [*Too Many Experts Can Hurt Your Innovation Projects.*](#)

The ‘orthodox Elect’ and its arch enemy

However, there are heterodox thinkers who *are* most certainly experts in their field that challenge the ‘unchallengeable’ views of the decreed narrative, often with evidence that suggests that their differing views may have merit. It is of this breed of the heterodox thinkers that represent the arch enemy of the ultra-orthodox. Not the David Ickes’s or the Alex Jones’s of the world. They are of no real threat, although they may be entertaining at times. But the others, the ones with real expertise, credentials, and experience? These are the ‘dangerous’ ones the ultra-orthodox want silenced, and they will fight tooth-and-nail to do so. In most cases, they generally get their way whether it is through raising a

fuss to platform providers like YouTube or Twitter in getting them removed or through threatening tactics like doxing or humiliation.

However, some get through by being invited to platforms like *The Joe Rogan Experience (JRE)* or being interviewed by the *Daily Wire*, a news platform started by Ben Shapiro, both far too big to be taken down. Unquestionably, at time of writing, these two platforms are deemed Enemy #1 with the *orthodox Elect*, a phrase I will adopt attributing it to John McWhorter in his 2021 book, *Woke Racism*, in which he used the term, the Elect, to describe those who religiously adhere to the tenets of anti-racism and decry anyone as proverbial blasphemers who do not. Much like statue-toppling, the *JRE* and *Daily Wire* are examples of platforms the orthodox Elect want disappeared, like Twitter's removal of Trump's feed. The orthodox Elect are becoming increasingly agitated that they cannot remove them, which is plainly evident when, after any controversial interview, a barrage of hate articles, false rebuttals, and mischaracterisations ensue. I picture the movie, *Dawn of the Dead*, in which a mob of zombies are pressing against the doors of the shopping mall trying to get in.

The comedian's armour against the orthodox Elect

Another enemy of the orthodox Elect are comedian or ex-comedian vloggers and celebrities like Russell Brand, Isaac Butterworth, JP Sears, Ricky Gervais and now, Dave Chapelle, all of whom, have huge followings, not to mention Joe Rogan previously mentioned above. To be honest, I personally believe that most comedians are thoroughly disliked by the orthodox Elect. Comedians mock anything, or to use a common British phrase, 'take the piss out of anything including themselves'. I have, yet, to find a funny comedian who is woke, orthodox, and politically correct. Those who had once followed some of the aforementioned comedians and joined the ranks of the orthodox Elect during the last couple of years of Trump and the pandemic have now steered clear away from them, in case, I presume, of being infected by 'right-wing', QAnon-ist, rabbit-hole, white-supremacist, and murderously dangerous behaviour. Earlier in the year, I had an attempt at writing a humorous piece titled [*Biden and Trump Go Grocery Shopping Together*](#). It was a short piss-take story at *both* Biden and Trump in which they were doing the rounds at the local grocery store and bumped into each other. Personally, I'm no fan of either, but those who supported Biden admonished me on 'being so horrible' to Biden, yet Trump, no

problem. Unsurprisingly, the reverse did not occur. Maybe I didn't try hard enough to demonise Trump but how far should I have gone? The orthodox Elect would have simply preferred that I didn't write it all. As an aside, I seriously wonder if many of the orthodox Elect understand satire at all, which, perhaps explains why some of these comedians manage to stay under the radar of big tech's scythe of censorship.

Joe Rogan isn't smart

We must return to Joe Rogan, who, undoubtedly, has the largest one-on-one talk-show platform in which Rogan interviews a wide variety of people from all walks of life not limited to sports celebrities, CEOs of major industries, scientists, actors, comedians, medical doctors, intellectuals, ex-servicemen, and authors of controversial books. Some of his guests, no doubt, will resonate positively with the orthodox Elect; however, returning on the point of intersectional agreement, the orthodox Elect will abandon listening to someone if *other* points of view are in question. In the case of Joe Rogan, it is his choice of guests, some of which have been very controversial indeed, including Abigail Shrier, Alex Jones, Dr Sanjay Gupta, Bret Weinstein, Stefan Molyneux, Dr Peter McCullough and, yes, Elon Musk, the billionaire entrepreneur who moved his Tesla business from California to Texas. Coleman Hughes, one of today's most eminent podcaster and thinker concerning racial issues tweeted out that he found Rogan's style of engagement to be more intellectually honest than that of most professional intellectuals. Hughes himself, a person of colour, has railed against the tenets of CRT and has invited Ibram Kendi, the author of *How to be an Antiracist*, to be a guest on his show for an interview. He declined. Kendi, like most of those in the orthodox Elect, do not like to be challenged.

Rogan is hated so much by the orthodox Elect, that they, astonishingly, refer to him as 'not being smart enough'. I guess he kind of looks a little less likely to be intelligent if one likes stereotyping. Yeah, he likes the gym, drinks his whisky, and smokes his cigars on set, likes his guns, swears a bit, looks a bit like one of those crazed ex-military guys with his bald head and tattoos. I have no doubt that the shallowest people who thrive on stereotyping and pigeonholing others will think this way. Yet, I dare say, that those who say this will find themselves flummoxed for words and dead in their tracks as to what to say if they were asked to give a two to three hour interview with someone who they have no experience on the subject. Rogan, time and time again, tries to

educate those occasional orthodox Elect listeners that, on subjects that are discussed in which he has no expertise with, he makes this patently clear to his listeners. But this seems to make no impression. The orthodox Elect often has a strange warped sense of logic that the *interviewer* also needs to be an expert on the topic discussed. Which means chat shows like Terry Wogan, Phil Donahue and Graham Norton should never have existed if they applied the same logic to these shows. Moreover, the orthodox Elect only want interviews that *affirm* what they want to know on all sides rather than to *challenge*. To challenge, in their books, is to waste too much time and effort; however, they will doggedly persist, behind the scenes, to *silence* the debate.

Heterodox thinkers are often well-travelled

Those who are well-travelled most certainly become better heterodox thinkers, particularly on such subjects which are of a cultural nature. Compare someone who lives and has always lived in one state in the United States watching his or her own favourite mainstream network with someone who's been extensively travelled or has come and settled from a different culture. Divisive topics such as the never-ending problems of racism, anti-racism, sexism, evangelism, and more recently, transgenderism nearly always ripen to fruition in the minds of those who simply haven't been able to get out there in the wider world. Imagine the social activist who decries anyone who denies the teachings of CRT-rooted anti-racism. Now let's imagine that same person taking a sabbatical in central Africa for several months. I have, no doubt, that he or she will have a very different view on racism and anti-racism upon returning. Sadly, despite the new experiences that person had in central Africa, returning home, and discussing that same subject to his activist fellows with a new light would probably fall on deaf ears to most of them. The orthodox mindset is such that the verdict had already been given closing it to any further thought or discussion. Now and again, there are some who will listen and make a reassessment of their former judgments, but they are generally fewer in number. Moreover, those that flip to the 'dark side' of heterodoxy are, themselves, now the target of the orthodox Elect. An interesting observation can be seen in a sort of different kind of way in which today's progressives are tomorrow's conservatives which are then attacked by the *new* progressives. Which is why progressive governments generally fail to meet any of their objectives.

The orthodox Elect love to 'follow the science'

At this point, we must dive into the problem of how the orthodox Elect treat science. Of course, *they* know what science is, or at least they think they do. ‘Follow the science’, ‘We trust the science’, ‘Science is clear’, ‘Stop drinking the Kool-Aid and get out of that rabbit hole you conspiracy theorist tin-foil hat nutcase’, ‘Listen to Fauci’. I’ve heard them all and most certainly, you have too. However, the problem with the orthodox Elect’s perspective of science is twofold. The appeal to a higher authority and the seemingly gross ineptitude to expand science by crossing over the frontiers of what is not yet evidenced. Perhaps I should save the second point to another piece, but save to say that science is often not able to progress without breaking into new unexplored frontiers. Many of the orthodox Elect ‘scientists’—I prefer to call them technical analysts—don’t seem able to accept this, despite some of our great scientists in the past who needed to break into new unevidenced frontiers such as Tesla, Newton and Curie. Today’s orthodox Elect scientists would really be better off being those assistants and sidekicks that the frontier scientists need to crank out their numbers and write their papers. They probably don’t have the right latitude of thinking to discover anything new.

As for the first, we have a problem with the orthodox Elect’s predilection in taking anything said by a higher authority, even if affiliated politically, as taken as being read with the utmost veracity and to be taken at face value without question. The orthodox Elect consider other eminent scientists, even if far more experienced in their respective fields, that take an alternative view, as mere quacks. In their minds, they are not to be trusted and merely spread dangerous misinformation. This level of thinking is at its most shallow and absolutely contrary to the advancement of science. Any reasonable individual will understand that there will be failures and successes in the discovery of new ideas, but the orthodox Elect can’t abide by this. *Any* idea which has not been triple peer-reviewed and backed up with one-hundred percent evidence without *any* flaws associated with it and then ratified by our political elite must be dismissed as quackery and tin-foil hat material. I allude to this in another piece titled [Scurvy, Hydroxychloroquine and Lemons](#), in which it took 2 million people to die from scurvy over a period of two hundred years before someone successfully peer-reviewed it and finally convinced the authorities that consuming citrus fruit actually stops scurvy.

In 2021, the use of ivermectin and other therapeutics warrants more attention as a preventative to work alongside with the vaccines, but it is ‘verboden’ to talk

about them because they clearly don't work (*cough*) and because they haven't been extensively peer-reviewed, so the orthodox Elect keep saying.

Sure, right. We know they don't always work, but we also have a substantial amount of evidence that they can assist in reducing the symptoms. Not always, of course. As for those cases, some very tragic indeed, that involve severe side effects from the vaccine, rare as they may be, the narrative is to silence the news as much as possible, whereas any side effect from a therapeutic is to be *accentuated* as much as possible. Not terribly impartial and fair I posit.

Celebrity doctors with rapper-like names are the experts

The thinking of the orthodox Elect is somewhat shallow in nature tending to suppress their own curiosities to deep dive into understanding alternative views in fear of polluting their own deeply galvanised convictions. For example, during December 2021, an interview took place between a renowned heart doctor, Dr Peter McCullough, having treated many COVID patients with therapeutics, and the much-maligned Joe Rogan. A whopping 3-hour interview. The orthodox Elect would rather *not* watch the interview—as this would be a complete waste of their time—but instead, unbelievably, to watch a celebrity-turned doctor, Zubin Damania, nicknamed ZDOG (I kid you not), who earns \$6 million per annum rubbish the interview with no solid material to back his claims, most of them highly opinionated. This is only one of many examples of this most utmost of travesties. Clearly, one should ask the question. Where is the science now? That's right. With a celebrity YouTube doctor with a rapper-like hip nickname, ZDOG! Perhaps I'm being too harsh and judgmental as ZDOG has some genuinely good content as well, but I am gravely concerned that real experts in the field who are not following the political narrative are silenced. And there have been many of them. This is truly frightening.

Total mass retain of the absurd and the mad

So perhaps it's time to get a feel as to what's going to happen soon. Because I think we've got to a point where total absurdity and madness in the world has got to such a point in which it is no longer tenable to hoodwink half the world into blindly following our leaders and conforming to narratives however bizarre and unreasonable they may be. Let's take some examples where some of the orthodox Elect are beginning to wake up to.

1. The idea that the tenets of critical race theory is not such a great idea after all.
2. The idea that mask-wearing in open spaces and parks, once enforced in some states and countries in the western world, is simply ridiculous, especially with a new strain of virus which is far more infectious and transmissible.
3. The idea that mandating and vaccinating everyone in the world will end the pandemic, because, clearly, and one would have to be utterly clueless not to see this, being vaccinated doesn't stop the spread of the virus, although it has helped the most vulnerable ride it out during the earlier far nastier strains.
4. The idea that white supremacists and right-wing fascists are those rebellious and 'utterly selfish' antivaxxers, many of them, in fact, being lefties, hippies, indigenous and people of colour.
5. The strange and bizarre tactics of big tech to censor renowned experts in their fields, however plausible and logical they may be.
6. The doggedness by some governments to ban therapeutics like hydroxychloroquine and ivermectin.
7. Frustrated doctors losing their licences just for mentioning these drugs even though there *might* be a chance of reducing the onset of the virus if a positive-tested patient tries them out.
8. The absurd notion that mass testing, mask-wearing to perpetuity, vaccine passports (a really dumb idea considering that the vaccinated spread the virus anyway) and, of course vaccine mandates, especially for children, will end the pandemic.

And what about some of the conspiracies like Hunter Biden and the Wuhan lab leak which we weren't allowed to post in 2020 only to later emerge that much evidence had surfaced to suggest that they are true? Really, the list goes on, and come the new year, I will be publishing the next silly and absurd moments of 2021 as I did for 2020, [55 Crazy & Absurd Moments of 2020](#).

The people are beginning to wake up at last... I think

More people are beginning to take note and realise, what the hell is going on here? Especially during the latest wave of the coronavirus, code-named Omicron, as we start to learn all the Greek letters of the alphabet. Yet, the remaining hardened orthodox Elect are flailing away like an octopus on speed to

keep the fear to a maximum. To spread grossly exaggerated and misleading reports; even to *fabricate* journal pieces like the May 2020 report in the [Lancet about the safety of hydroxychloroquine](#), which, after being discovered as ‘unreliable’, had then been retracted. To the best of their abilities, to cover up or twist the narrative of the ever-increasing global mass protests which are taking place against vaccine mandates and continuing restrictions. To keep spruiking the idea that the only way to stop the pandemic is by vaccinating everyone, despite a virus which is quickly mutating. And then to keep the vicious circle going by pushing the message that *unvaccinated* people mutate the virus!

To make an end statement, many of those who frequently posted on social media espousing the above absurdities have gone strangely silent as of late. More people I have noticed have overcome their fear of being ostracised and beginning to speak up. More people are willing to not conform to the absurd and bow down to the madness. The diminishing base of the orthodox Elect (or so I hope) are not liking this one little bit and are tearing their hair out, scratching for anything out of desperation. But the cracks are widening. More and more of us are getting *really* tired of this lunacy and are starting to rebel and fight back. Maybe we will get there again. To another era of Enlightenment and freedom from the tyrannical whips of the orthodox Elect.