

Artemis Moon Accords: Roscosmos' Rogozin Weighs in...

[ARTEMIS MOON ACCORDS: ROSCOSMOS' ROGOZIN WEIGHS IN...](#)

by [Joseph P. Farrell, Giza Death Star](#)

May 14, 2020

While everyone's been following the Fauci(rhymes with Grouchy)-Lieber-Wuhan virus plandemic narrative, something has been going on "up there" that's worth noting. Indeed, part of me thinks that one objective of this whole plandemic exercise (Secretary of State Pompeo's word, not mine) was to function as a gigantic distraction while "they" get other pieces in place. One of those "pieces" the Trump administration is trying to put into place are the so-called Artemis accords, which essentially would allow private interests to mine the Moon and keep as property whatever they recover there.

If your suspicion meter is already in the red zone with that one, then join the club, because mine is too, and it was also way beyond the red zone and into the purple zone for G.B., who shared this article, and also some very intriguing high octane speculations which I want to pass along to you:

[Rogozin Compares Reported US Lunar 'Artemis Accords' With Iraq, Afghanistan Invasions](#)

As the title of the article makes clear, the head of Russia's space agency Roscosmos, Mr. Dmitry Rogozin, is comparing the effect of the Artemis accords to the American invasions of Iraq and Afghanistan:

Earlier in the week, reports emerged that the Trump administration is working on a new international pact under

the name 'Artemis Accords', which will allegedly provide a framework under international law for companies to own the resources they extract from the moon.

The head of Roscosmos, Dmitry Rogozin, lambasted alleged US plans on "moon mining" and creating "safety zones" on Earth's only natural satellite, comparing the situation with the US presence in Iraq and saying that the "invasion method" remains the same. He described the method as creating a "coalition of volunteers" and "heading to the goal" no matter who may be against it.

The tweet reads: "The principle of invasion is the same, whether it be the Moon or Iraq: the creation of a "coalition of consonants" is initiated (as an option – a "coalition of willing"), and then, bypassing the UN and even NATO, if anyone doubts there, forward to the goal. However, it is only Iraq or Afghanistan that can come out of this".

Mr. Rogozin's observation is worth pondering, for like it or not, he may be "on" to something: the American invasions of those two countries were, as many regular readers of this blog are probably aware, were designed to accomplish a multitude of goals; the invasions functioned as bridgeheads not only in the war on terror, but also for coalitions of the participating governments and their "most favored corporations." Some have made the case – in my opinion a strong one – that those invasions were *principally* for corporate enrichment, and that the war on terror was merely a narrative designed to sell the venture to the public. Add to this the drug trade tied to Afghanistan, the pipeline ventures tied to the region, and one has a powerful motivation for the establishment of such coalitions deliberately designed to create enough weight to bypass international law or major geopolitical players like Russia or China (considerably weaker as they were back then).

But there's a hidden implication to Mr. Rogozin's

speculations, and it's a very intriguing one to ponder, and this is where G.B.'s own high octane speculations come in. In drawing the analogy to Iraq and Afghanistan, Mr. Rogozin is hardly unaware of the fact that the analogy breaks down between the Moon and those two countries. To be sure, all three are "desolate," but the Moon, unlike Iraq and Afghanistan, is uninhabited. There is no one there to protest any such corporate invasion...

...or, perhaps, that is Mr. Rogozin's point: maybe there *is* someone there, or someone at least *watching* it in order to make sure the hairless monkeys on the parent planet don't get too "uppity." Normally, I'd dismiss such speculations as being too high octane even for this website, except there's one thing hovering uneasily in the background, and it can hardly be coincidental: President Trump's "Space Force." I mention this because recently the "Space Force" began running recruitment videos, videos which emphasize an "off-planet career." And let's not forget the army general a few years ago who mentioned that the future soldier would have to fight "little green men."

Now here's where G.B.'s high octane speculation comes in, and I consider it important enough to pass along: Mr. Rogozin, he reasons, can hardly have selected his analogy of the "American method of invading" between the Moon, Iraq, and Afghanistan by accident. One of my own high octane speculations with respect to the invasion of Iraq in particular, was that a very *hidden* motivation for doing so was to physically occupy and plunder its archaeological sites. By "plunder" I don't necessarily mean exclusively taking physical items and not returning them. I mean also taking measurements, photographing cuneiform tablets, and so on. We were told by Schrubbs junior's administration that the invasion was to deny Saddam Hussein the acquisition of "weapons of mass destruction," and I advanced at the time in various interviews and in books that this was not, as many believe, a complete lie, but merely a

lie covering a truth: the search was for weapons of mass destruction, but of the “ancient” kind as described in old Mesopotamian texts, not the modern atomic, biological, or chemical kind. To this end, I’ve speculated in various books that the Baghdad museum looting was perhaps a part of this operation, and Saddam himself certainly wasn’t helping matters by sponsoring archaeological digs all over the country, and letting it be known that he viewed himself as the reincarnation of Nebuchadnezzar. Whoever *did* rob the museum knew what they were doing and exactly what they were looking for, and I remain unconvinced to this day that (1) it was an American operation exclusively, and (2) that all of what was stolen was recovered and returned to Iraq (which is the public narrative). We know, for example, that some cuneiform tablets are simply missing, and other artifacts made their way into private collections (such as Hobby Lobby’s).

All this brings us to G.B.’s speculation: What if Rogozin, knowing all this, is really trying to warn people that under the cloak of “keeping whatever private corporations may recover on the Moon” includes archaeological artifacts, recovered under the cloak of, and during, normal mining operations.

After all, one way to make sure things stay secret, is to make them proprietary... and Space Force + private mining corporations + museum lootings do, as Rogozin points out, fit the “American pattern” of invasions.

See you on the flip side...