

Do as We Say or Lose Your Money and/or Your Account

[Do as We Say or Lose Your Money and/or Your Account](#)

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

October 19, 2022

You may recall the “Occupy Wall Street” movement from a few years ago that occurred in the wake of the 2008 “bailouts” and the subsequent exposure of corporate shenanigans in Congress and by a few intrepid reporters. Our very own friend and colleague Catherin Austin Fitts was warning about missing money in the federal budget, to the tune of trillions of dollars. Another friend of mine was close to the scene of the action in New York City, and joined the protests, and informed me that they were not really a group of radical people, but simply people of all political stripes and varieties, and pretty much all demographics, that were saying “enough!” to government-issued corporate privilege and power.

Thus, what was unique about the protests at the time – though few noticed it and even fewer commented about it – was that the protests were genuinely populist. Populism is usually taught as a “bad thing” in modern American quackademia, and the Occupy Wall Street protests were a living lesson in why, for the protests *brought together* people both of left-wing and of right-wing political and cultural leanings, and all under the banner of protest against growing corporate power, and its indifference to the country and culture as a whole. It was the first outward and visible sign of an inward and cultural transformation that was beginning to take place: everyone was fine with ‘capitalism,’ but there were limits, and corporations and the government itself had crossed the line of

those limits.

Occupy Wall Street, like all such movements, was quickly targeted by radical elements and agents provocateurs in an effort to radicalize what was otherwise a spontaneous movement and derail it. From a certain standpoint, those efforts were successful, but the movement and, more importantly, the perceptions and sentiments behind it, did not disappear, they merely reemerged in another guise, and when they did reemerge, lo and behold, the numbers had grown: *the perception and sentiments had spread, and gained new recruits.*

This past Monday I blogged about a French intelligence analysis that places the USA as the principal enemy of France, and in the article about that report, I also noted that globaloneyism itself is implicated in that analysis, i.e., that globaloneyism is a principal enemy of the national and cultural interest of France. Whether or not this is an accurate assessment of the French intelligence analysis, I believe it to be an accurate representation of the basic paradigm shift represented by the Occupy Wall Street movement, and whatever it may have transformed into at present, namely, the perception that the roots of globaloneyism are in the international business class; their own publications have emphasized that they want a borderless (and hence, cultureless) world in which to conduct business and transact freely. It sounds nice, but the reality of it is that it means everything is oriented only for profit, and anything standing in the way of that – religion, culture, family, ethnicity, sex, you name it – must be weakened and destroyed. And such cultural expressions as freedom are also a threat. The cultural and political commentator Dr Steve Turley sums up this whole approach – of *both* sides – with the very apt aphorism: Globalism is not a civilization, it's a *system*, and that is ultimately why it is rapidly losing its appeal. It's merely the "businessman's" version of Communism, with all its international pretensions and aspirations.

The cancel culture has emerged from this whole approach, and we're seeing examples recently with Paypal's sudden announcement that if you used their service and espoused "views" they didn't like, they'd *fine* you \$2500.00. Paypal's stock quickly suffered, with the company backtracking a bit, but nonetheless, a corporation had arrogated to itself the right to decide what you think, and to fine you if you didn't think appropriately: welcome to the world of the World Economic Forum, the world of BIS chief Augustin Carstens, the world of der Hochklaus von Blohschwab, of Baal Gates, George Soros... of SPECTRE.

Now apparently JP Morgan Chase has cancelled the checking account of a religious charity for being... well, a religious charity that they apparently don't like:

[JP Morgan Cancels Religious Nonprofit's Checking Account, Demands Donor List as Condition for Reconsideration](#)

The charity is headed by former Republican US Senator Sam Brownback from Kansas, who noted:

In a post at [Restoring America](#), Brownback, a former Republican U.S. senator and governor from Kansas, said that CCRF is "diverse" and "bipartisan," and represents "people from every faith and walk of life. Its Advisory Board, he noted, "includes members who are Christian, Hindu, Jewish, Latter-Day Saints, and Muslim."

Worse, Chase gave Brownback and the charity no real explanation as to why the account was closed:

To this day, the NCRF does not have a clear reason as to why our account was closed after only three weeks. We certainly hadn't made any transactions in that short amount of time that would have triggered any regulatory red flags.

Brownback said that he was "shocked and surprised" to learn

that “someone from Chase eventually reached out to our executive director and informed him that it would be willing to reconsider doing business with the NCRF if we would provide our donor list, a list of political candidates we intended to support, and a full explanation of the criteria by which we would endorse and support those candidates.”

He argued that the demands for “this type of information” was “entirely inappropriate,” and unfortunately, not the first time a religious organization “has found itself facing sudden and unexplained account closures.”

Oh... we’ll reconsider doing business with you, just supply us your donor list!

Or to put that point differently: tell us everyone you associate with, and we *might* allow you to have an account.

That, folks, is tyranny... and let’s remember, it’s a Rockefeller bank.

You might want to think about *this* for a moment:

[JP Morgan Fines and Penalties paid since 2000](#)

And just in case you didn’t look closely:

Current Parent Company Name: JPMorgan Chase

Ownership Structure: publicly traded (ticker symbol NYSE: JPM)

Headquartered in: New York

Major Industry: financial services

Specific Industry: banking & securities

Penalty total since 2000: \$36,129,269,434

Number of records: 222

TOP 5 OFFENSE GROUPS (<u>GROUPS DEFINED</u>)	PENALTY TOTAL	NUMBER OF RECORDS
financial offenses	\$26,619,328,020	112

TOP 5 OFFENSE GROUPS (GROUPS DEFINED)	PENALTY TOTAL	NUMBER OF RECORDS
consumer-protection-related offenses	\$6,363,346,750	37
competition-related offenses	\$1,855,919,125	13
government-contracting-related offenses	\$614,000,000	1
employment-related offenses	\$521,399,028	45
TOP 5 PRIMARY OFFENSE TYPES	PENALTY TOTAL	NUMBER OF RECORDS
toxic securities abuses	\$13,459,785,714	7
investor protection violation	\$6,212,471,206	75
mortgage abuses	\$5,362,675,000	5
banking violation	\$4,262,350,341	14
anti-money-laundering deficiencies	\$2,161,000,000	2

That small local credit union is looking better and better... maybe it's time to start cancelling the cancellers. No one wants Communism, and by the same token, no one wants corporatism and its version of soulless tyranny either. The old bailout adage has it that some banks are just "too big to fail." I think the lesson is that some are just too big to function efficiently and within the law.

See you on the flip side...

[Connect with Joseph P. Farrell](#)

cover image credit: [Clkr-Free-Vector-Images](#)