The Pressing Dangers of Technocracy

Analysis by Dr. Joseph Mercola ✔ Fact Checked | August 07, 2022

STORY AT-A-GLANCE

> Technocracy is an economic system that started in the 1930s during the height of the Great Depression, when scientists and engineers got together to solve the nation's economic problems. Technocrats have silently and relentlessly pushed forward ever since, and their agenda is now becoming increasingly visible

> Technocrats invented a new economic system from scratch — a resource-based economic system in which energy and social engineering run the economy rather than pricing mechanisms such as supply and demand

> Technocracy calls for the total dismantling of the political system, which includes the U.S. Constitution. Nations are to be led by unelected leaders who decide which resources companies can use to make certain products, and which products consumers are ultimately allowed to buy

> The Trilateral Commission is a key technocratic mastermind group that has dominated the American political system since Jimmy Carter

> The only reason technocracy has not yet been able to overtake the U.S. — although they're getting incredibly close — is because of our Constitution. This is why we must fight to protect our Constitution at all costs. One of the most effective ways to do this is through grassroots movements and getting involved in local politics

This article was previously published August 9, 2020, and has been updated with new information.

Patrick Wood — an economist, financial analyst and American constitutionalist — has devoted a lifetime to uncovering the mystery of what is controlling most of the craziness we're currently seeing, and which has been exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic.

He's written two books on this topic: "Technocracy Rising: The Trojan Horse of Global Transformation" and "Technocracy: The Hard Road to World Order." I was intrigued by his work as my own approach is to seek to understand the foundational cause of any given problem.

> "I think that's a really important takeaway for listeners," Wood says. "Don't just confine your view to the microcosm, like what's in front of you. Always try and look for the big picture … Once you have the big picture, it's hard to unsee it. Once you see it, it's hard to not see it. It guides everything else you do within your life at that point, and that's really important.
>
> It's certainly important in medicine, because if a doctor or researcher doesn't really understand the whole picture, how can he understand a little part of the picture when you get right down into some nitty-gritty detail? It's very difficult."

Wood's foray into the ideology of technocracy began with a chance meeting with Anthony Sutton at a gold conference in the early 1970s. Sutton has written several books about political science, primarily about the Trilateral Commission, which Wood had studied from a financial angle.

They developed a relationship and eventually wound up collaborating on a newsletter and two books, "Trilaterals Over Washington: Volumes 1 and 2," which have since been re-released.

> "Having been mentored by somebody like Anthony Sutton, who was a world-class researcher, left indelible marks on my life. I couldn't do what I do today without his coaching, instruction, watching him do things, watching his mind work," Wood says.

"He would sit down every morning and spend his two or three hours just flipping through the newspapers. Looking for stories in the front page, back page, middle page, classifieds, whatever. He was really intent on keeping his mind focused on his subject, and digging in the right places and stuff. So that's helped me today, to do what I do."

Definition of Technocracy

So, what is "technocracy"? As explained by Wood, technocracy is a movement that started in the 1930s during the height of the Great Depression, when scientists and engineers got together to solve the nation's economic problems. It looked like capitalism and free enterprise were going to die, so they decided to invent a new economic system from scratch.

They called this system "technocracy." It was to be a resource-based economic system. Rather than basing the economic system on pricing mechanisms such as supply and demand, this system is instead based on energy resources and social engineering. In a nutshell, under this system, companies would be told what resources they're allowed to use, when, and for what, and consumers would be told what to buy.

> *"They actually proposed to use an energy script instead of money, and let energy be the determining factor on what was produced, bought and sold, and consumed, and so on. But being engineers and scientists, in 1938 when this definition came out, which I'm going to read, they had capsulized what they viewed as the scientific method and the scientific approach.*
>
> *It's important to see that today, because we see the same subtleties, the same mindsets, the same thinking processes that they had back then. I will contend that's a very dangerous thing. It's a dangerous thinking process. But here's what they concluded in 1938:*
>
> *'Technocracy is the science of social engineering. The scientific operation of the entire social mechanism, to produce and distribute goods and services to*

the entire population.'

First off, you'll see that it's the science of social engineering. That ought to be enough to make the hair stand up on the back of your head, because who wants to be scientifically engineered by somebody that you don't know, somebody that doesn't know you, but rather has this idea that they can reform you, remake you?

But most importantly, you see the economic aspect that they had in mind, the scientific operation of the entire social mechanism — that's all the people in society — to produce and distribute goods and services to the entire population.

This was an economic system from the get go, not a political system. And what's really important to see in that — the big takeaway here — is that technocracy viewed politics and politicians as an unnecessary, irrelevant, and even just a stumbling block to getting on down the road with society.

They proposed to get rid of all the politicians. Just dismiss them. Dismiss the Senate, the Congress, all the elected officials. They basically wanted to set up an organization chart, like a corporation would have today, where you have the president and you have vice-presidents doing different things. Then you have directors over certain departments and so on.

And they would just disappear the political system per se, leaving no citizen representation of government. Of course, that means the Constitution [is] immaterial, too, because that defines the political structure.

In fact, they openly called on FDR to declare himself dictator, so that he could just implement technocracy. He didn't take them up on it. We can thank God for that. We only got the New Deal instead. By comparison, it's much better … So, this was the genesis of technocracy and technocrats."

Scientists Stand Above All Other Individuals

As explained by Wood, the technocrats "had this crazy idea that they were better than everybody else." This philosophy and mindset can be traced back to Henri de Saint-Simon, a French philosopher from around 1800. Saint-Simon is considered the father of scientism, social sciences, transhumanism and technocracy.

He said in one of his essays, "A scientist ... is a man who foresees. It is because science provides the means to predict, that it is useful, and the scientists are superior to all other men." This was the mindset of technocrats in the 1930s, and it's the same today. In essence, science is used to manipulate society and keep the economic engine running.

Top Technocrats Rescued Through Operation Paperclip

While technocracy began in the U.S., the first country to implement it was Nazi Germany under Hitler. However, it's important to realize that technocracy is not Republican or Democrat. It's not Marxist or Capitalist. It's not a Nazi philosophy. It's an independent ideology.

When technocracy first began in the U.S., it was a membership organization. At its peak, there were more than 500,000 card-carrying, dues-paying members in the United States and Canada. Incidentally, the head of technocracy in Canada was the grandfather of Elon Musk, founder of Tesla and SpaceX. Around the same time, a technocratic organization also got started in Germany.

> "As Hitler rose to power, he realized that the technocrats, as an organization, would be competitive with him becoming a dictator. So, he outlawed the Technocratic party in Germany. At about the same time, technocracy was outlawed in Canada [for two years]. For a number of reasons, they thought that somehow the two were connected and that technocracy in Canada would be supporting Hitler ...
>
> It was discovered later by historians that these technocrats, who were banned from meeting, were actually very active during the course of World War II, during Hitler's reign. They were the statisticians, the mathematicians, the

physicists, the engineers for business and so on, that really enabled Hitler's expansion and dictatorship.

That's not to say that they were all in lockstep with his goals, but they had a good time supporting all those things, because they were highly prized by Hitler and his leadership.

During the war, they found out also that these technocrats were communicating between the columns of power in Nazi, Germany. Hitler was rather paranoid about keeping all of those different areas separate so they would not communicate, but they did communicate during the war.

After the war … a top-secret operation [took place] in the United States … called Operation Paperclip, which brought some 1,200 of these top scientists and engineers from Germany to the United States. They sanitized their resumes and installed them into positions of scientific prowess in the United States, like at the national technology agencies.

So, the very same people that were helping Hitler do what he did, completely bypassed the Nuremberg trial. Some of them should have been there, I'm sure. But they were brought to the United States and given high positions of prestige, to continue to practice their science and engineering."

Beauty and the Beast

The Trilateral Commission's co-founder Zbigniew Brzezinski, a Columbia University professor, brought the concept of technocracy into the Commission in 1973, with the financial support of David Rockefeller.

"Brzezinski wrote this book called 'Between Two Ages — America's Role in the Technetronic Era.' It caught Rockefeller's eye. And so, Rockefeller and Brzezinski became like the beauty and the beast. They went on to form the Trilateral Commission, which declared, from Day 1, that they wanted to foster a new international economic order.

They said that repeatedly in their literature, and this is what got Sutton excited, and me too. What is this new international economic order you're talking about? What do you mean? We have an economic order. It seems to be working. Why do you want to change everything? What is your idea here?"

The Trilateral Commission more or less took over the Jimmy Carter administration, and has dominated the political structure ever since. Regardless of their party affiliations, U.S. presidents have been members of the Trilateral Commission.

Carter, Ronald Reagan, George H.W. Bush and Bill Clinton were all members. Within two weeks of his inauguration, Barack Obama appointed 11 Trilateral Commission members to top-level positions in his administration, equivalent to 12% of the Commission's entire U.S. membership.[1] The ramifications of this are described in Wood's article,[2] "Obama: Trilateral Commission Endgame."

"What happened here is that they were after the mechanism, because America was the greatest economic engine in the world at that time," Wood explains. *"They wanted to get control of the economic engine of the world so that they could manipulate it for their own benefit and convert it, transform it if you will, into technocracy …"*

Personal Freedom Is the Enemy of Technocracy

It's important to realize we're fighting an enemy that has literally spent the last several generations compiling their power base. They've done it progressively, slowly and very consistently over time with the endgame in mind at all times. They engineered circumstances that allow them to amass more and more power.

> **❝ What the technocrats are doing is making an end run around national sovereignty. Rather than a frontal assault on the system, which has never been**

> **successful, they've simply eroded national sovereignty piece by piece.** "

Their last great power grab in the U.S. was the 9/11 tragedy. It allowed them to push through the Patriot Act, which sacrificed many of our freedoms in one fell swoop. They're in the process of doing it again with the current pandemic. It's quite clear the pandemic is being used to move us toward an authoritarian tyranny.

However, the COVID-19 pandemic has provided a platform that will dwarf their 9/11 power-grab and radically increase their ability to continue to erode our civil liberties and control our society. If you find this line of reasoning interesting, I think you will enjoy the video below from Really Graceful, which reviews whether or not you'd even notice if you were living under tyranny.

Technocratic Infrastructure

It's also crucial to understand that the only reason they've not yet been able to overtake the U.S. is because of our Constitution. We're the biggest barrier worldwide to implementing technocracy, which is why there's been so much focus on dismantling the freedoms of Americans.

> *"The strategy has been to build infrastructure for their system. Infrastructure is the schematic diagram that makes things work. For instance, we have roads in our country. We have railroads. We have physical roads. We have freeways. We have telecommunications systems. We have telephone lines. We have airports and things that connect everything together.*
>
> *The concept of infrastructure is basic to any economic system. You have to have some type of infrastructure, so that the whole system will work. And so, today when the government passes a $2 trillion infrastructure bill, you and I will think, 'Oh, finally, we're going to get those potholes fixed on our street or something.'*

In the technocrat mind, in the larger scheme, setting up the infrastructure involves so many more things today than it ever did.

For instance, the infrastructure of technocracy now has to do with anything called smart: smart growth, smart cities, smart phones, smart devices, the internet of things that ties everything together, all of the sensors and the cameras. This is the new infrastructure of the digital era. It's all technology based, I might add.

So, infrastructure started way back when the Trilateral Commission was first started. A case in point: One of the early founding members of the commission was [the late] Caspar Weinberger, who happened to be the president of Bechtel Engineering. That's the largest private engineering company in the world. They're huge. They're are private. Nobody knows much about them. But they were part of the Trilateral Commission group …

They've always realized that without building this infrastructure, they have nothing. They can get nowhere. They must have it in order to move on down the road. We've seen this emphasis on infrastructure ever since 1973 in ways that people hardly can understand anymore, because it's so technological.

But the infrastructure being laid today includes such things as the internet of things, where sensors and everything connect together to feed data back to, who knows, some mainframe somewhere.

All of the financial transactions, all of the data transactions [get sent] back to some computer somewhere where artificial intelligence is sitting on top of it all to make sense of all the data coming in.

The same artificial intelligence programs now are taking that data, working it, getting some sense of meaning out of it, then turning around and issuing things that we should do in response. In other words, how it should change us.

This is the science of social engineering. It's engineering by algorithm. They saw this even back in the 1930s, even though there was no such thing as artificial intelligence back then.

They realized that science eventually would be to the point where their algorithms could be automated to the point where they would be able to replace the political structure, to keep everything in line, to keep everything working.

Rule by algorithm. Operation by algorithm. This is the big predominant thing we see today. When something doesn't fit into the algorithm, you'll hear the term 'Science says.' We should do that thing."

To give you just one rather hilarious real-world example of the technocratic "science says" strategy, here's a sentence from an article in The Sun:[3] "People who refuse to wear a face mask to reduce the risk of coronavirus have lower cognitive ability, new research has found."

Not only is it laughable because it's illogical, it's also completely irrelevant, since there's not a single well-designed study showing that mask wearing lowers the spread of viral infections.

Rule by Algorithm

Initially, science is used to issue suggestions, but those suggestions rapidly turn into mandates. We've repeatedly seen that with vaccines, for example. But the COVID-19 pandemic has also revealed there's a much larger plan that includes implantable digital identifications, medical records and vaccine passports, digital currency and banking — all of which will ultimately be tied together so that algorithms and automation will be able to keep everyone in line, everywhere, all the time.

"People who buck the system won't be able to participate in all the things in society that other people do who got the vaccines and just took the program without questioning. The algorithm will control everybody, will manipulate everybody.

So, it goes from, 'Science says' to the algorithm, and then it becomes automated. Then they don't have to say 'Science says' anymore. They just push the button. The algorithm takes care of it and you get the shot and that's the end of it.

This business of infrastructure is very sophisticated. Today it's called supply chain, by the way. That's a big term you'll hear, too. The supply chain, moving goods and services to get just in the right place, just in time.

No warehouse is necessary. Just kind of ship it and it's there exactly the day you need it. This has all been automated as well. It's part of the infrastructure they need to implement technocracy one day."

Data Is the New Oil

In her book, "[The Age of Surveillance Capitalism](#)," professor Shoshana Zuboff exposes the stunning capacities currently available to surveil, analyze and manipulate our behavior. It's crucial to realize that as bad as it is today, the predictive power of technology is advancing at an exponential rate, which means their ability to manipulate behavior is increasing at a pace we cannot fully comprehend.

"Data is the new oil of the 21st century," Wood says. *"We said that for years now, and it's really true. Whoever owns the data, controls the system. Data is more valuable to technocracy than any other commodity that you could conceivably imagine. And Google has been collecting this data for a long time.*

They've been analyzing it for a long time, and they have a number of techniques now where they can use that data, weaponize it in a sense, turn it back on us and cause it to modify our behavior. And this is right in line with the scientific social engineering concept.

Several years ago, Eric Schmidt [former long-time Google CEO and, later, chairman of Alphabet,] *was invited to be a member of the Trilateral commission. He's also hobnobbing with our government to create systems for*

surveillance and data collection. Google now has been in a position to weaponize that data ... Google does this in several ways.

Not only do they condition the feed that you see when you search for a certain term, but also ... when you start to type in a search, it will give you the answers [and] you pick one. It won't give you the ones that you might really be looking for, but it'll give you what they think you should pick. This has a huge, psychological impact on people. Just huge."

What's the Ultimate Goal?

For instance, years ago, if you searched for a holistic medicine topic, many of my articles would appear at the top of your search. In June 2019, Google quietly started to eliminate Mercola.com from search results. I discussed this in detail in two different articles when that happened. Recently, however, it appears that Google is again allowing searches, but only if you include Mercola in the search terms.

"You haven't done anything different. You're still doing exactly what you did, but Google is treating you as a non-person now," Wood says. *"It reminds you a little bit of '1984,' where Winston worked in the ministry of information and his business half the time was scratching out people from history. They just ceased to exist.*

Every record, even their birth record was erased and nobody would ever hear that person's name again. If they went to look, they couldn't find him. And then people started thinking 'Maybe it was just my imagination. I never really knew somebody like that.'

Google has this power to present information that it wants you to hear or see, and they can manipulate minds and mindsets. It's just amazing. They even said, internally, that they believe they have the power to take the 2020 election away from Trump because of this very feature. Well, wait a minute.

If any person or organization sets themselves up intentionally to overthrow the government of the United States, I think there's a term for that. It's called sedition. It might give way to insurrection as well, but that doesn't bother these people. There's no ethical guide whatsoever that tells them this is wrong and don't do it. They feel this is perfectly normal. They've got the data, they make the rules.

So, they're influencing people, they're nudging people in one direction or another direction. And it's extremely dangerous because those who are susceptible to that kind of manipulation, once they are in that manipulation channel, they can get them to do anything.

Once it gets a hold of a person and really starts messing with their mind, then they can feed all kinds of stuff into it and get them to do all kinds of things they would not have otherwise done.

And that's true for Facebook and Twitter and other entities like that as well. But you can't look at Google, Facebook and Twitter and say these are communists. You can't do that. They're technocrats. They march to a different tune completely and they could care less about the political ideology behind it.

I don't care who you are, what your political persuasion is, but if you start writing against vaccines, for instance ... you'll find yourself censored just right along with everybody else and your stories will disappear. There'll be shadow banned. There'll be pushed down the stack where they don't appear in the searches anymore.

It doesn't really have to do with a class of people that they're censoring, it has to do with the topics that are being censored. That's the key thing here to understand. One of the key topics today that they are so in love with is this idea of global manipulation of the human [gene] pool, to get the medical hooks into your body.

This is social engineering at its extreme, where they're not only engineering the society around you, the environment around you, they also want to engineer you personally. This is their mindset right now. We've seen evidence of this all over the place. I don't want to go into it and confuse this conversation, but this is where it's going."

Sustainable Development Isn't What You Think

Wood also explains why "sustainable development" goals, which sound like a good thing, really aren't. The United Nations has declared that sustainable development is going to be the new economic system of the future. It's a resource-based economic system based on energy.

"A couple of years ago, the head of climate change at the U.N., Christiana Figueres, gave a press conference in Europe and she said, 'This is the first time in the history of mankind that we're setting ourselves the task of intentionally, within a defined period of time, to change the economic development model that has been reigning for at least 150 years since the Industrial Revolution.'

That's a direct quote from her lips. I dedicated a chapter in my book to demonstrate that sustainable development is technocracy from the 1930s. It has all the same markers. It has all the same elements in it. It was brought to the United Nation by members of The Trilateral Commission, by the way …

Their vision for the future of society is this sustainable future where they will control all the resources and all the consumption. In other words, they will tell businesses what they're allowed to build and they will tell consumers what they're allowed to consume. Period, end of subject. You don't need to be involved in this. They figure this all out for you in advance.

This is the science of social engineering here. They have the science, you just have to follow and do what they tell you to do. It's very insidious. Of course, they

have nice platitudes like we're going to eliminate poverty, we're going to have education for all, we're going to have jobs with dignity.

That's all wonderful stuff, but when you get down to the bottom of their so-called sustainable development [and green deal] goals, you see [that] all you have to do to get those things is let us have all the control over the resources and the management of those resources on a global basis."

Taking Back Local Government Is Key

Importantly, what the technocrats are doing is making an end run around national sovereignty. Rather than a frontal assault on the system, which has never been successful, they've simply eroded national sovereignty piece by piece. Wood also reviews what we can do to save our republic and thwart the steady march of technocracy:

> *"I believe very strongly that local activism is the only way to rebuild our country, if there is going to be any rebuilding at all. Local activism — because this is how they got us. They built [the technocratic system] from the bottom up. We cannot tear their house down from the top down. It's simply is just not going to happen. They're too powerful,"* Wood says.

> *"There is no national government or any element of national government that's going to save us from these technocrats and technocracy. There's no state government, either, or local government, the way it stands now, unless that local government gets influenced and populated by people who know better and who are willing to tell these others:*

> *'Go away, you don't belong here. This is not the way we're going to run our community, our town, our city,' whatever it is, and we have access to those people."*

One of the most important elected local officials that you should concern yourself with is your sheriff. They are responsible for enforcing tyrannical edicts from local, state and

federal government, and if they choose not to, government has no power. City councils also have a lot of power. They can pass binding resolutions to protect citizens against the technocratic agenda.

> *"There was a city in California, I can't remember the name right now, but somebody got to the city council and educated every one of them. The city council held a referendum and passed a binding resolution that says there will be no agency of the city or any other activity of the city that will support Agenda 21. They banned Agenda 21 from their city, lock, stock and barrel. It was just a small city, but I thought, 'Yeah!'"*

What is Agenda 21? It is the keystone document for Sustainable Development. It was developed in 1992 at the Rio de Janeiro conference of the United Nations' first Earth summit. This became the agenda for the 21st century. The doctrine that came to be known as Agenda 21 came from a book written by Trilateral Commission member Gro Harlem Brundtland, called "Our Common Future."

Citizens for Free Speech

We cover a lot of information in this interview, so be sure to listen to it in its entirety, or read through the transcript for more. Also consider picking up one or both of his books, "**Technocracy Rising: The Trojan Horse of Global Transformation**" and "**Technocracy: The Hard Road to World Order**."

Wood's nonprofit organization, **Citizens for Free Speech**, is another excellent resource where you can learn more about your constitutional rights and how to communicate your ideas to others. For a small donation, Citizens for Free Speech also offers a laminated **No Mask Card** that you can wear on a lanyard, explaining your First Amendment Right to disobey local mask mandates.

> *"I started Citizens for Free Speech with the idea that technocracy is attacking the First Amendment,"* Wood says. *"It's censoring our ability to communicate.*

It's keeping us from communicating with each other and with our government and with our adversaries, those who may not agree with us fully.

Our ability to communicate has been completely decimated in America. We're so dysfunctional. Everybody's at everybody else's throat all the time. There's no patience, there's no civil discourse anymore. And I believe that what people really have to learn, if they're going to be local activists, they need to learn how to communicate their ideas.

Once they get ideas, they need to learn how to communicate those ideas to other people. Maybe those people agree with them, maybe they don't, but nevertheless, they need to be able to express their ideas in a way that everybody in the room doesn't get triggered and start hammering on you.

This concept of appropriate communication is what restoring the First Amendment at this point is all about … The First Amendment is under an intense attack by these people. That's part of their strategy. Get rid of the First Amendment effectively, and what else do you have? Well, you have the Second Amendment. That's the first thing you see.

I don't even want to talk about the Second Amendment. I support it totally, don't get me wrong, but if we lose the First Amendment, the Second Amendment was put there to take care of the loss of the first. And that's the strategy that the enemy has, to break America down.

[Once you] get rid of the First Amendment, they figure America will fall into chaos, probably armed conflict, and that will make it just right for them to sweep in and take over when people then beg for anybody to put government back together, put the country back together.

So, the idea of supporting and defending the First Amendment is critical right now. People can get the issues, but if they cannot communicate those issues effectively, what's the point? Why just sit on your couch and know everything there is to know if you have no ability to communicate that to somebody else? …

People ... understand the value now, or maybe the necessity, of civil disobedience. This is a very touchy subject. I don't want to go down the road too much. But we have reached a point where technocracy has pushed us into a corner ...

If we do not resist and say, 'We're not going along with your program,' then they will continue to push us into the corner until we simply cannot get out of that corner. The time has come for people to do what they know is right, and to protect themselves first — not to think about 'the greater good' all the time ...

Once people see through the pseudoscience of face mask and social distancing, contact tracing, and all these mechanisms that are being thrown down at us, once they start to see through the statistical models being totally erroneous, they're beginning to understand we just need to stop this behavior and not obey them ...

We must restore our Constitution, which is the framework for everything else in our nation. We must restore the effective application of the constitution to our society ...

There's public shaming, the cancel culture, it all comes to bear on this right now. This is part of the communication process that we need to overcome. We need to push this line of thinking back and restore personal individual liberty to America."

Sources and References

- [1] Technocracy News January 7, 2016
- [2] Obama: Trilateral Commission Endgame
- [3] The Sun July 14, 2020